

in a retail business a man is not tied down to a bench where he works from 8 till 5, probably, without speaking to any one. He comes into contact with the public as well as his employers and fellow-employés every minute of the day. We would suggest that the union—although this may not be exactly worded so as to meet your views—should be careful in admitting to its ranks members who may be undesirable.

4. *Mr. Tanner.*] In regard to this, will you please mention the clause to which you refer?—Clause 5, subsection (2). Presuming we give preference, we say that the union rules should include these suggestions of ours before they are registered, and we suggest that these should be included in this paragraph. The next suggestion I have to make is that "The union shall guarantee all its members to be *bond fide* tradesmen." If we give preference to unionists it is only right that, say, in the case of grocers they should have some experience of the grocery trade. Speaking from experience, we have had men coming to us for employment who have been carpenters, or engaged in some other line, and they have come to us claiming employment on the ground that they are members of the Grocers' Union; therefore it is our strong claim that we should have some guarantee that in this respect men coming to us for employment should know something of the trade. The next suggestion is, "Provided that any member be proved to be dishonest he be immediately expelled from the union to which he belongs." I was before the Committee yesterday on behalf of the employers, and this same question cropped up then. I would like to say that we do not wish a man to be debarred from becoming a member of a union for a reason of this kind, but that if after he becomes a member of a union he be proved to be dishonest we think there should be some means of dealing with him by the union and the employers. It is very often absolutely impossible to sheet home a case of dishonesty to a man. He may appropriate such trifling things that it may appear persecution to make a Court case of it. Sometimes it may happen that there is only a suspicion in the mind of an employer that a man may not be honest, and, although there may be very good grounds for that suspicion, yet it cannot be really made more concrete than that an employer thinks a certain employé to be dishonest. I think that if it were provided that in cases of dishonesty being found out and proved it would make men very careful in their actions. Therefore we consider that it should be the promise of the unions to expel men of this sort who have been proved to be dishonest and have been given every chance. A question of this sort is not alone a matter of cash, but a matter of taking goods from the store. Another proviso is "Provided that the chairman, secretary, or other officers of one industrial union be strictly debarred from holding office in any other union." This, I think, is necessary because the officers of a union have so much to do in framing the policy of the union—in bringing up and dealing with disputes. We certainly think that outsiders should not be allowed to deal with matters which, under the circumstances, they may know very little about. In the case of grocers, seeing the officers have so much to do in connection with a dispute, we think they should be grocers and understand the technicalities of the trade. In regard to clause 33, we would suggest that instead of a Board as at present constituted to deal with disputes, when a dispute does arise the Board shall be so constituted that there shall be three representatives on each side to represent the particular industry in dispute. I might say we are not particular as to the number on each side, but we think that in every case of a dispute the assessors should be chosen from the particular trade affected. We are indifferent as to the method of electing them, but think this is a very desirable change. Another thing that we would suggest is that the Government appoint a Magistrate or lawyer as a permanent Chairman, for we think that it is absolutely necessary that a man of legal training should be Chairman of the Board. Those are all the suggestions we have down, Mr. Chairman, but Mr. Macfarlane wishes to say something in reference to the Chinese traders.

*The Chairman:* I think, Mr. Wardell, that last suggestion of yours—referring to special Boards being set up to deal with technical cases—is met by clause 49, which gives you the power to have a special Board set up if you so desire it.

*Mr. Wardell:* Personally, I did not understand what purpose these special Boards were for, whether they were to deal with industries or disputes.

*The Chairman:* It is as to whether they can be better dealt with by experts or the ordinary Board. You can apply to a special Board, or go before the ordinary Board.

*Mr. Wardell:* May I ask would it not be better as I have suggested? I understand that in other parts when a dispute arises—we will say for the sake of argument—in the case of the grocers they have grocers to deal with it.

*The Chairman:* That is a suggestion you have put forward; it has been already put forward, and we will deal with it later on.

*Mr. Macfarlane:* I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that in our trade we are greatly affected by the large number of Chinese businesses in this town, and if this Act is passed, and we have no reason to think otherwise, there should be something done to regulate this trade. The Chinese open at 6 in the morning and keep open till 12 at night. The employers in our trade who keep well-regulated stores have no chance in competing with them. Though the Chinese keep greengrocers' shops they sell groceries to a very large extent, and the grocery trade is really the only trade affected by them.

*The Chairman:* This is outside the scope of this Bill.

*Mr. Laurensen:* If they keep open to all hours it would be better to make a note of it for the Shop Hours Bill.

5. *Mr. Tanner.*] We can understand your objection with regard to workmen who may have been convicted of dishonesty, or have a questionable character, having preference of employment. You think there should be a stipulation in the law compelling unions to provide for cases of that kind?—Well, I will put it in this way: there should be no stipulation to prevent them from taking these men into the union, but that if a man afterwards proves to be dishonest the union should deal with him as well as the employer.