

sider it should be made clearer that one employer can cause a lockout. In clause 5, we recognise that for a union to strike while working under an award is an offence, but we want the words "or not" struck out, because we consider it is only a fair thing when an award is not in force.

9. You only want to bind a union which is registered under the Act and working under an award?—That is so. Clause 6: We want the words "where an award is in force" included, to carry out our meaning with regard to clause 5. In subsection (3) of clause 6 we want inserted, after the words "publishes in any newspaper any expression of approval," the words "or otherwise." Subsection (4) of the same clause we strongly object to. There might be only seven men in the union, as, for instance, take the glass-bevellers.

10. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] It would have to be proved that there was a combination?—It says, "the majority of the members of the union."

11. That is to fix it on the union. If the majority indorsed the strike, then the union would be responsible?—In regard to clause 9, we object to give twenty-one days' notice of intention to strike. If that is carried there will be no strike at all in those industries.

12. This applies to specific trades: Do you think the stokers in a gasworks should be allowed to leave a town in darkness, so that people could commit all sorts of depredations and assaults?—But take a union trying to come to an agreement with its employers.

13. The trades to which this clause applies are engaged in what may be called the necessities of life. You know thousands of children and invalids are dependent on milk, and cutting off the supply suddenly may mean death?—Yes, but twenty-one days is too long a time. Cut it down, because the employers have all the benefit of it. They could get blacklegs in that time.

14. *The Chairman.*] How many days would you give?—I reckon twenty-four hours is quite sufficient. Our union has not given that clause very serious consideration however, because it does not affect us.

15. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] It is in the interests of the public as a whole?—Yes. We object very strongly to clause 10. We consider the penalties already sufficient without suspension of registration for three years. If you had one or the other it would be a different thing.

16. But if it is made optional by the Court?—It should be one penalty for one offence. Clause 21: We consider that fines could be collected in the ordinary way as a debt, not by stopping a man's pay through his employer.

17. Do you think it is right that a single man should pay a penalty as well as a married man?—Yes, certainly.

18. Well, you cannot always get it from a single man?—If I were fined for striking at any time I should be very sorry to have my employer stopping it from my pay.

19. We desire to have an effective way of getting it paid?—A man would be practically the slave of his employer. With regard to Part III, "Conciliation," we are surprised to find a number of the clauses in last year's Bill are missing, and think the Minister must have listened to the labour agitators and taken notice of their manifesto. If any evidence was needed to show the necessity for Industrial Councils, and that they were approved of by labour, there was the instance where Mr. Young, who was loudest in his condemnation of this clause, sat with the Hon. Mr. Millar as the independent chairman to settle the seamen's case, which they did with good results, and that was purely an Industrial Council. Where there is only one man provided for to sit with the Magistrate, as it is here, there is a big chance of his being bought over.

20. Supposing we made it three men, and gave the Magistrate no voting-power, would you approve of that?—Yes. No employees are afraid to meet their employers. The cry against the clause came from the agitators, because they are anxious to appear before the Conciliation Board and get their £1 per day, or whatever it may be. It is therefore not in their interests to have Industrial Councils. Clause 32: No barrister or solicitor should be allowed to appear in these matters. They cannot appear at present.

21. It is to prevent them coming in that the provision is made. At present they can appear if both sides agree?—Is that so? Well, you should make it clear that they cannot come in at all. In the "Miscellaneous" we object to the number forming a union—twenty-five—on the ground that it is too big. For instance, take the glass-bevellers. So far as I know, there is only one firm engaged in this industry, which has a monopoly. There are only six men employed in it, and they have no chance of forming a union until there are seven. They applied to our union, and we took them in. We asked the employer to meet us in conference and make a special agreement for his men, and he said he was going to resist in the Arbitration Court any attempt to bring him in under our union. He will be able to treat these men as he likes, and if the number is made twenty-five they will have no chance of forming a union if the Court refuses to allow them to come into our union. We object very strongly to section 47. The unions now are practically forced to vote for any one the Trades Council nominates. It is a waste of time to send out circulars asking for nominations from the unions.

22. The object is to prevent the appointments getting into the hands of three or four big unions. On the other hand, it is not right that a union of seven members should have the same voting-power as a union with six thousand?—One vote for fifty members would give the wharf labourers about forty votes.

23. *The Chairman.*] You would have, one union one vote, the old practice?—My idea of getting the right man is that at the special meeting the vote should be taken, and in sending in the returns the secretary should state how many men were at the meeting.

24. *Mr. EU.*] How would it do to take the vote by ballot?—It is really a waste of time sending out papers at all if the Trades Council forces the hands of the unions. Clause 49: We object to the worker receiving any back pay at all, and consider the Government should take it for charitable purposes.