

with the details required by the Income-tax Act. A witness spoke with regard to a circular which was sent round by the Labour Department, and said that it was very dictatorial. That circular was issued directly after the furniture-trade dispute in Auckland, and it was merely to the effect that employers and unions were asked—as soon as a dispute arose to send particulars to the Labour Department. The reason why it was issued was that the first we knew of the dispute in the case referred to was to see the big headlines in the newspapers when the news of the dispute was telegraphed down here. The intention of the circular was most harmless, and we have no power to carry out what was proposed in it; it was merely asking for a voluntary opinion. I beg to ask the Committee to take notice of a recommendation made by one witness: that the giving of false information should be punishable. I see it has been left out in the Bill, and I would ask the Committee to make provision for such cases. There is one point which I should like to bring before the Committee, and that is that there have been attacks made upon me in the Wellington papers since the matter has been before the Committee. As I am a Civil servant, and therefore precluded from making any reply, I should like to bring the charges under the notice of the Committee. In last night's *Evening Post* there is an article headed "A New Detective Bureau." In answer to that, all I can say is that I do not think there is anything wrong in being called a detective, because the duty of a detective is to bring criminals to justice. In this morning's paper there is a report of a meeting of the New Zealand Employers' Federation, at which a resolution was carried unanimously in which the following expression was used: "It is now apparent, however, that the labour party, led by the Secretary of the Labour Department, has decided upon a most socialistic platform which has as its ideal "One employer only, and that employer the State." I would ask the Committee, as a measure of protection to me, to refer to the evidence given yesterday, in which it was shown that for ten years the labour councils have brought this matter up yearly at their conferences. It was also mentioned by a witness that the employers had great distrust of the Labour Department. I think that any one who distrusts it must have something to conceal. I have here a letter from my Auckland Inspector, dated the 16th October, 1903, in which he says, "So far, I cannot speak too highly of the general assistance and courtesy given by employers to me in getting any required information, and an apparent cheerful willingness to carry out my instructions. I was rather amused lately when reading the speeches of honourable members in the House, during the debate on the Arbitration Act, when they appeared to consider it would be a great hardship for an employer to be called upon to produce his books for the inspection of a factory Inspector, knowing as I do that I do not think there is an employer throughout the length and breadth of this district but would volunteer his books for my inspection—not only this, but instruct their clerical staff to furnish me with written copies of the same. I venture to think that if some such system as the above was put in force it would give general satisfaction to all concerned, and save a good deal of friction through the interference of persons irresponsible to the Department."

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (1,425 copies), £10 6s.

*Price, 9d.]*

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1903.