

of its real nature. Let them get Charles Reade's book, "Put Yourself in his Place," and read that for an exposition of what old unionism was, and then say whether they prefer rattening, fire-raising, and murder to the new unionism, which, rightly understood and carried out, promotes confidence, mutual respect, and mutual agreement. It is time the meaning of this cry against new unionism for old unionism should be known throughout the length and breadth of the land. Those who write these letters about the "new unionism" are entirely unacquainted with its rules or its system; they utterly fail to appreciate what it means at the present time. What is it that the capitalist is afraid of? A federated unionism? We are told, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly, but no matter which, that in this dispute capital feared the affiliation of the Officers' Association with the Seamen's Union. Now, let me put this position to the capitalist: Does he object to an alliance, defensive and offensive, between any two nations? Will he tell us that, because England and some other power are allied, therefore, in every-day life, there must be alliance between the people of one and the other; that in all commercial transactions they must consult each other; that in Germany, in their social movements, they are going to have an influence on England? Now, this is the position which the Shipowners' Association take up in regard to their officers: that, because there is an alliance between the Marine Officers' Association and the Maritime Council, therefore that alliance must interfere with every-day business. Look at the matter calmly; the thing is absurd on its face. The same thing that holds on the larger question should also hold in the minor position. There is not the slightest ground for fear in regard to this trouble on account of federated unionism. The whole position of federated labour is this: that it leaves with every minor power to deal with individual questions—to say that, if an organized attack is made on any one of the sections, the whole body of unionists will resist any such attack. Here is a case in point: The Shipowners' Association have organized an attack upon the Maritime Council. The Union Steamship Company have deliberately joined in that attack—

*Hon. Mr. McLean*: No.

*Mr. Sandford*: I know that Mr. McLean will differ from what I say in this; but I shall cite the testimony of Mr. McLean, who is the Union Company, upon the point. In the first place, the meeting at Albury represented the views of the whole of the shipowners of Australia. At that meeting an understanding was come to on certain lines. No understanding was come to in regard to fixing up the difficulty that had arisen, but a lock-out was agreed upon.

*Hon. Mr. McLean*: The lock-out was long before; there was no understanding for a lock-out come to.

*Mr. Sandford*: I will read from the telegraphic report what happened: "One result of the Conference at Albury has been to bring about a better understanding between the intercolonial companies than at present exists. It is expected, in consequence, that a considerable amount of tonnage will be laid up, the effect of which will be to throw a large number of men out of employment." Now, if that does not show that the shipowners and the Union Company had decided anything, whatever was to be the result of the strike or the matter in dispute, they could entirely agree in this: that they were going to have a considerable difficulty with the labour party. Now for the Union Company's manifesto: "The directors have no alternative left but to fall in with the resolutions of the Steamship Owners' Association and other employers of labour, and to support them to the utmost of their power in opposing the encroachments of the labour unions by every possible means." In view of this, did the Union Steamship Company deliberately ally itself to the Shipowners' Association, which had declared it had for its prime object the crushing of the unions? Those extracts which I have read speak for themselves. Now, in regard to the Hon. Mr. McLean's remarks yesterday, he told us, we know, with the greatest truth, and the greatest candour—and I for one admire his conduct all through this matter—he told us candidly that union and non-union labour had worked together on the company's boats. He might have stopped there. But he admits that this was only allowed until union men could be obtained. The union knew that cases must arise where it would be a suicidal policy in all circumstances to prevent union and non-union labour working together. If a ship were short-handed it was necessary to allow union men to go to sea with the non-union man, who would make up her complement; but for the Union Company to say that, because the unions showed common-sense and forbearance—because they showed a desire not to inconvenience the shipowner or the public, because the unions gave this permission to work with a non-union man—that action constituted a principle for foregoing all our rights, and enabling them to say, further, "That is a reason for allowing us (the Union Company) to do just as we please," surely that was a most unreasonable position for them to take up. Mr. McLean again says, "Employés are entitled to take their fair share of the product of their labour." I acknowledge that we have no right, if employers are making only 15 per cent., to demand that they should pay us at the rate of 16 per cent. I go with Mr. McLean in saying that the employer has a right to a fair share; but I also say that unionism has for one of its advantages that it gets for the employer a fair return for his capital. Mr. McLean also told us yesterday that the Union Company were forced into their union with the Shipowners' Association. Granted; but by whom? The shipowners had no power to say, "You shall enter with us upon this war for the annihilation of unionism." Unless the Shipowners' Association had some power behind them which they could shake at the head of the Union Company they could do nothing. They said, "If you do not assist us in this struggle with the Australian strike we will see that the monopoly of trade with New Zealand held by the Union Company shall cease." No doubt they had the power in that way of jeopardizing the whole industry of this colony and paralysing trade. But Mr. McLean tells us he—the Union Company—had no alternative. I think I can show that he had an alternative. Why was not a Conference accepted at the beginning of the trouble? When the struggle continued, and blood was spilt, there was this alternative of a Conference—the alternative which this new unionism held out as practical and desirable from the commencement of the dispute. We said, "Meet us in Conference; let us have a board of arbitration; we, the labour party, are prepared to abide by the result of arbitration." That was the principle which was held by this unionism that is now so much decried,