

Federal Council recommends cancellation of registration if Bill is carried. Tramway, Aerated Water, Domestic Servants oppose it." I might say that, in addition, the Tailoresses' Union passed a pretty stiff resolution against the Bill at the instigation of the Council of the Tailoresses' Federation, and I know that other unions in Christchurch oppose it on the lines of the Canterbury Trades and Labour Council's manifesto. There might be a few in favour of it, but the opposition to the Bill is general. With reference to clause 53, I might say that the clause will affect the following unions in Christchurch: The tailoresses have their president, vice-president, and secretary outside the industry; tailoring trade, secretary; freezers, secretary; Livery-stablemen's Union, secretary; engine-drivers, secretary; meat-preservers, president, secretary, and auditors; plasterers, secretary; millers, secretary; slaughtermen's assistants, secretary; metal-workers, secretary; dairymen, secretary; moulders, secretary; farm labourers, president, secretary, treasurer, auditors, trustees; grocers' assistants, secretary; brickmakers, president; brewery employees, president and secretary; cycle trade employees, secretary; hairdressers, president; aerated-water workers, president; domestic workers, ; and tramway employees, secretary. We find this happens. Take, for instance, the meat-preservers: Their president was dismissed, and they could not get any meat-preserver to take the position. Some one had to fill it, and the meat-preservers asked me to take it. I have not attended many of their meetings, and I do not know their opinion of the Bill—they have never discussed it—but I know that not one of them would take up the position of president or secretary of the union. Other unions are in just the same position. The moulders are in a similar position, and that is a fairly large union as unions go down there. The Council of the Federation of Tailoresses object to the Bill because all along they have had to get officers from outside the union. The livery-stablemen have been prejudiced in the way I have already pointed out. The millers just the other day wrote me a letter asking me to take over the secretaryship. Let it be borne in mind, too, that we do not go chasing after these secretaryships. I do not get anything from the Farm Labourers' Union, and I am living on money of my own. The slaughtermen's assistants came to me in the same way, and the dairymen have gone to a gentleman named Mr. Darcy. In connection with clause 53 I might say that some time ago a Mr. Gohns, of Christchurch, who is now in the Labour Department at Wellington, was boycotted by the tailors' employers in Christchurch, and the man could not get a position anywhere. His own union paid him £2 10s. a week as a retaining-fee until the Court came along to take their case; but gave him to understand that as soon as the case was over the retaining-fee would not be paid. When the case was finished Mr. Gohns lost his £2 10s. a week, and having a wife and children to keep and rent to pay, he had to do something. An appeal was made to the Canterbury Trades and Labour Council, and the result was that eight or nine unions in Christchurch federated themselves for the purpose of employing him as a permanent secretary. They called themselves the Permanent Secretary's Federation of Christchurch, and Mr. Gohns was asked to occupy the position of secretary. This was done to relieve a position created by the intimidation practices of the employers—by the boycott of the employers. Under clause 53 of this Bill the unions could not have employed Mr. Gohns, and as he could not get work his wife and children would have suffered. The unions found that during Mr. Gohns's occupancy of the position they could get their work done efficiently and economically, and since Mr. Gohns has been appointed to a position in the Labour Department another gentleman has been put in his place. We are driven into the position of employing paid secretaries—paid agitators, as they are sometimes called—because it is dangerous for any one to take an official position in any union. I do not wish to say much more in connection with this Bill. All we intend to say is embodied in the manifesto, which explains what we approve of and what we disapprove of. We approve of five or six provisions in the Bill. We approve of clause 21, subsections (1) and (2), sections 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44, which are practically all we do approve of.

9. *Mr. Ell.*] What about clause 49?—We disapprove of that.

10. What is your objection to clause 50?—We object to that on the ground that the Inspector is simply an employee of the Department, and the situation may arise when the Inspectors may be instructed to issue permits indiscriminately. The time may come when the Inspector may have to act according to the instructions of the Minister. It is difficult at the present time to prevent issue of permits when the Chairman of the Conciliation Board gives the permits, but it might be worse if this provision became law. The secretary or president of the union and the employer concerned ought to be allowed to issue the permits.

11. Are you aware that the provisions of subsection (1) of clause 50 are covered by the provisions of the Act of 1895, giving the unions the power of consultation?—I think the Chairman of the Conciliation Board is a much more independent person than the Inspector of Awards.

12. Do you believe in a working-man being able to rise to the position of a captain of a ship?—Certainly.

13. And if qualified for that position, you think he ought to make as good an employer as any one else?—Yes, certainly.

14. How is it that witnesses in union cases are not marked men?—I just explained to you in my evidence that witnesses are marked men. In a case I conducted myself two got the sack before the case was adjudicated upon.

15. You know that cases must be conducted with witnesses: there are hundreds of cases, and you can only point to two where the men have been punished?—The three representatives, if the Industrial Councils clause goes through, will be the very best men in the union. The employers will know that, and as they do not like unionism—especially when it is against them—they will see to it and take the backbone out of unionism by intimidating these men. Intimidation! it is general all over the place.

16. I know there are cases of intimidation, but they are the exception to the rule: you admit that the Conciliation Boards as at present constituted are practically useless?—Under the present Act, yes.