

of cases they have compromised on terms which are not legal. I, as an officer of the union, have gone into the matter carefully, and we find that we could do nothing.

92. In case of a man falling back upon the union and getting it to represent him in the Court, would you allow him to settle the matter privately?—No. When a man gives permission to the union to take up his case and act for him he should not settle it out of Court without the consent of the union.

93. I did not clearly understand the statement made by Mr. Barnes, that a man should be paid compensation for accident on the basis of the wages which he had been earning for the previous six or twelve months, no matter what wages he might be earning from the employer by whom he was at the moment engaged?—Precisely so; and I would add that perhaps during the preceding six months the man may have been laid up through sickness or through an accident, and the amount for that time should be taken off his earnings for the six months. It should be based absolutely on the amount of money which he has earned during the preceding six months.

94. *Mr. Laurenson.*] What does a man get if he is injured in working on the Railway Wharf here in Wellington?—I am not aware what it is, but as far as I can gather it is much the same as in other places.

95. What do the railway men get in Lyttelton?—I think it is £1 a week; but if a man is injured upon a steamer and gets damages against the owners, then he has to refund the allowance from the Railway Department.

96. Supposing the owners of the steamer paid him £1 a week, would they require him to refund that?—Yes, if he was receiving £1 a week from the Government.

97. *Mr. Sidey* (to *Mr. Cooper*).] In connection with the question of appeal, under the ordinary jurisdiction of the Magistrate's Court there is a right of appeal on matters of fact when the claim is over £50: have you any objection to such a provision?—The Trades Council has not considered that point, but personally I do not think there is any objection to it.

Mr. Naughton: The object of taking these matters before the Magistrate's Court is that small cases may be settled quickly. If there is to be an appeal on matters of fact, as well as on matters of law, it will simply make the proceedings before the Magistrate's Court useless. It will give a greater opportunity for appeal and consequent delay. I do not know what action the Trades Council may take in the matter, but that is my personal opinion.

Mr. Collins: If we allow that to come in, then we shall have to go back on the whole question.

Mr. Sidey: Would the deputation be in favour of allowing such an appeal in cases where the claims exceed £200?

Mr. Naughton: The Trades Council has not had that point brought under its consideration. What we have chiefly considered is that there should be some means provided for settling small claims quickly.

Mr. Ell: We have had evidence given to us in favour of there being an appeal from the Magistrate's Court to the Supreme Court, and from that to the Appeal Court. Would you be in favour of that?

Mr. McLaren: The bodies I represent are most strongly opposed to any such a thing.

Mr. Cooper: The cost of litigation is now quite as much as the unions can stand.

Telegrams handed in by Mr. Field.

Auckland, 6th October, 1903.

My committee strongly oppose Labour Department Bill in all its phases.

GROSVENOR,
Secretary, Employers' Association.

Blenheim, 7th October, 1903.

EMPLOYERS' Association strongly protest against Labour Department Bill. Consider Bill monstrous, and bordering on Russian persecution. Many will give up employing labour if passed.

F. BYTHELL,
Secretary, Employers' Association.

Dunedin, 8th October, 1903.

OTAGO Employers' Association strongly protest against Labour Department Bill as being highly inquisitorial and entirely unnecessary. Any reasonable objects of Bill already dealt with in existing Acts. Section 7, (c), specially objectionable, and should be strenuously resisted.

GARROW,
Secretary, Employers' Association.

Christchurch, 8th October, 1903.

BILLS committee of the Canterbury Association met to-day, and adopted following resolution *re* Labour Department Bill: "If the only object sought to be obtained through the Labour Department Bill were the compilation of legitimate industrial returns no serious objection could be raised, but the Bill provides for such extensive and undefined powers beyond those already held by the Labour Department (which are already considered sufficient) under other Acts that the committee considers the Bill dangerous in the extreme, and should be strongly resisted."

BROADHEAD,
Secretary, Employers' Association.

Napier, 9th October, 1903.

OUR association enters strong protest against Labour Department Bill. The whole measure is unwarranted, and distinctly oppressive to employers and colonial industries.

Captain TONKIN,
Secretary, Employers' Association.