The above proposals for the abolition of the Trade Union Act, the dictation by the Government as to what the union shall do with its funds, and the dictation also of the Government as to whom the members of a union shall elect as their officers, is perhaps the most autocratic of all clauses. In Conservative England, since the decision in the Taff Vale case, the whole trend of legislation affecting trades-unions has been to enable those unions to have a free hand in the control of all their funds, and the functions of the union. We assert that the members of a union are best fitted to manage their affairs, without dictation from any outside body. Especially despotic is the clause which seeks to prevent others than those actually engaged in an industry to which the union relates from being officers of that union. We say that it is impossible to make such a hard-and-fast rule, and assert again that the choice of officers lays with the members of a union.

It is most difficult from a mere recital of the principles of this amending Bill to get at its hidden depths and meaning. After a most exhaustive scrutiny of every detail of the Bill we have no hesitation in saying that this is the most cunningly devised, insidious, and dangerous measure, from the standpoint of the workers, and the public well-being, which has ever been submitted to our House of Representatives and to the people of New Zealand. Let us examine the proposals made: (1) "Abolish the Boards."—This is contrary to the clearly expressed intentions of the framers of the original Act, and if it is carried our organized labour will do well to consider whether we cannot condemn this Bill too strongly, and if it is passed into law we must advise the unions to withdraw their sanctions to this kind of legislation, and to use all means of passive resistance to make the legislation null and void.

We are, &c.,

A. PARLANE, President	G. LIGHTFOOT
W. T. YOUNG	PETER L. MUIR
W. H. WESTBROOKE, Secretary	D. MCLAREN
A. J. CAREY	A. H. COOPER
M. J. REARDON	T. J. LYONS.

C. H. CHAPMAN examined. (No. 12).

155. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—President of the Federated Typographical Union of Workers, and a member of the Wellington Branch.

156. Also a member of the Wellington Trades and Labour Council?—No, we are not affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council.

157. Have you seen this Bill known as the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Act?—Yes. The Board of Management of my union considered the Bill, and the Committee of Management, which is very representative, being constituted of members working in each of the printing-offices in Wellington, having gone through the Bill, sent it to the committee of which I am a member, with instructions to bring evidence before this Committee.

158. In its favour or otherwise?—We are in favour of some of the clauses, indifferent to a considerable number, and very antagonistic to several. My union object to a number of the clauses of the Bill because, however good the intentions of the promoters might be, it appears to us that under the operations of the Bill trade-unionists would find themselves bound by a system of arbitration which will be unnecessarily severe upon them and not, as labour legislation should be, in the nature of protection. The principal clauses objected to are No. 3, which states that "After the coming into operation of this Act no industrial disputes shall be referred to any Board of Conciliation or special Board of Conciliation under the principal Act." I might say that in a recent dispute my society, in compliance with the present Act, presented its dispute to the Conciliation Board, but also took advantage of the clause in the Act which enables them to take the dispute out of the hands of the Conciliation Board and refer it direct to the Court.

159. The famous Willis Blot, of course?—We did that because our observation of the Conciliation Board had been that it simply meant unnecessary delay, and therefore we went direct to the Court. At the same time we know quite well that the recommendations given by the Conciliation Board have generally been more in favour of the workers than have the awards of the Court; but as, of course, there is the right of appeal by any employer or by any party, the union has expressed its opinion that it would be merely wasting time to go to the Conciliation Board. Our union also thinks that while the right of appeal remains with the Industrial Council that waste of time will still endure and prove irritating to the workers.

160. Will the right of appeal remain with the Industrial Councils?—Yes. Clause 4 is one that we consider it is unnecessary to give much evidence upon. It is not so important as clause 5, which, we consider, is an unnecessary restriction upon the unions. Although not particularly harmful to our own union in Wellington, we realise that in time it may be harmful, because we, of our own knowledge, have seen cases where men prominent in trade-union affairs have been sacrificed, and until there is a much stronger clause in the Act which will make the punishment pretty severe on employers who use intimidation, we consider the union should be permitted to elect whom they please to represent them on any Conciliation Board or Industrial Council. Our own union is able, generally speaking, to provide men from its own ranks to represent it, and owing to the particular circumstances in Wellington the fear of intimidation and sacrifice is not so prevalent as it is with many other unions. Clause 24 is the next clause of any importance with which we disagree. We consider that the fine mentioned in that clause in the event of a worker breaking any award—£10—is too severe, and should be reduced by half, so that the clause should read "£5" instead of "£10" in the case of the worker. Clause 29 should also be reduced in a similar amount to make it a reasonable fine. To clause 30 my union takes strong objection, and considers it most inadvisable that an employer should be made the instrument to levy fines through breaches of an award, and if that clause is retained, we think the 25 per cent. should