

regard to this clause, whereby our Federation, which is composed of such a large body of men in New Zealand, to say nothing of Australia; the ramifications of the Federated Seamen's Union extend throughout Australia, and, as I have said, this clause would at the present time prohibit them from registering any portion of the federation in Wellington. I would also favour an alteration in the direction that it read, "the Court" instead of "the Board," although my opinion is that no Board is so biassed as to give any prejudicial opinion in regard to a matter of this sort. Clause 12, subsection (2)—"Nothing in this Act or in the registration of an industrial union under this Act," &c. : I think this is a restriction that is placed upon unions without any due cause, and I think if this is to apply to a union in one direction it ought to apply to the employers in another direction—that an employer should not be permitted to form any organization of workers whatever. This clause prohibits the unions from entering into any manufacturing operations.

9. *Mr. Tanner.*] Have you not misunderstood it? It does not prohibit, it does not authorise.—No; it does not authorise. Therefore I say there is no necessity for the section. There is nothing in the Act which gives a union any authority to commence any industry. I do not think that a union should be prohibited in any manner from commencing any industry if it desires to do so. In 1888 the Seamen's Union had very good and substantial reasons to run vessels on this coast in opposition to the Northern Steamship Company, and there is no telling what might happen again. I take it that the clause is meant to prevent a union from commencing an industry of any kind. Now I wish to deal with clause 16.

10. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the words "not exceeding one acre"?—Yes. I cannot say for the life of me why a union should be narrowed down to one acre. Supposing, for example, a union desired to erect any building of any extent with a nice piece of land to it, this clause would prohibit it: for instance, we might have reason in this city to build a Trades Hall, and there is no telling what we may desire to have attached in connection with that Trades Hall. We might desire to have a ground to hold our Eight Hours Demonstration, sports, &c. I say that no union should be narrowed down to the extent of one acre. It is simply following the lines of the Trades Union Act. Clause 21, "Any Council or other body, however designated, representing not less than four industrial unions," &c. : in regard to this clause I think that, outside of the number of unions, industrial associations nowadays should only consist of industrial unions of the one industry, and, further, I think that the number should be narrowed down to either two or three industrial unions.

11. *Mr. Collins.*] You mean "two or more," do you not?—Yes, "two or more." If industrial associations are constituted of the one industry you then have the one trade consolidated into one body with a Federated Council over their head, and that being so it would be within the power of the Court, where any dispute affects that association of the one industry, to make an award colonial instead of local. That is, of course, if the parties desire it.

12. *The Chairman.*] Why should you not elect the Court by the registered unions, and there is no necessity then for an industrial association in the whole thing?—An industrial union's jurisdiction does not extend outside of one particular industrial district; is it right to say that an industrial union carrying on a business of any particular industry in any particular district shall have the right to go to the Court to the detriment of the other unions and say, "We ask that this Court shall make their award universal throughout the colony"?

13. The only thing is to decide whether you will allow the industrial unions by themselves to elect the Court the same as the Board, and to take a dispute into the Court, is it not?—The industrial unions have the power now to take a dispute into the Court, but they have not the power of election to the Court. I may say that you have here in Wellington a Trades Council with various industrial unions affiliated. Now, there are no two unions in that Council of the same industry, but that body, being an industrial association, has the power, so far as the wording of this Bill is concerned, to go to the Court as an association on behalf of any union and ask the Court that their award shall be made universal throughout the colony. It is necessary that unions that cannot be affiliated with the Trades Council shall be fully considered in every part of the colony. Clause 85, subsection (1), paragraph (d) : "The currency of the award being any specified period not exceeding two years from the date of the award." I think that the extreme should be three years, then you allow the Court a certain time to go and come on. In pretty well every award that has been made in the colony two years has been the specified time of its term. I think that two years in the Bill is too little.

14. *Mr. Collins.*] Would you say, "not less than two years"?—Yes, not less than two years, and not exceeding three. Then, coming to clause 86, subsection (3) : "Power to extend the award so as to join and bind thereto" : this is where the matter of an industrial association constituted of industrial unions of the one industry ought to come in. I think the Court should only have the power to make the award colonial where it affects industrial associations of the one industry throughout the colony.

15. *Mr. Tanner.*] The last line says, "in the same industry." Do you not think that applies?—It does not appear to me to be sufficiently explicit. I think it should be more so, seeing that this Bill applies to workers directly.

16. *Mr. Morrison.*] A suggestion has been made to insert the words "in the colony" after the word "employer;" would that meet your difficulty?—It would be beneficial to a certain extent if that were inserted. Clause 104; I think there is too much power in this clause left in the hands of the Minister. In subsection (3) I would suggest that an alteration be made; at present it reads "the Minister may from time to time," &c. I suggest that it read "the Minister of Railways shall, if desired, enter into an industrial agreement."

17. *Mr. Collins.*] Would not the proposal to bring all the Government employes under the Act do away with your difficulty?—It would not be sufficient.

18. *Mr. Arnold.*] What is the difference between "may from time to time" and "shall if desired"?—"Shall" is compulsory, and "may" is not. That is how I take it.