

61. Have they been worked successfully under that grouping system?—Yes.

62. How far does the preaching of socialism by the Wellington unionists interfere with the work of development of unionism at the present time?—I should say, not very much.

63. Of course it has been alleged that men who are dreamers have lost sight of the actual influence of unionism in their anxiety to grapple at what may be termed a phantom?—I think the unions will soon find out if a man does not successfully grapple with their difficulties.

64. In unionism there is a great forward movement?—Yes, a very great forward movement.

65. Do you see any redeeming features about this Bill?—Yes, there are one or two good points in it. I might mention the extension of the definition of the word "worker."

66. Do you think it would have been wiser on the part of the unions to have been more specific in their manifesto in respect to the various clauses?—I cannot say I do. The manifesto was framed by the committee of which I am a member and the secretary.

67. From a great many of the newspaper reports there is a general condemnation of the measure, without any approval whatever in connection with any clause: do you not think it would have been wiser to have said something in its favour?—I could hardly give evidence against the committee of which I am secretary.

68. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] You object to the Industrial Councils on the ground that there are so many small unions: how many small unions are there that are not branches and that would not be covered by a general award of the Council?—I cannot give you the number.

69. There are not many. You read telegrams from the Otago, Canterbury, and Auckland Councils indorsing the manifesto?—Yes.

70. Do you think it at all likely that, after the manifesto issued, any Trades and Labour Council would pass any other resolution?—I do not see why they should not.

71. Do you think they would publicly announce that there was a split between the Trades and Labour Councils of the colony?—I think some of these wires came before the manifesto was issued. The Canterbury Council came out with one quite as strong.

72. Had you consulted with the Trades Council before you issued this manifesto?—Yes.

73. But it was published before the Trades Council indorsed it?—That might be.

74. The unions affiliated to the Council had no opportunity of seeing the Bill before you issued the manifesto?—Yes, they had. The principal part of it was published in the newspapers.

75. If that is the case, how comes it that so many unions are sending me their own comments on the Bill?—I do not know that they are.

76. The Christchurch Bootmakers have, for one; also the Miners', Painters', and Carpenters' Unions. I have got eighteen unions' replies now, which I will submit to the Committee at a later date, and they come from Auckland down to the South. You read a telegram from Invercargill, and I have a letter from the Trades Council there asking me to send a copy of the Bill down for them to discuss before coming to a final resolution?—The wire came to me as I read it. I have had no communication with Invercargill for some time.

77. The Bill is being dealt with by the different unions now?—Are the Wellington unions getting the Bill?

78. Yes, but not through certain secretaries, so that they can make their comments on it?—I am satisfied if members of the unions get the Bill and pass their opinions on it. Seeing that we represent the unions, I do not think it is —

79. If you represent the unions, how comes it that the recommendations of the Trades and Labour Conference, passed by the representatives of the Labour party, are now opposed by you?—Well, on some minor points they may be.

80. The provision for the Magistrate to enforce awards is not a minor point?—It is a matter of opinion

WILLIAM THOMAS YOUNG examined. (No. 4.)

81. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am a member of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades and Labour Council.

82. Have you seen the Bill?—Yes.

83. And you have formed your opinion on it?—Yes, in conjunction with other members of the committee.

84. We shall be glad to know what it is?—I have committed to writing what I have to say on this matter, and it is a detailed statement of my evidence on the whole Bill. I might say that the members of this committee have not only thoroughly investigated every clause of the Bill, but have thoroughly investigated every word, and this evidence is a result of our investigations. I may add that the evidence I am about to give was placed before the committee and unanimously indorsed. Clause 3 of the Bill: For the reasons hereinafter given it is our opinion that this should be deleted from the Bill. Clause 4, subclause (1): For the reasons that will be hereinafter stated, we would urge that all the words after the word "Court," in the 22nd line, should be struck out, and for the same reasons subclause (3) should be deleted. In regard to the former portion of subclause (1) we are strongly of opinion that that should be permitted to remain in order that all disputes shall not be referred to the Court in the first instance—that is, providing for exactly what the annual conferences of the Trades and Labour Councils, and the whole of the labour unions, have been advocating ever since 1900, when, by amendment to the Act, power was given to either party to a dispute to refer it direct to the Court of Arbitration. Since then there has been little or no conciliation between employer and employed, and we have found ourselves face to face with practically a hard and fast system of arbitration only, inasmuch as in some ninety cases out of a hundred—and that we believe to be underestimating them—the disputes are referred direct to the Court by the employers. Clauses 5 to 17 inclusive: These purport to abolish the Boards of Conciliation, and replace them with Industrial Councils consisting of three representatives of the employers and three of the workers, with an independent person as Chairman