LABOUR LAWS COMMISSI[illegible]

APPENDIX

TO

SECOND AND FINAL REPORT

OF

THE COMMISSIONERS

APPOINTED TO

INQUIRE INTO THE WORKING

OF

THE MASTER AND SERVANT ACT, 1867,

THE

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 34 & 35 Vict. Cap. 32,

AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES:

CONTAINING

NOTES OF CASES, MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS, AND OTHER PAPERS.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S
BRANCH LIBRARY
BOMBAY

LONDON:
PRINTED BY GEORGE EDWARD EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1875.

[C.—1157.-I.] *Price* 1*s.* 4*d.*

CONTENTS.

PAGE

APPENDIX, containing—

1. Papers by Mr. Hughes on—
   1. Master and Servant Act - - - - - - - 1
   2. Memorandum on Draft Report with Amendments - - - 2
2. Notes of Cases (on Criminal Law Amendment Act) - - - - - 7
   Table of Cases - - - - - - - - 42
3. Minutes of Evidence on Criminal Law Amendment Act (with Index of Witnesses) - - - - - - - - - - 45
4. Miscellaneous Papers:
   (*a.*) Letter of Mr. Howell to Secretary of Commission - - - 105
   (*b.*) Resolutions of Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee, 20th March 1874 - - - - - - - 105
   (*c.*) Summing up of the Honourable Mr. Baron Amphlett in the case of Regina v. Halliday and others - - - - - 106
   (*d.*) Returns of convictions under Criminal Law Amendment Act - - 107
   (*e.*) Note of additional case under Master and Servant Act, 1867 - - 113
   (*f.*) Case of Burns v. Crosby referred to by Mr. Boa in his evidence, 931, page 46 - - - - - - - - - 114
   Case of Francis v. Lees referred to by Mr. Boa in his evidence (q. 41), page 47 - - - - - - - - - 114
   (*g.*) Resolutions passed by the Amalgamated Society of Engineers at the Manchester Conference, July 1872 - - - - - 115
   (*h.*) Table of Cases of Convictions under Master and Servant Act, 1867 - 116

Abstract of Second Report - - - - - - - - 121

INDEX - - - - - - - - - - - - 123

APPENDIX PART IV.

4 (*a.*)

COPY OF LETTER from the Secretary to the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, referred to in p. 1 of Report.

The Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee,
27, Villiers Street, Strand, London, W.C.
10th June 1874.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant (awaiting me on my arrival from Newcastle), in which you request me to give evidence before the Royal Commission on the Labour Laws, relative to the working of the Master and Servants Act, 1867, and the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871.

In reply to your letter, I beg to state that I very much regret that the peculiar circumstances in which I am placed as secretary to the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Unions, whose decision I enclose, together with the circumstances which gave rise to the Commission, and also the nature of the proposed inquiry, altogether prevent me from acceding to your request.

In declining to give evidence before the Commission, I desire to do so with all respect to the Royal Commission, and to every member constituting it, and I hope that I shall not be considered either disrespectful or presumptuous if I state the principal reasons for the course which I feel compelled to take. They are as follows:—

1st. I am of opinion that no such Commission should have been constituted by any government without first appealing to, and obtaining the consent of Parliament, especially in such a case as the present, where the inquiry has been so recent and so full, and where the points at issue are so well known and so fully understood.

2nd. The subject-matter referred to the Commission was considered by a Royal Commission, 1st, in the case of the trades unions generally, in 1867–8–9, when a full and exhaustive inquiry was made, and a series of elaborate reports were presented; 2dly, on the matter of the Master and Servants Act, in 1865–6, upon which report the present Act was passed.

3rd. The matters referred to the Commission are, in my opinion, of the most simple and definite kind, being in fact chiefly of a legal and legislative character, rather than of such a nature as to require an exhaustive inquiry by a Royal Commission.

4th. These questions have been frequently before Parliament, and all matters relating thereto have been fully explained and discussed over and over again during the past five years.

5th. The late Government had already promised that these questions should be dealt with, as stated by Mr. Gladstone in his late address to his constituents at Greenwich, the Home Office having all the necessary information before it for that purpose.

In the matter of the Master and Servants Act, 1867, the dispute chiefly hinges on the 14th section, by which the magistrates have the power to send a workman to gaol for a breach of contract, contrary to all other statutes and to the common law.

However enormous the losses, however disastrous the consequences, however wicked or even spiteful the motives in which other breaches of contract originate, the remedy is by civil process only; but in the one case only of a poor workman there is the power of commitment to a common gaol. If you need an instance of the injustice and excessive cruelty of this law, look at the recent case of Cutler *v.* Hague, where not only had the man to suffer imprisonment for *three months* for a morally justifiable act, but he has also had to suffer two subsequent prosecutions for the same offence, to the eternal disgrace of English law. If not a single case of imprisonment had occurred under this section of the Act, my condemnation of it would have been the same, as a violation of the equity of the contract between man and man; but it is all the more strong seeing that so many have suffered the disgrace of a gaol for doing what they believed they were quite justified in doing. A breach of contract, as such, should bear its just and proper punishment, but this 14th section of the Master and Servants Act, 1867, is contrary to the whole tenor of English law, and nothing but its entire abrogation will satisfy the just demands of the British workman.

With regard to the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871, it is another instance of class legislation, and no amount of tinkering in the shape of amendment will justify its existence. The only shadow of a pretence for its enactment was the necessity for putting down a certain kind of depredation called ratténing, chiefly known to exist at Sheffield.

If the ordinary statute and common law be not sufficient to stamp out this crime, for so it is, then amend the Malicious Injury to Property Act so that its application shall be general and not special, except in so far as it applies to the Act itself.

If on the other hand the ordinary law of the land be not sufficient to put down violence to the person, amend the Malicious Injury to the Person Act, instead of tacking on a special law to the Trades Union Act, 1871, as this Criminal Law Amendment Act undoubtedly was, first by its enactment, and has been since by its application. It appears to me that the whole question lies in a nutshell.

Apologising for the length of this letter,

I am, &c.
GEO. HOWELL.

Francis H. Bacon, Esq.,
Secretary to the Royal Commission on the Labour Laws,
32, Abingdon Street, Westminster, S.W.

4 (*b.*)

The Decision referred to above.

RESOLUTIONS passed by the TRADES UNION CONGRESS PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

A full meeting of the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee took place on 20th March, at which Mr. Daniel Guile presided. After a very full and lengthened discussion on the whole question, and with all the facts before them, the following resolutions were unanimously carried, with the exception that Mr. Macdonald dissented from the fourth:—

1. Moved by Mr. Allan and seconded by Mr. Rolley, "That the resignation of Mr. Macdonald be accepted."

2. Proposed by Alfred Bailey, President of the Amalgamated Tailors' Society, seconded by Mr. Rolley, President of the Sheffield Trades Union Congress, "That this meeting "of the Parliamentary Committee elected by the Trades "Union Congress, representing more than one million "workmen, specially convened to consider the action of "the Government in appointing a Royal Commission, "deem it to be a mere excuse for delay; and we adhere "to the resolution already passed deprecating the ap"pointment of the Commission, and we hereby pledge "ourselves to continue to protest against the whole scheme, "as being a surprise, an intrigue, and a fraud; and we "further recommend the whole trade unions of the "country to refuse to have anything to do with the "Commission, either in the way of giving evidence or of "recognizing in any way the action, *pro* or *con*, of the "Commission."

3. Moved by Mr. Arch and seconded by Mr. Odger, "That the secretary be instructed to send a copy of "the above resolution to the Principal Secretary of State "for the Home Department, the whole of the trades "unions of the country, and also to the newspapers."

4. Proposed by Mr. Odger and seconded by Mr. Arch, "That this committee urge upon the whole trades "societies of the kingdom to hold meetings in support "of the course adopted by this committee in repudiation "of the Royal Commission; and, further, we request that "resolutions be sent to the local members of each con"stituency, calling upon them to support immediate "legislation on the several points as agreed upon at the "Sheffield Congress."

5. Proposed by Mr. Allan and seconded by Mr. Odger, "That Mr. Bailey be the chairman of the committee, in "the place of Mr. Macdonald, resigned."

4 (c.)

REGINA v. HALLIDAY and others.
(Tried in March 1874, at the SOUTH LANCASHIRE ASSIZES, held at MANCHESTER, before BARON AMPHLETT.)

IN the course of the trial, counsel for prisoners took objections to the form of the indictment, and Mr. Baron Amphlett delivered judgment on that part of the case as follows:—

All cases of conspiracy must be looked at with regard to the circumstances under which they arose. In this case Messrs. Hargreaves seem to me to have done that which they were legally entitled to do, viz., to refuse to employ any of the trade-union men. I think the union men were equally entitled to do all they could to prevent Messrs. Hargreaves continuing that exclusion if they saw fit to do so in a lawful and peaceable manner, and to persuade miners not to work for Messrs. Hargreaves while they continued that exclusion of union men. I think they were at perfect liberty to do that. I do not suppose that any lawyer would maintain that because two or more persons engaged in persuading another not to work for a particular master under such circumstances, they were liable in consequence to be tried for conspiracy. But you must recollect with regard to this case between employer and employed—that it is an offence, and has been so held to be an offence, at common law that persons should combine together for the purpose of destroying that freedom of will that every person is entitled to have. In the absence of other circumstances, the employers have a perfect right to conduct their business in their own way, and if a number of persons combine together for the purpose of putting undue pressure upon them and to prevent them from exercising that freedom of will, which on the high authority of Baron Bramwell a man is as much entitled to as the freedom of his body—if there was an attempt to interfere in that freedom of will, and unless that could be justified, it would be an illegal act, a criminal conspiracy, on the part of those persons. The reason why I do not believe that the second and fourth counts apply in this case is, that although to a certain extent the action of the men belonging to the union in persuading people to leave their employment—independently of the question of contract—might be an interference with the freedom of the will of the masters, still they were not doing it for the purpose of injuring or molesting the masters, but for the purpose of enforcing their own rights. They were doing it for the purpose of preventing the masters from continuing the system of exclusion of themselves which the masters had begun; and although they were to a certain extent interfering with the masters' freedom of will, yet as long as they did so lawfully and in a legal manner they were not liable to be indicted for criminal conspiracy. It is for that reason, there being no question of breaking contract in those counts, I do not think that the second and fourth counts can be maintained, because they proceeded on this, that the defendants were interfering with the masters' discretion simply by trying to persuade workmen to leave their employment, which they would be justified in doing. I wish, however, to guard myself against being supposed to hold the opinion that in all cases it would be justifiable for people to combine together to persuade others to leave their masters' employment even when they were under no contract. If a number of persons combine together for the purpose of maliciously and vindictively injuring masters I think a very different consideration would arise, and it would be a very striking result of our law if a number of people were allowed to combine together to ruin masters by bribing people to leave their service. I must say, if such a case should arise in which a number of persons did combine together, not for their own protection, but for the injury of a particular master, I think they would be held liable as conspirators. Having said, therefore, what I have done, I conceive in this particular case, when it cannot be denied that the union men are acting upon the defensive, I think that it was perfectly competent for them by peaceable, legal, and proper means to try to defend themselves by prevailing upon workpeople not to work or to leave the service of those particular masters. But then it must be done in a proper and legal manner. He went on to say that if in the present case the facts proved that the defendants had combined together to effect their object by persuading the workmen to break their contracts, which was illegal and a criminal act on their part, he was of opinion that the indictment would be good. Mr. Hopwood argued that because the Criminal Law Amendment Act defined what should be the meaning of molesting or obstructing a person for the purposes of the Act, it was to be taken as giving a general definition of those words which should be applied through the whole sphere of the law. He could not allow that argument. The Act gave very extensive powers to magistrates of dealing in a summary way with particular offences, and it simply defined what molesting and obstructing was for the purpose of those offences. The only other material question was that raised by Mr. Aspinall, that there was no agreement in this case at all. That was a question for the jury rather than for him. Many of those agreements took effect from the moment they were signed by the men, and the masters were entitled to sign them at any time. He would, therefore, let the first and third counts go to the jury.

SUMMING-UP of the JUDGE on the whole case.

The Judge then summed up as follows: Gentlemen of the jury,—You have listened so attentively to this important case that it will be more agreeable I should sum up now, and you should go and consider your verdict before we part. The case does not lie in a very wide compass. But before I call your attention to the evidence, which alone you have to consider, I will first say a word with regard to the somewhat lengthy argument upon the law of the case. We have been told that the law of conspiracy is going to be altered, and I shall be extremely glad if it be altered, because in many of its aspects it is still undefined, and it opens a good deal of difference of opinion. But in answer to the statement that it is a law of the rich against the poor, I believe it would be more injurious to the poor man to have the law of conspiracy not amended or remodelled, but done away with altogether. Just conceive the state of society if you allow rich men to combine together to injure poor men. If you allowed associations of men to conduct themselves in a way to ruin individuals without being responsible in a criminal court it would shock most of you. Take such a case as a case of seduction, which is not a criminal offence. Would it not be monstrous for people to combine together to take away the chastity of a woman? There are many things which it may be safe to society not to be made criminal when an individual engages in it, but which ought to be made criminal when persons combine. And I don't think the present law acts at all injuriously on the workmen above the way it operates upon the employer. What I venture to say in a case of this sort is that the law is equal with regard to workmen and employers. Employers may combine together for the purpose of locking out some workpeople who won't comply with their rules. I say, on the other hand, that miners and workpeople can combine together and say, "We won't work for the master "unless he will give us such and such wages," but not to go beyond that. I will put it first with regard to the employer. What would the workmen say if employers were allowed to combine together, not for the purpose of a lockout, but for the purpose of dismissing workpeople who have a binding contract with their master? For the same reason I venture to lay down the law that if the miners, not content to combine to enforce their own rules, extend that combination to break legal contracts, you must allow the masters to combine to defeat the legal rights of workpeople. This case will depend on facts. The question is, is it a fact, or is it not, that the defendants have combined together for an illegal purpose, that illegal purpose being, as stated in the indictment, that they entered into an agreement to "induce and persuade" the miners in the employ of the executors of Messrs. Hargreaves to break their contracts? If they combined merely to persuade persons who were under no contract to leave their employment, then under the circumstances of this case they could not be rendered liable for conspiracy. With these few observations for the satisfaction of the learned counsel I have laid down the law as I consider it to be, and if necessity requires I shall leave it to be decided by another tribunal. But with that you have nothing to do. Let us look at the evidence, and it will be for you not to strain facts against the defendants, and if you have any doubt in the matter, the defendants are entitled to the benefit of that doubt. The charge is of an illegal agreement for the purpose which I have held to be illegal. It is not necessary for you to show that that agreement has been carried into effect. On the other hand, even if one or two of the defendants did illegal acts that does not prove an agreement, and the defendants would not be indictable under this form of indictment. The great thing you should keep in your minds is whether you are satisfied that the defendants, any two or more of them, in the limits of this charge did agree to commit this alleged injustice on their masters.

4 (*d.*)

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable the House of Commons, dated 8th May 1873; for,

"RETURN of all CONVICTIONS under the Act 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32, stating, in separate Columns, those of Masters and those of Workmen; and also stating the Nature of each Offence, and the Punishment for the same; and the Number of APPEALS to QUARTER SESSIONS, and the Results thereof."

ENGLAND AND WALES.

COUNTIES.

Name of Petty Sessions in Counties.	Total Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32, between 29th June 1871 and 8th May 1873.			
	Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
ENGLAND:				
Bucks:				
Newport Pagnell - -	1	7 Aug. 1872	Obstructing a labourer with a view to coerce.	7 days imprisonment.
Isle of Ely:				
Hundred of Ely, and South part of the Hundred of Witchford.	3	8 Aug. 1872	Threatening a labourer -	7 days hard labour each.
Chester:				
Hundred of Eddisbury -	1	27 May 1872	Intimidating workmen -	1 calendar month.
Lancashire:				
Ashton-under-Lyne Division	2	17 July 1872	Intimidation - -	One ordered to be imprisoned 1 month, the other for 14 days; neither conviction was enforced.
Lincoln—Holland:				
Hundred of Elloe - -	1	19 Mar. 1872	Using violence to master to dismiss workmen.	1 month hard labour.
Middlesex:				
Clerkenwell * - -	1	30 Sept. 1872	Molesting workman -	7 days.
Hammersmith * - -	1	10 Jan. 1872	Attempting to coerce -	2 calendar months hard labour.
Worship Street * - -	1	30 July 1872	Threatening workmen with a view to coerce.	1 month.
Thames * - - -	1	17 Oct. 1872	Intimidation with a view to coerce to leave employ.	1 month hard labour.
	3	6 April 1872	Using violence with a view to coerce to leave employ.	3 months hard labour.
	1	29 June 1872	Intimidation with a view to coerce to leave employ.	1 month hard labour.
Monmouth:				
Pontypool - - -	1	3 Feb. 1872	Obstructing workmen -	14 days hard labour.
Norfolk:				
Happing and Tunstead -	4	10 Sept. 1872	Breaking scythe, and coercing persons to quit their employment.	7 days hard labour, and 1 month hard labour in addition, for non-payment of costs.
Northampton:				
Brackley - - -	1	10 July 1872	Threatening to stab a person with a fork, and intimidating and obstructing such person with a view to coerce him to quit his employment.	3 calendar months hard labour.
Daventry - - -	1	10 July 1872	Intimidation - -	21 days hard labour.
	8	9 April 1873	Ditto - - -	Two for 6 weeks hard labour; three for 3 weeks hard labour two for 2 weeks hard labour; one for 1 week hard labour.
Northumberland:				
Castle Ward, West Division of.	1	26 April 1873	Threatening a person with a view to coerce him to quit his employment.	14 days hard labour
Nottingham:				
Nottingham Division -	1	10 Feb. 1872	Threats - - -	21 days hard labour.
	1	8 Jan. 1873	Violence - - -	6 weeks hard labour.
Oxford:				
Chadlington Division -	1	13 Mar. 1872	Molesting and obstructing a workman.	14 days hard labour.

* Metropolitan Police Courts.

House of Commons Return of 8th May 1873—*continued.*

Name of Petty Sessions in Counties.	Total Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32., between 29th June 1871 and 8th May 1873.			
	Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
Somerset :				
Shepton Mallet - -	1	5 July 1872	Intimidation - -	14 days hard labour.
Western Division - -	2	5 Oct. 1872	Threatening and intimidating a workman.	1 month hard labour each.
Stafford :				
Northern Division, Pirehill	1	13 Mar. 1872	Intimidation - -	21 days.
Suffolk :				
Hundred of Babergh -	2	17 Jan. 1873	Coercion with violence -	1 month hard labour each.
	1	17 Jan. 1873	Ditto ditto -	21 days hard labour.
	1	23 Jan. 1873	Ditto ditto -	Ditto ditto.
	1	23 Jan. 1873	Ditto ditto -	1 month hard labour.
Warwick :				
Burton Dassell and Kineton Divisions.	1	28 Feb. 1872	Molestation - -	3 calendar months hard labour.
	1	26 June 1872	Threatening - -	Ditto.
	1	26 June 1872	Ditto - - -	Ditto.
Stratford Division - -	1	14 June 1872	Threatening a workman -	21 days hard labour.
Nuneaton Division -	2	4 April 1872	Threatening and intimidating workpeople, to prevent their working for employers.	28 days hard labour each.
Worcester :				
Bromsgrove - -	3	21 Nov. 1871	Intimidation - -	7 days hard labour each.
York, West Riding :				
Lower Agbrigg - -	4	2 Sept. 1872	Obstructing workmen -	14 days hard labour each.
Total - - -	57			
WALES.				
Glamorgan :				
Higher Miskin - -	6	15 Aug. 1871	Molesting to coerce men to quit employment.	1 week each.
Total - - -	6			
Total for England and Wales -	63			

BOROUGHS.

Name of Petty Sessions in Boroughs.	Total Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32, between 29th June 1871 and 8th May 1873.			
	Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
Birmingham - - -	2	26 Feb. 1872 -	Intimidating workmen -	1 calendar month each.
Birkenhead* - - -	2	„ „ -	Intimidation - -	1 calendar month hard labour each.
Bolton - - - -	1	10 Jan. 1872 -	Molesting workmen -	1 month.
Cambridge - - -	1	21 May 1872	Violent coercion - -	14 days.
	1	7 June „	Ditto - - -	7 days.
	1	12 July „	Threatening and intimidating.	7 days.
Chester - - - -	3	14 Jan. 1873 -	Using violence to one with a view to coerce him to leave his employer's service.	Two sentenced to 1 calendar month hard labour, and the other to 6 weeks hard labour.
Gateshead - - -	2	„ 1871 -	Using violence - -	14 days.
	2	„ „ -	Ditto - - -	3 months.
	4	„ „ -	Ditto - - -	2 months.
	1	„ „ -	Ditto - - -	6 weeks.
	2	„ „ -	Ditto - - -	1 month.
	1	„ „ -	Intimidation - -	1 month.
	5	8 Jan. 1872	Using violence - -	2 months.
Kingston-upon-Hull - -	1	14 Aug. 1871	Intimidating workmen -	2 calendar months hard labour.
	1	7 Sept. „	Ditto - - -	6 weeks hard labour.
	1	28 March 1872	Ditto - - -	40 days hard labour.
Leeds - - - -	1	9 April 1872	Molesting workpeople in the flax trade with a view to coerce them to quit their employment.	14 days hard labour.
Liverpool - - -	1	23 Feb. 1872	Assaulting workman -	1 calendar month.

* Stipendiary Magistrate Acts.

House of Commons Return of 8th May 1873—*continued.*

Name of Petty Sessions in Boroughs.	Total Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32, between 29th June 1871 and 8th May 1873.			
	Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
Liverpool	1	3 May 1872	Threatening and assaulting workmen.	6 weeks.
	1	18 Oct. „	Threatening workman	1 calendar month.
	1	19 Oct. „	Threatening and assaulting workman.	Ditto.
	1	3 July „	Threatening workman	Ditto.
Middlesborough	1	6 May 1873	Using violence to a workman with a view to coerce him to quit his employment.	14 days hard labour.
Newark	1	24 June 1872	Threatening workmen with a view to coerce them to quit their employment.	7 days hard labour.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	20	Aug. to Oct. 1871.	Intimidation	From 14 days to 3 calendar months.
	6	Jan. to Sept. 1872.	Ditto	Ditto.
Salford	1	12 Mar. 1872	Intimidating workman to leave his employment.	2 calendar months.
Sheffield	1	28 June „	Hiding tools	1 month.
	2	28 Mar. „	Using violence to a workman.	1 month hard labour each.
Tynemouth	3	18 April 1873	Intimidating railway guards on a coal train.	14 days each.
Total for Borough Petty Sessions.	72			
Total for County Petty Sessions.	63			
Grand Total for England and Wales.	135			

Note.—There were no convictions of masters in the above period.

APPEALS TO QUARTER SESSIONS.

Counties and Boroughs.	Number of Appeals to Quarter Sessions.	Results thereof.
Middlesex	4	1 conviction quashed, and 3 confirmed.
York, West Riding	5	1 conviction affirmed, with costs; 4 quashed, without costs.
Bolton	1	Quashed.
Total	10	

SCOTLAND.

County.	Court.	Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32., against Workmen.	Nature of each Offence.	Punishment of same.	Number of Appeals to Circuit or High Court of Justiciary.	Results thereof.
Forfar	Sheriff Court, Dundee.	3	Threatening and intimidating a workman, with a view to coerce him to quit his employment.	10 days imprisonment.	None.	
Renfrew	Sheriff Court, Greenock.	1	Use of violence to certain carters in employment of Caledonian Railway Company, with a view to coerce them to quit said employment	40 days imprisonment.	None.	
Perth: Perth District	Ditto	8	Watching and molesting a workman; generally known as picketing.	6 days imprisonment.	1 appeal to Circuit.	Affirmed.
Total		12				

Note.—There have been no convictions of Masters under the above Act.
In Scotland offences under the 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32. are prosecuted before the sheriff of the county or his substitute.

Crown Office, Edinburgh, 20 June 1873.

CHARLES MORTON, Crown Agent.

House of Commons Return of 8th May 1873—*continued.*

IRELAND.

County.	Name of Petty Sessions.	Total Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32., between 29th June 1871 and 8th May 1873.			
		Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
Cork - - -	Cork City - -	2	29 Aug. 1872	Assault to coerce workmen.	2 months imprisonment and hard labour each.
Galway - -	Gort - - -	3	1 March 1873	Molesting with intent to coerce to dismiss miller, and to alter mode of carrying on business.	14 days imprisonment and hard labour each.
Tipperary - -	Templemore -	1	11 Oct. 1871 -	Assault contrary to sect. 1.	1 months imprisonment and hard labour.
		1	„ „ -	Ditto - -	14 days imprisonment and hard labour.
Total - - -		7			

Note.—There have been no convictions of Masters under the above Act.

This return has been compiled from returns furnished by the various petty sessions clerks in Ireland.

Dublin Castle, 20 March 1874. } T. H. Burke.

Return to an Address of the Honourable the House of Commons, dated 31st March 1874; for,

"Return of all Convictions under the Act 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32., stating, in separate columns, those of Masters and those of Workmen; and also stating the Nature of each Offence, and the Punishment for the same; and the Number of Appeals to Quarter Sessions, and the results thereof, during the year 1873, and down to the present date (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 385, of Session 1873.)"

ENGLAND AND WALES.

COUNTIES.

Name of Petty Sessions in Counties.	Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32., between 1st January 1873 and 1st April 1874.			
	Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
ENGLAND:				
Cambridge:				
Bottisham - - -	1	13 Aug. 1873	Threatening and intimidating	21 days.
Essex:				
Walden - - -	3	9 Aug. „	Intimidation - -	14 days.
Gloucestershire:				
Coleford - - -	8	13 May „	Threatening and intimidating	7 days each.
Sodbury - - -	1	6 June „	Obstruction with a view to coerce.	1 month hard labour.
Lancashire:				
St. Helen's - - -	2	9 Mar. 1874	Threatening and intimidating workmen.	3 days each.
Middlesex:				
*Thames - - -	4	20 Nov. 1873	Using violence with a view to coerce a workmen to quit his employ.	Two sentenced to 14 days hard labour; one to 2 months hard labour; and the other to 3 months hard labour.
	1	8 Oct. „	Threatening with a view to coerce to quit employ.	3 months hard labour.
Monmouth:				
Bedwelty - - -	1	19 Dec. „	Intimidation - -	3 weeks hard labour.

* Metropolitan Police Court.

House of Commons Return of 31st March 1874—*continued.*

Name of Petty Sessions in Counties.	Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32., between 1st January 1873 and 1st April 1874.			
	Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
Northampton:				
Brackley - - -	1	28 July 1873	Intimidation with a view to coerce a workman to quit his employ.	21 days hard labour.
Suffolk:				
Melford - - -	3	17 Jan. „	Using violence, to coerce prosecutor to leave his work.	Two sentenced to 1 month's hard labour, and the other to 21 days hard labour.
	2	23 Jan. „	Ditto - -	One sentenced to 1 month's hard labour, and the other to 21 days hard labour.
Total - - -	27			
WALES:				
Denbigh:				
Bromfield - - -	1	19 Jan. 1874	Intimidating and molesting workmen.	7 days.
Total for England and Wales	28			

BOROUGHS.

Name of Petty Sessions in Boroughs.	Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32., between 1st January 1873 and 1st April 1874.			
	Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
Manchester - - -	3	10 Feb. 1873	Intimidation - -	7 days each.
	1	5 Dec. „	Ditto - - -	14 days.
Middlesborough - -	1	8 Sept. „	Using violence with a view to coerce a workman to leave his employ.	14 days hard labour.
Sheffield - - -	2	28 Mar. „	Ditto - - -	1 month's hard labour each.
Swansea - - -	1	8 Sept. „	Threatening and intimidating with a view to coerce one to depart from his hiring.	1 calendar month.
Tynemouth - - -	3	18 April „	Intimidating railway guards	14 days.
Total for Boroughs -	11			
Total for County -	28			
Grand Total - -	39			

Note.—On the 19th December 1873, two Masters were convicted of threats and intimidation in the division of Bedwelty in Monmouthshire, and sentenced to 21 days hard labour and to pay costs.

Note.—The clerk to the justices for the division of Bedwelty in reply to an application for further particulars of the convictions mentioned in preceding note stated that by some mistake that note had been inserted in the return because no case of a conviction of a master had ever occurred, and in fact no persons, with the exception of those in case p. 7, had ever been summoned under the Act.

APPEALS TO QUARTER SESSIONS.

Counties and Boroughs.	Number of Appeals to Quarter Sessions.	Results thereof.
Cambridgeshire - - -	3	Conviction confirmed but modified.
Denbigh - - -	1	Conviction confirmed with 10*l.* costs.
Lancashire - - -	6	Convictions quashed.
Sussex - - - -	2	Ditto.
Total - - -	12	

House of Commons Return of 31st March 1874—*continued.*

SCOTLAND.

County.	Court.	Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32. against		Nature of each Offence.	Punishment of same.	Number of Appeals to Circuit or High Court of Justiciary.	Results thereof.
		Masters.	Workmen.				
Edinburgh -	Sheriff Court -	Nil -	1	Persistently following a fellow-workman from place to place and threatening him for continuing at work.	10 days imprisonment.	—	—
Perth: Perth District -	Ditto -	Nil -	6*	Watching and molesting, commonly known as picketing.	6 days imprisonment.	1	Affirmed.
	Total - -		7				

* The six men were tried under the same complaint.

Offences under the 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32. are prosecuted before the sheriff of the county, or his substitute, and this return has been compiled from information furnished by the various sheriff clerks in Scotland.

Crown Office, Edinburgh, 5 June 1874.

JAS. AULDJO JAMIESON, Crown Agent.

IRELAND.

County.	Petty Sessions.	Total Number of Convictions under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 32, between 1st January 1873 and 31st March 1874.			
		Number of Convictions of Workmen.	Date of Conviction.	Nature of Offence.	Punishment awarded.
Cork City - -	Cork City - -	1	6 Sept. 1873	Violence, intimidation, and coercion.	6 weeks imprisonment, with hard labour.
Ditto - - -	Ditto - -	6	11 Nov. 1873	Ditto ditto -	2 months imprisonment, with hard labour each.
Fermanagh - -	Lisnaskea - -	1	26 July 1873	Assault - -	14 days imprisonment, with hard labour.
	Total - -	8			

Note.—There have been no convictions of Masters under the above Act.

This return has been compiled from returns furnished by the various petty sessions clerks in Ireland.

APPEALS TO QUARTER SESSIONS.

County.	Number of Appeals to Quarter Sessions.	Results thereof.
Cork City - - -	1	Conviction affirmed.

Dublin Castle, 10 July 1874.

T. H. BURKE.

4 (*e.*)

LABOUR LAWS COMMISSION.

(MASTER AND SERVANT ACT, 1867.)

HAMILTON.

Under the Summary Procedure Act, 1864.

Complaint under the Master and Servant Act, 1867.

Unto the Honourable Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the County of Lanark.

MILLER and RODGER, Coalmasters, Swinhill Collieries, Dalserf, and GEORGE MILLER and DAVID SMITH RODGER, both residing in Glasgow, the individual partners of that firm, as such partners and as individuals,

against

JOHN MENZIES, miner, Swinhill Collieries, Dalserf.

THE COMPLAINERS HUMBLY SHOW

THAT the said John Menzies, hereafter called the employed, being the workman of the said Miller and Rodger, hereafter called the said employers, in their trade or business of coalmasters at Swinhill, Dalserf, in the county of Lanark, under a certain contract of service for a period then unexpired did on the thirty-first day of October eighteen hundred and seventy-four at the collieries of the said employers at Swinhill, Dalserf, in the said county, unlawfully neglect or refuse, and has ever since neglected or refused to fulfil said contract, and has absented himself from the service of the said employers without a just cause or lawful excuse. And the said complainants the employers further say that the amount of compensation or damage which they claim for the said breach and non-performance of the said contract is twenty pounds sterling, and they pray that the said employed may be summoned and adjudicated upon under sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22, of the Master and Servant Act, 1867, and the subsequent statutes continuing the same, viz., 31 and 32 Victoria, caput 3., 32 & 33 Victoria, caput 85., 33 & 34 Victoria, caput 103., 34 & 35 Victoria, caput 95., 35 & 36 Victoria, caput 88., 36 & 37 Victoria, caput 75., and 38 Victoria, caput 76., and any other Act or Acts further continuing said Master and Servant Act, 1867.

May it therefore please your honours to grant warrant to cite the said John Menzies, respondent, to appear before you to answer to this complaint, and thereafter to proceed in the matter in terms of the said Acts first mentioned, according to justice.

(Signed) MILLER & RODGER.
GEORGE MILLER.
D. S. RODGER.

Hamilton, 12th December 1874.—The justices grant warrant to officers of court to serve a copy of the foregoing complaint, and of this deliverance, upon John Menzies, respondent, and to cite him to appear personally to answer thereto, within the ordinary court hall of Hamilton, upon the 21st day of December current, at 12 o'clock noon, with certification; and also to cite witnesses and havers for both parties for all diets of court in the cause.

(Signed) THOMAS PATERSON, J.P.

This complaint served by me, Andrew Sandilands, constable, upon John Menzies, respondent, by delivering to him personally a full copy thereof and deliverance thereon, having a just copy of citation subjoined, in presence of John Reilly, residing in Lanark, this 16th day of December 1874 years.

(Signed) A. SANDILANDS, Constable.
JOHN REILLY, Witness.

Hamilton, 21 December 1874.—The complaint being called, the pursuer and defender, or respondent, appeared. The justice adjourns the cause till the 28th day of December current at 12 o'clock noon, and ordains the respondent to appear personally at said diet.

(Signed) THO. DUNCAN, J.P.

Hamilton, 28th December 1874.—The complaint being called the pursuers and defender, or respondent, appeared. The justice adjourns the cause till the 11th day of January next (1875) at 12 o'clock noon, and ordains the respondent to appear personally at said diet, two words delete.

(Signed) THOMAS PATERSON, J.P.

At Hamilton, the 11th day of January 1874 years.

In presence of Alexander Grant, William Henry McNeill Hamilton (Alexander Grant), and Thomas Paterson, Esquires, three of Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the county of Lanark, and also present James Stevenson Hamilton, Esquire, another of said Justices of the Peace,

Compeared John Menzies complained against, and the complaint being read over to him he answers he is not guilty.

(Signed) ALEXANDER GRANT, J.P.

The witnesses after-named were examined in support of the complaint.

(1.) Matthew Walker, colliery manager, Swinhill.

(2.) William Semple, underground manager, Swinhill.

The Justices in respect of the evidence adduced, find the said John Menzies guilty of the crime charged, and therefore adjudge him to forfeit and pay the sum of 2*l.* of modified penalty, with the sum of 5*l.* 3*s.* of expenses. And in respect it is inexpedient to issue a warrant of poinding and sale, ordains instant execution by imprisonment unless the said sums shall be sooner paid, and grant warrant to officers of court to apprehend the said John Menzies, and convey him to the prison of Hamilton, and to the keeper thereof to receive and detain him for the period of one month from the date of his imprisonment, unless said penalty and expenses shall be sooner paid.

(Signed) ALEXANDER GRANT, J.P.
JAMES STEVENSON HAMILTON, J.P.
WM. H. MCNEILL HAMILTON, J.P.
THOMAS PATERSON, J.P.

Master and Servant case.

DEAR SIR, Hamilton, 19th January 1875.

As requested by your favour of yesterday I beg to send you (1) copy complaint and proceedings in master *v.* servant-case, Miller and Rodger against John Menzies (2) copy of account of expenses; and (3) a copy of the notice at Swinhill Collieries.

Permit me to give the following information and explanations. The case called in the Justice of Peace court of 21st December last, but as there was only one Justice present it could not go to trial, though witnesses for the complainers were present. After some discussion on preliminary points, the preliminary objection being repelled, the case was continued till the following Justice of Peace court of 28th December last. The case then called, the witnesses were again in attendance, but only one Justice being present, the trial had again to be postponed. To avoid further disappointment the case was at the request of the agents and parties continued for a fortnight, passing over the court immediately following the New Year's day, and the court of 11th January current was fixed. On that court day the case went to trial before four Justices on the bench.

The complainers had four witnesses in attendance, but the defendant had no witnesses. After two of the complainers' witnesses had been examined and the third witness brought in, the Justices inquired at the defendant's agent if he had any witnesses, for if not, there was no necessity for hearing further evidence, for they were satisfied the case had been proved as one of an aggravated character of unlawful refusal or desertion by the defendant. By the Act it is not required that a record of the evidence be taken, the names of the witnesses examined only be recorded.

It is to be kept in mind that the defendant had an agent at all the diets who cross-examined the witnesses at length. The evidence adduced was to this effect, that the defendant was employed under the 14 days' warning rule. The notice of the rule was exhibited, and it was also sworn to that the notice was properly posted up at the works where the defendant had been working. He stopped working on 31st October last, working only a part of that day. He came afterwards to lift his graith. The underground

manager told him he could not leave without giving his 14 days' notice, and that he had better work his warning. He gave an oath and declared that he would not work a warning and defied his masters doing anything to him, and it was stated he had caused other miners to leave without giving warning. It was also proved that he had on the cashing day drawn more money than he had wrought for, and that he had retained his house which belonged to the complainers two weeks after he stopped working, without paying rent for it, and that the loss to the complainers was considered about 8*l.*

The Justices considered the case as a serious one against the defendant and that he was clearly guilty of unlawful refusal to fulfil his contract. The account of the expenses was examined by the Justices, and in view thereof they modified the penalty to 2*l.*, and failing immediate payment of penalty and expenses, gave imprisonment for one month.

I beg to send you above the correct information in this case, and remain

Your most obedient servant,
JAMES NAISMITH,
Justice of Peace, Clerk Dep.

Francis H. Bacon, Esquire,
Secretary, Labour Laws Commission,
32, Abingdon St., Westminster, S.W.,
London.

Account of expenses in complaint. Miller and Rodger against John Menzies.

1874.		£	s.	d.
Dec.	Drawing complaint - - -	1	0	0
	Fair copy, two sheets - -	0	2	0
	Obtaining warrant - - -	0	2	6
	Paid dues - - - -	0	2	6
	Making copy for service - -	0	2	0
	Instructing officer - - -	0	2	6
	Paid dues - - - off 6*s.*	0	16	0
	Presenting complaint - -	0	1	6
	Paid bar officer - - -	0	2	6
	Attending court, examining witnesses, and debating - - -	1	10	0
	Paid witnesses - - -	1	0	0
	Paid J.P. clerk's dues - -	0	7	6
	Hearing judgment - - -	0	0	0
		£5	9	0
	Taxed off -	0	6	0
		£5	3	0

4 (*f* 1.)

Containing CASES referred to by MR. BOA.

BURNS *v.* CROSBY.

On Tuesday, February 6th, 1872, a case involving a point of much importance to trades unions, came up at the Small Debt Court, at Airdrie, before Sheriff Logie. An action was brought by Edward Burns, a working mason, to recover pecuniary damages from four fellow-workmen, named respectively Crosby, Lockhart, M'Lay, and Gardner, as compensation for loss sustained by him through his being deprived of employment by an unlawful combination on their part, they having told his employers that if he was not discharged from the employment they would quit work, in consequence of which the pursuer was dismissed.

The defence was a denial that the men had unlawfully combined for the purpose alleged. Proof was accordingly led at some length.

Decision.

The Sheriff, after stating at length the circumstances of case "For this proceeding on the part of the defenders, I am of opinion that they are liable in reparation to the pursuer. The old combination laws having now been repealed, it is unnecessary to advert to them; but the Act of last session has an important bearing on the present question. By that Act, 34 & 35 Vict, chap., 32, sec. 1, it is enacted, that every person who shall "threaten or "intimidate any person in such manner as would justify "a Justice of the Peace on complaint made to him to "bind over the person so threatening or intimidating to "keep the peace—or shall molest or obstruct any person in "manner defined by this section with a view to coerce "such person, being a master, to dismiss or cease to "employ any workman" shall be liable to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a term not exceeding three months. No doubt the present action is not brought under the statute, and had criminal proceedings been taken against the defenders, these would probably have failed, because the defenders took no steps against the masters by threats or intimidation which would justify their being bound over to keep the peace, nor did they molest him in the manner defined in the Act by following him about from place to place, watching or besetting his house, or by following him in a disorderly manner through the streets. But it being established by the Act, that to coerce a master into dismissing one of his workmen is illegal, it mattes nothing, as regards the injured party who suffers by this illegal proceeding, whether the *modus operandi* be by threats of violence and personal annoyance, so as to subject themselves to punishment criminally, or by a combination to refuse working along with him, so as to force his dismissal by a fear of the work being brought to a stand still. As a general rule, whenever an unlawful act has been committed, by which an innocent party has suffered pecuniary loss, the sufferer is entitled to reparation at the hands of the aggressor. "*Alterum non lædere* is one of the three general precepts laid down by Justinian, which it has been the chief purpose of all civil enactments to enforce. In consequence of this rule, every one who has the exercise of reason, and so can distinguish between right and wrong, is naturally obliged to make up the damage befalling his neighbour from a wrong committed by himself. Wherefore every fraudulent contrivance or unwarrantable act, by which another suffers damage or runs the hazard of it, subjects the delinquent to reparation."—Erskine, b. 3, p. 1, s. 13. It is, therefore, the illegality of the Act which gives the claim for reparation. Any criminal procedure which may or may not follow against the aggressor has no effect whatever as regards the civil rights of the injured party to reparation. If a man assaults another he may be tried criminally for the assault, but he is also liable to the assaulted for the injury he has sustained. If he breaks a neighbour's windows he must make up for the loss of the broken windows, as well as stand his trial for malicious mischief. In short, as concisely stated by Guthrie Smith in his work on Reparation—p. 5, "The punishment inflicted in the interest of "society is no bar to the private remedy." It can hardly be disputed that if the defenders had coerced the masters into the dismissal of the pursuer by proceedings which rendered them amenable to the criminal law, they would have rendered themselves liable to indemnify the pursuer, but, if so, the same principle applies to the present case. They have been guilty of an unwarrantable act, by which the purseur has suffered damage. It may, no doubt, be said that the defenders were at perfect liberty to leave their employment if they saw fit, and that it was optional to the masters either to part with them or with the pursuer. But the illegality consists in this, that they combined together for the illegal purpose of coercing their masters to dismiss one of their fellow-workmen, not from any personal objections they had as to the man, but for the purpose of concussing him into the payment of a certain fine demanded of him by an Association of which they were members. As was said by Justice Crompton in the case of Walsby, 19th January, 1861—30 *Law Journal*, p. 121:—"I think that several workmen have no right "to combine to procure the discharge of persons obnoxious "to them by threatening to leave the employment at once "in a body unless those persons are forthwith discharged." "What a man may do singly he may not combine with "others to do to the prejudice of another."

I have carefully perused the recent case of Weardon to which I was referred by the agent for the defenders, in which the conviction of a stone-mason at Bolton for molestation was quashed, but it appears to me to have no bearing on the present case, because in that case the prosecution was a criminal one against Weardon under the same Act for conduct similar to that followed by the present defenders, and the Recorder held, and I think rightly held, that he had not been guilty of such violence or intimidation as rendered him amenable to the criminal law, and he therefere quashed the decision of the magistrates. In the circumstances of this case, as proved in evidence, *I am of opinion that the pursuer is entitled to damages from the defenders for having illegally combined to coerce their masters to dismiss him in the manner already detailed*; and that the pursuer having not only lost his employment, but having been unable to find it elsewhere he is entitled to 3*l.* 3*s.* of damages and expenses."

4 (*f* 2.)

FRANCIS *v.* LEES.

Yesterday, at the Sheriff Small Debt Court, Sheriff Lees presiding, Joseph Francis, lumper, 35 Toward Street, Plantation, Glasgow, sued Capt. John Lees, residing at 4 Havelock Terrace, Paisley Road, manager of the "Allan "Line" of steamers, Glasgow, for 50*l.* of damages, restricted to 12*l.*, in consequence of defender having (1) on "the 1st July last, near the ship Cairngorm, then lying at "the Broomielaw, in presence of Thomas Wyllie, stevedore, "and several persons, maliciously, and for the purpose of "depriving pursuer of employment with the said Thomas "Wyllie, with whom the pursuer was then engaged as a "lumper said to Wyllie, 'Put that scoundrel (pursuer) out "'of your employment. You'll oblige me very much by "'not employing him. If you knew as much about him as "'I do you would be sorry for employing him;' (2) by and "in consequence of defender having, on the 25th September, "while pursuer was employed by Capt. James R. Burns, "manager of the 'Anchor Line' of steamers, as a lumper, "called upon Capt. Burns, and maliciously and with the "view of depriving pursuer of his employment, stated, 'He "'(pursuer) is the ringleader of the harbour. I would be "'very sorry if you kept him in your employment; it "'would be dangerous for you to keep him in your employ-"'ment'—in consequence of said statements pursuer was "discharged from said employment, and had been unable, "through the said false and malicious reports which have "been spread abroad among shipowners by defender, to "obtain employment in Glasgow—defender having no "probable cause for acting towards pursuer as he had done "but being solely actuated by malice, spite, and a desire to "injure pursuer, on account of his having, while acting as "foreman lumper under defender, been obliged to go out "on strike along with the rest of the lumpers at the "Broomielaw in the beginning of June last."

Proof was led on both sides. It was not denied by defender that he had made the statements in question, which he justified in consequence of pursuer being one of the ringleaders in the late strike of lumpers at the Broomielaw.

The Sheriff said he had no difficulty in giving a decision in the case. There was no libel in the language used by the defender, who was quite justified in the statements he had made, The lumpers' strike had caused great confusion at the harbour, and the pursuer was one of the ringleaders in it. It was held that workmen who had caused a master to dismiss one of their number, in consequence of being a non-unionist or otherwise, the man so dismissed had no recourse against his brother workmen. The present case was one of a similar character, with the exception that parties were reversed. He assoilzied the defender, with costs.

Agent for the Pursuer—Mr. Macdonald.

Agent for the Defender—Mr. Balfour.

---

4 (*g*.)

PAPER referred to and produced by MR. ROBINSON.

EXTRACT from RESOLUTIONS passed at the MANCHESTER CONFERENCE of the AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS, July 29th, 1872.

8.—Proposed by Leonard Wild, seconded by Isaac Vose, "That this meeting, in considering the various questions "affecting the trade interests, find that piece work (even "in its best features) is without doubt the worst evil we "have to contend against, for under the most favourable "conditions it is utterly selfish in its operation, and is calculated to set man against man, by tending to benefit "those most opposed to our Society and all similar institutions; this being the case, the conference cannot too "strongly condemn the system; further, we recommend "the members generally to use their utmost influence in "putting an end to piece work, and trust the Council will "see that this resolution is carried out in the most decided "manner."

Carried unanimously.

9.—Proposed by George Langstaff, seconded by Robert Winterbottom, "That while piece work unfortunately exists "in the trade, this meeting calls upon the Council to faithfully carry out the conditions laid down in our making "book, and also make it a positive condition to have all "the workmen and boys engaged on piece work paid their "fair share of the surplus through the pay office, instead "of through what is generally termed piece master; also "to have proper rated wage, apart altogether from piece "work prices."

Carried unanimously.

10.—Proposed by David Farrow, seconded by George Caton, "That in every instance where a member of any "Branch refuses to carry out the resolutions passed by this "Conference in relation to overtime and piece work, we "would recommend the Council to allow branches to deal "with all such members, even to the extent of exclusion "if found necessary.

Carried unanimously.

INDEX TO CASES.

No. of Case.	Name of Case.	Page in Report.	Section of Act.	Circumstances, &c. of Case.	Sentence.
1	Allen *v.* Alchin	87	14.	Groom illusing a horse; plea, guilty	3 months' hard labour.
2	Allett *v.* Falkner	106	—	Farm labourer absenting himself from service	Discharged from service, costs and compensation.
3	Archer *v.* Parker	95	—	Apprentice leaving employer	Fine, 1*s.* and costs.
4	Armstrong *v.* Devine	88	9.	Apprentice of engineer leaving employ (three prior convictions); damages, 20*l.*	1 month's imprisonment.
5	Baker *v.* Friend	68	9.	Straw bonnet shape maker leaving without notice; Worship Street	Fine, 10*s.*; costs, 2*s.*, or 7 days' imprisonment.
6	Baily *v.* Kirk	60	9.	Apprentice misbehaving, *i.e.*, refusing to put up shutters; damages, 2*s.*	Fine, 2*s.* and costs, or 1 month.
7	Bailey *v.* Taylor	94	—	Carter in coal pit refusing to work; defence, "horse kicked"	Fine, 2*s.* 6*d.* and costs, or 14 days.
8	Barker *v.* Appleton	119	9.	Apprentice disobedient, with threats; damages, 10*s.*	6 weeks' hard labour. Stipendiary at Hall.
9	Batchell *v.* Galsworthy	14	9. & 14.	Apprentice absenting himself; damages, 3*l.* 10*s.*	2 months' hard labour.
10	Bates *v.* Page	11	—	Apprentice leaving employer; 1*l.* claimed	Fine, 1*l.* and costs, or 3 months' hard labour.
11	Battein *v.* Baker	104	9.	Apprentice absent; 2*l.* claimed	6 weeks with hard labour.
12	Balls *v.* Clarke	74	9.	Fishcurer's men absent; damages, 1*l.*	Fine, 10*s.* each and costs, or 14 days.
12*a*	Ditto ditto	75	9.	Ditto ditto ditto.	
13	Bird *v.* Simpson	95	—	Pitman refusing to work; loss, 4*s.*	Fine, 4*s.* and costs, or 14 days.
14	Birtles *v.* Byrnes and five others	54		Glass manufacturer's men neglecting work; damages, 30*l.* 15*s.*	10*s.* and costs in each case.
15	Bonillancy *v.* Gopfer	64	—	Cabinet maker leaving without due notice	2*l.* compensation and costs.
16	Bracewell *v.* Lowe	118	9. & 14.	Cotton spinner deserting service	1 month's hard labour.
17	Bracewell *v.* Aitken	118	9. & 14.	Apprentice to cotton spinner deserting service	1 month's hard labour.
18	Brock *v.* Medland	16	—	Apprentice absenting himself to attend races (3rd summons)	14 days' hard labour.
19	Browett *v.* Goddard	105	9.	Apprentice absenting himself; pleaded guilty	6 weeks' hard labour.
20	Brown *v.* Munday	110	9.	Farm labourer absenting himself	21 days' hard labour.
21	Booth *v.* Nealé	96	14.	Farm labourer; cruelty (scalding pigs); loss, 30*l.*	3 months' hard labour
22	Burdon *v.* Burton	20	—	Workman neglecting to fulfil contract	10*l.* compensation.
23	Butler *v.* Goodhead	93	14.	Apprentice absconding	1 month hard labour.
24	Cannington *v.* Wilcock	58	—	1st conviction	7 days' hard labour.
25	Cannington *v.* Wilcock	58	—	2nd conviction	1 month's hard labour.
25*a*	Cannington *v.* Smith	58	—	1st conviction	1 month's hard labour.
26	Cannington *v.* Smith	58	—	2nd conviction	3 months' hard labour.
27	Carter *v.* Gale	110	9.	Farm labourer neglecting to take sheep to the downs	1 month's hard labour.
28	Carrothers *v.* Edwards	33	9.	Farm labourer absenting himself from employ	Wages abated.
29	Chapman *v.* Warr	84	9.	Farmer's labourer and groom absenting himself	10*s.* compensation, and costs.
30	Child *v.* King	108	1.	Farm labourer absenting himself	21 days' hard labour.
31	Chipp *v.* Crampton	27	—	Spade tree maker breaking contract, having overdrawn wages	Fined, 10*s.*; costs, 1*l.* 6*s.* in all, in default 1 month.
32	Clark *v.* Randall	82	9.	Shoemaker neglecting contract to make shoes, 7*l.* claimed for breach of contract as compensation; no defence.	3 calendar months' hard labour.
33	Clegg *v.* Bark	12	—	Farmer's dairymaid leaving without notice	Wages, 1*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, abated.
34	Cole *v.* Billington	90	9.	Farm servant damaging cheeses; damage, 18*l.*	1 month's hard labour.
35	Colgan *v.* Doogan	30	—	Tailors' workman deserting service of employer; damages, 3*l.*	Defendant to return to service, and pay 3*s.* costs.
36	Cooke *v.* Plank and others	111	9.	Labourers refusing to work after 7 o'clock	14 days' hard labour.
37	Cooke *v.* Ogden	48	9.	Apprentice absenting himself; plea, guilty	2 months' hard labour.
38	Cook *v.* Cann	112	9.	Farm servant leaving service	14 days' hard labour.
39	Cooper *v.* Woodfield	94	14.	Apprentice (3 times summoned)	3 months' hard labour.
40	Cooper *v.* Reynolds	106	—	Neglecting contract to saw	Fine and costs, or 1 month's hard labour (paid).
41	Cooper *v.* Cox	106	—	Ditto ditto	Ditto ditto.
42	Coupland *v.* Jackson	62	—	Farm servant absconding several times	Contract annulled. Fined 1*l.* and costs.
43	Coward *v.* Gowland	21	—	Workman neglecting to fulfil contract	2*l.* 10*s.* compensation.

No. of Case.	Name of Case.	Page in Report.	Section of Act.	Circumstances, &c. of Case.	Sentence.
44	Cowans *v.* Bielby	117	9.	Apprentice absconding	1 month's hard labour.
45	Cunningham *v.* Bogle	41	9., 14.	Farm servant deserting service; 12*l.* damages claimed	Ordered to pay 5*s.* compensation, 3*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.* costs, or 15 days in default.
46	Darlaston Steel Company *v.* Plant	93	9.	Filler at furnaces, ironworks; damages	Fined 20*s.* and costs, or 14 days.
47	Dangerfield *v.* Bradley	118	9.	Ironfounder master summoned by workman for dismissing man without notice; 1*l.* 12*s.* claimed as damages.	Fined 1*l.* 12*s.* and costs.
48	Davies *q.* Davies	13	—	Farm servant deserting service	2*l.* compensation, and costs.
49	Davies *v.* Smith	28	—	Miller deserting service	2*l.* compensation, or 2 months.
50	Dawker *v.* Mundy	61	—	Farm servant (female) never going to work after taking "fasten penny"; 2*l.* damages claimed.	Contract annulled, and to pay 2*l.*, and costs.
51	Desilva *v.* Shaw	58	—	Runaway apprentice	21 days' hard labour.
52	Denny *v.* Hall	57	14.	Collier making false return of ore raised; 5*l.* damages claimed	3 months.
53	Downing *v.* Watling	72	9.	Fishcurer's workman deserting employ; damages, 30*l.*	20*s.* and costs, or 1 month.
54	Doddrill *v.* Gregory	90	—	Apprentice absenting himself (2nd offence)	14 days.
55	Doherty *v.* Moumelly	36	—	Workman absenting himself	Fined 3*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*, in default 6 weeks, unless he returns to his service.
56	Dove *v.* Davis	65	—	Tailor not finishing coat; damages, 10*s.*	Fined 10*s.*, and costs.
57	Duhig *v.* Connell	36	—	Leaving before expiration of time	Case dismissed.
58	Duggan *v.* Jones	24	9.	Farm labourer absenting; 10*l.* damages	Contract annulled, costs 18*s.*
59	Duhig *v.* McCauliff	36	—	Leaving before time	Defendant to be discharged from service.
60	Dunlop *v.* Pollok	39	14.	Workman of coal masters deserting employers	15 days.
61	Eaton *v.* Green and another	81	9.	Workman of a machinist neglecting contract for sawing	Bound in 2*l.* to complete by Christmas (ordered 13th December).
62	Edwards *v.* Sturgess	28	—	Leaving service; pleaded guilty	Compensation 8*s.*, and costs.
63	Ellis *v.* Diddams	19	—	Tailor's apprentice absconding	3 months' hard labour.
64	Elliot *v.* White	21	14.	Running away (2nd offence)	3 months' hard labour.
65	Ekins *v.* Limer	82	9.	Farm labourer absenting himself; 5*s.* damages claimed	2*s.* 4*d.* compensation, and costs.
65*a*	Fendick *v.* Reeves	70	—	Binder summoned by apprentice for not teaching him trade	Ordered to find 2 sureties in 25*l.* to fulfil contract, 4*s.* costs, in default 14 days.
66	Fenwick *v.* Helmore	17	—	Tailor's apprentice absenting himself (2nd summons); refusal to obey orders	6 weeks' hard labour.
67	Gay *v.* Wiltshire	29	—	Leaving service; pleaded guilty	7*s.* compensation, and 7*s.* costs.
67*a*	Gluson *v.* Hogan	35	—	Deserting employ	Ordered to return to service.
68	Godbeer *v.* Bright	17	—	Apprentice absent; impertinence; 2nd summons	14 days with hard labour.
69	Gowers *v.* Whybrow	103	9.	Silk manufacturer's man neglecting to work	Fined 2*l.* and costs, in default 1 month.
70	Green *v.* Dent	20	—	Workman neglecting to fulfil contract	To pay 1*l.* compensation.
71	Ground *v.* Clark	21	—	Ditto ditto	Ditto ditto.
72	Groucutt *v.* Sambrookes	94	—	Furnace keeper leaving without notice	Fine 1*s.* and costs, in default 14 days.
73	Groucutt *v.* Corser	92	9.	Engineer neglecting engine and leaving before successor	5*l.* and costs or 2 months.
74	Hancock *v.* Webb	109	9.	Farm servant	21 days' hard labour.
75	Handler *v.* Willagurd	65	—	Cigarette-maker (rare accomplishment among Englishmen) leaving service before end of term.	Case adjourned for arrangement; 20*l.* compensation claimed.
76	Harries *v.* Lewis	12	—	Farm servant deserting service; defence, food not good	Fine, 1*l.* and costs.
77	Harris *v.* Pearch	56	14.	Gasman; breach of contract; aggravated misconduct	3 months' hard labour.
78	Harrison *v.* Nash	60	9.	Basket maker's man absenting owing money	Costs and to complete contract.
79	Hartland *v.* Crump	95	—	Man leaving without notice	Fine, 1*s.* and costs.
80	Healy *v.* Molyneux	34	9.	Boatman deserting employ; damages 5*l.*	Fine, 5*l.*
81	Hill *v.* Matten	83	9.	Female farm servant leaving service; 4*l.* claimed as damages	Fine, 10*s.* and costs.
82	Hodge *v.* Pike	20	9.	Assistant to draper absconding	Fine, 6*s.* 6*d.*, to include costs.
83	Hooper *v.* Cook	29	14.	leaving service; plea, guilty	Compensation, 5*s.*; costs, 5*s.*

No. of Case.	Name of Case.	Page in Report.	Section of Act.	Circumstances, &c. of Case.	Sentence.
84	Hopper v. Nichol	22	9.	Apprentice, 8*l.* 8*s.* compensation.—N.B. Considerably increased since by continued absence.	3 months.
85	Hudson v. Swan	85	9.	Blacksmith's apprentice absenting himself; 5*s.* claimed as damages	Contract annulled.
86	Hume v. May	20	—	Workman not completing contract	5*l.* compensation; contract annulled.
87	Hunt v. Brooks	59	—	Fustian cutter's apprentice, see Warrington cases.	
88	Huthwaite v. Middleton	116	14.	Apprentice absenting	6 weeks' hard labour.
89	Irvine v. McDonagh	82	—	Female servant deserting employ; damages indefinite	Defendant to fulfil contract and give security in 5*l.*; in default 1 month.
90	Jarvis v. Thompson	58	—	Apprentice	1 month hard labour.
91	Jenner v. Bruty	102	9.	Weekly labourer absent; threats; drunk	3 months' hard labour.
92	Jewell v. Lamacraft	15	—	Apprentice to tailor misconducting himself; second conviction	14 days' hard labour.
93	Joicey v. Rouke	88	9.	Apprentice to engineer absenting himself	Fine, 10*s.* and costs.
94	Jolliffe v. Goddard	108	14.	Apprentice deserting service	3 months' hard labour.
95	Jones v. Lloyd	13	—	Female farm servant leaving service; second offence	Discharged from service, wages abated, and 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* compensation; ordered to complete service.
96	Jones v. Probert	27	9.	Farm servant deserting services; 10*s.* compensation	10*s.* costs or 1 calendar month hard labour.
96*a*	Jube v. McEvoy (3) others	85	14.	Female staymakers deserting employ; 15*s.* damages	Complaint dismissed.
97	Keller v. Cohen	69	9.	Tailor absent	Fine, 10*s.* or 7 days.
98	Laidler v. French	21	—	Apprentice absenting himself	1*l.* 4*s.* compensation ordered.
99	Laidler v. Vest.			Apprentice ditto	1*l.* compensation ordered.
99*a*	Laing v. Gordon	36	—	Absenting himself from employment	2*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; in default of payment 2 months, unless he returns to his service.
100	Leete v. Smith	81	—	Farm labourer neglecting to fulfil contract piece-work, 10; compensation, 10*s.*	Compensation and costs ordered.
101	Leiper v. Reid	44	9 & 14	Baker's apprentice absenting himself; 5*l.* claimed for damages	1*l.*10*s.* compensation and 2*l.*10*s.* costs or 15 days in default.
102	Lee v. Watson	60	9.	Improver nailmaker absconding	10*s.*; ordered to fulfil contract and pay costs.
103	Like v. Cutter	26	9.	Farm servant deserting service	Fine, 1*s.* 6*d.*; a fortnight allowed to pay; in default 7 days.
104	Lewis v. Brown	90	9.	Farm labourer absent from work, drunk	7 days.
105	Lywood v. Perrit	107	9.	Farm labourer absenting himself	2 calendar months' hard labour.
106	Martin v. Sharp	61	9.	Ironmonger's apprentice absconding	1*s.* 6*d.* compensation and costs.
107	Macdonell v. Macdonell	87	—	Absenting himself	2*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; in default 1 month; wages forfeited unless he returns to service.
108	Mays v. Cordery	76	9.	Fellmonger's workman leaving service	2*l.* compensation and costs 4*l.* 10*s.* within a month.
109	McQuaid v. Elliott	32	—	Farm labourer deserting service	Contract annulled; wages forfeited; fined 1*l.* and 3*s.* costs; in default 1 month.
109*a*	Millership v. Felton	92	9.	Pitman 50*s.* loss	Order abating wages 4*s.* 6*d.*; in default imprisonment, 14 days.
110	Morgan v. Lawler	53	9.	Apprentice; 5*l.* 5*s.*; convicted under 14th	3 months' hard labour.
111	Morris v. Lewis	25	—	By labourer against employer	Defendant to pay wages and costs.
112	Mumford v. Dunn	18	—	Apprentice absconding, using bad language, &c.	3 months with hard labour.
113	Mumford v. Davey	100	9.	Farm servant ill-using and rendering valueless a horse, which would have been worth 100 guineas the year after.	Sentenced to 3 months' imprisonment, hard labour.
114	Nieson v. Macneely	83	14.	Labourer threatening and assaulting employer	1 month's imprisonment.
115	Nobbs v. Matthews	17	—	Apprentice not keeping time and so causing loss	14 days with hard labour.
116	Norris v. Spencer	84	—	Master summoned by apprentice for not fulfilling contract	Defendant ordered to pay 4*l.* 15*s.* and assign indenture.
117	O'Connell v. Wright	58	9.	Workman to whip-maker refusing to fulfil contract [before Stipendiary Magistrate]	1 month.
118	Parham v. Matthews	29	—	Absenting himself from service; plea guilty	To perform contract and pay costs.
119	Parham v. Wells	30	—	Farm labourer absenting himself; damages 1*l.* 5*s.*	To fulfil contract.
120	Pearson v. Hogarth	20	—	Apprentice absenting himself	To enter into recognisances, 10*l.*, to work.

No. of Case.	Name of Case.	Page in Report.	Section of Act.	Circumstances, &c. of Case.	Sentence.
121	Pinniger *v.* Targett	106	9.	Farm labourer deserting service; plea not guilty	2 months' hard labour.
122	Plevins *v.* Saunders and another	79	9.	Workmen drunk and neglecting work	Fine, 1*l.* 5*s.* and costs each.
123	Powell *v.* Saunders	109	9.	Shepherd absent	1 months' hard labour.
124	Pridham *v.* Rice	19	—	Apprentice to jeweller absent without leave	Compensation 1*s.* 6*d.*, fine 2*s.* 6*d.* and costs.
125	Pye *v.* Ainsworth	58	—	Runaway apprentice	1 month's hard labour.
126	Ratcliff *v.* Peers	23	—	Boiler maker's man deserting service	40*s.* fine and costs, or one month [was committed].
127	Ranby *v.* Brown	62	—	Farm servant absconding	To fulfil contract and pay 7*s.* 6*d.* compensation.
128	Ranby *v.* Barrowcliffe	62	—	Farm servant absconding	To fulfil contract and pay costs.
129	Reeves *v.* Fendick	71	—	Apprentice to printer for leaving employ	Fined 20*s.*, and costs 2*s.*, or 14 days in default.
130	Rice *v.* Dart	17	—	Whitesmith's apprentice absenting and keeping late hours	14 days with hard labour.
131	Roberts *v.* Johnson and others	95	—	Pipe moulders deserting service	Fine, 2*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* each or 14 days' imprisonment.
132	Roderick *v.* Walter	13	—	Farm servant deserting service, being engaged for a year; 3*l.* damages	3*l.* compensation.
133	Rowley *v.* Wyer	115	—	Labourer absenting himself	10*s.* and costs.
134	Ryan *v.* Hogan	30	—	Painter's man deserting employ; damage, 1*l.*	Fine, 15*s.*, and costs 8*s.* 6*d.*
134*a*	Ryan *v.* Troy	31	—	Female servant deserting employ, substitute paid 10*d.* per day	Fine, 3*l.*, 12*s.* 6*d.* costs; in default 2 months.
135	Satheld *v.* McIntyre, two cases	20	—	Apprentice absenting himself	Fine, 2*l.*, second time 1*l.*
136	Satheld *v.* Machlam	21	—	Apprentice absenting himself	Fine, 2*l.*
137	Sanders *v.* Kenniwell	62	—	Maltster's workman absenting himself	Fine, 1*l.* and costs, to be paid in 14 days; in default 14 days.
138	Schlesinger *v.* Nicholson	89	9.	Shipbuilder's men deserting service; damages, 8*l.*	Each 1*l.* compensation, or 1 month's imprisonment with hard labour.
139	Schlesinger *v.* Caldwell		9.		
140	——— *v.* Burns		9.		
141	*v.* Maxwell		9.		
142	Seaborne *v.* Price	25	—	Farm servant absenting himself at threshing time; damages, 10*s.*	Contract annulled, compensation 8*s.* 6*d.*
143	Seath *v.* Wallace	7	—	Apprentice absenting himself	Fine, 2*l.* 10*s.*, costs 2*l.* 5*s.*; in default 30 days.
144	Seath *v.* McClean	8	9.	Apprentice absenting himself, 20*l.*	Fine of 1*l.* 1*s.*, 2*l.* 5*s.* costs; in default 20 days.
145	Sewell *v.* Walker	21	—	Apprentice to fellmonger absconding; damages 6*s.*	6*s.* and costs.
146	Shard *v.* Short	60	9.	Apprentice absenting himself	2 months' hard labour.
147	Smallpage *v.* Berry	119	—	Engine tenter neglecting work	1 month with hard labour.
148	Smith *v.* Knauss	70	—	Skin dresser leaving without notice	Fine, 5*l.*, or 14 days.
149	Solomons *v.* Morris	68	—	Tailoress absenting herself; damages, 3*l.*	Fine, 5*s.*
150	Smith *v.* Coupe	49	9.	Convicted under 14; cotton spinner cheating by charging loom when set	3 months.
151	Smith *v.* Cooper	89	—	Apprentice absenting himself; 2nd offence	2 months.
152	Stephenson *v.* Talbot	90	—	Apprentice absenting himself; 2nd summons	14 days' hard labour.
153	Stephenson *v.* McLaughlin	48	9. & 14.	Workman to glass bottle maker deserting service; 20*l.* damage	To fulfil contract, in default 40 days' imprisonment.
154	Stephenson *v.* Tuck	86	9.	Apprentice to engineer absenting himself; 10*s.* claimed as damage	Fine, 10*s.*
155	Stephenson *v.* Neale	—	9.	Apprentice to engineer absenting himself; 3*l.* claimed as damage	Fine, 2*l.*
156	Stephenson *v.* Lamb	87	9.	Apprentice to engineer absenting himself; 1*l.* claimed as damage	Fine, 1*l.*
157	Stephenson *v.* Denham	88	9.	Apprentice to engineer absenting himself; 1*l.* claimed as damage	Fine, 1*l.* 10*s.*
158	Stevens *v.* Harris	29	—	Farm servant leaving employment; plea, guilty	5*s.* compensation and costs.
159	Stockham *v.* Chamberlan	18	—	Cork cutter's apprentice absenting himself	One month's hard labour.
160	Stoddart *v.* Cunningham	45	9. & 14.	Master summoned by ploughman for dismissal; 20*l.* claimed	4*l.* costs or 40 days imprisonment.
161	Surrey Gas Co. *v.* Constable	39	14.	Three gasmen for deserting employment	Each six weeks' imprisonment.
162	Swindell *v.* Hatchett	98	9.	Engineer neglecting work; 100*l.* claimed	2 months' hard labour.
163	Summers *v.* Clarney	20	—	Workman not fulfilling contract	1*l.* compensation.
164	Templeton *v.* McConnell	10	9.	Workman in a woollen manufactory absenting himself; damages, 1*l.*	Sixpence fine; 10 shillings costs; 3 days in default.
165	Thomas *v.* Thomas	12	9.	Farm servant leaving without notice	Fine, 1*l.* and costs.
166	Talbot *v.* Collins	31	—	Female servant deserting employ; damages laid at 8*s.* up to date	Fine, 2*s.* 6*d.* and costs 5*s.*; in default 1 week.
167	Touhey *v.* Corbett	31	—	Master for wrongful dismissal by servant; damages, 1*l.* 12*s.*	Defendant to take complainant back and pay 2*s.* 6*d.*
168	Trewby *v.* Hardinge	88	14.	Sixteen gasmen absenting themselves from works	Six weeks' imprisonment each.

No. of Case.	Name of Case.	Page in Report.	Section of Act.	Circumstances, &c. of Case.	Sentence.
169	Teesdale *v.* Hawkes	72	9.	Apprentice to a painter absenting himself from service; damage, 5*s.*	Fine, 25*s.* and costs or 14 days.
170	Turnbull *v.* Pearson	117	9.	Apprentice absenting himself	21 days with hard labour.
171	Tod *v.* Sewell	73	14.	Twine spinner's apprentice absenting himself; damage, 2*l.*	1 month hard labour.
172	Tod *v.* Warnes	74	14.	Twine spinner's apprentice absenting himself; damages, 2*s.*	1 month hard labour.
173	Turton *v.* Cook	116	—	Iron moulder absenting himself; 10*s.* claimed as damages	10*s.* and costs.
174	Turton *v.* Winwood	114	—	Workman to ironfounder leaving work; 1*l.* claimed as damages	10*s.* and costs.
175	Turton *v.* Wright	115	—	Dresser in an iron foundry absenting himself	10*s.* and costs.
176	Verdon *v.* Willis	35	14.	Apprentice absenting himself	1 month's imprisonment.
178	Wade *v.* Exton	61	9.	Apprentice absconding	33*s.* compensation and costs.
179	Wallis *v.* Hotham	97	—	Farm labourer absenting himself	Sentenced to 14 days' hard labour.
180	Walker *v.* Taysum	108	9.	Apprentice absconding; 2*l.* claimed as damages	3 months' hard labour.
181	Warrington cases (8)	59	—	5 cases of apprentices absenting themselves. See *Mr. Blechley's evidence* (q. 231) 2 cases of breach of contract 1 case aggravated misconduct, destroying property	Sentence, 3 months. Sentence, 2 months and 5*l.*, or 3 months in default. 3 months.
182	Walker *v.* Golden	36	—	Leaving employment before expiration of time	Fined 2*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*, in default 1 month.
183	Wallace *v.* Colf	34	14.	Carter drunk, neglecting work	1 month hard labour.
184	Waterhouse *v.* Bontoft	61	—	Ploughman deserting service	Sentence, to pay costs and be committed for one month.
185	Watkins *v.* Hill	33	9.	Farm servant deserting service	Wages abated.
186	Watts *v.* Adams	105	—	Farm servant leaving service	Ordered to return and fulfil contract.
187	Watson *v.* Fieldhouse	95	—	Workman leaving without notice; damages laid at 10*s.*	Fine, 5*s.* and costs, in default 14 days.
188	Webb *v.* Watts	114	—	Apprentice absenting himself	Ordered to fulfil contract and pay costs.
189	Wilson *v.* Montray	34	14.	Servant insubordinate and disobedient	1 month's imprisonment.
190	Wilson *v.* Wilson	50	14.	Manufacturing chemist's man drunk and neglecting work. No pecuniary compensation adequate.	1 month with hard labour.
191	Wilson *v.* Shaw	51	—	Same as Wilson *v.* Wilson	1 month with hard labour.
192	Webster *v.* Belfield	14	9.	Nailmaker's apprentice neglecting to work; damages, 17*s.* 6*d.*, 2nd offence	2 months' hard labour.
193	Webster *v.* Hallsworth	13	9.	Nailmaker's apprentice neglecting to work; damages laid at 16*s.*	2 months with hard labour.
194	Whieldon *v.* Nash	105	—	Farm servant absenting himself	Fine and costs, or 14 days' hard labour.
195	Whieldon *v.* Walker	105	—	Farm servant absenting himself	Fine and costs, or 2 months.
196	Williams *v.* Dono	104	9.	Apprentice absenting himself; damages laid at 10*s.*	3 months' hard labour.
197	Willis *v.* Payne	113	—	Reeler to a rug maker going without notice; 8*s.* claimed as damages	Fine, 6*d.* and costs.
198	Williams *v.* Roberts	63	14.	Farm servant absenting himself; defence, neither food nor lodging good	Fine, 5*l.* or 2 months' hard labour.
199	Williams *v.* Davies	64	—	Farm servant deserting service	Fine, 2*l.* and costs.
200	Williamson *v.* Whittingham	112	—	Workman engaging to work, borrowing money, and absconding	3 months with hard labour.
201	Wilkinson *v.* Higgs	21	—	Workman absenting himself; damages laid at 30*s.*	Fine, 1*l.* 10*s.* compensation.
202	Wood *v.* Coxhead	68	—	Workman drunk, fined; fine paid for him, and he would not repay it but went away	Fine, 1*l.*
203	Wright *v.* Murray	69	—	Cabinet maker not finishing job	Fine, 1*l.* or 14 days.
204	Young *v.* McKinlay	9	9.	Workman of an engineer absenting himself; damages, 10*l.*	Fine, 2*l.* 10*s.*; 2*l.* 10*s.* costs, or 1 month.
	Miller *v.* Menzies	2nd Report 113	All sections of Act.	Collier absenting himself; damages 20*l.*	Fined 2*l.* and 5*l.* 3*s.* costs,* or 1 month in default.

* *Note.*—Observe letter from Mr. Naismith (Clerk Dep. Justice of Peace) about costs.

ABSTRACT OF SECOND REPORT.

	Page
COMMISSION	1
PROCEEDINGS OF COMMISSIONERS	1
DIVISION OF SUBJECT, matter of inquiry into	2
1st. Master and Servant Act	2
2nd. Criminal Law Amendment Act and Law of Conspiracy, as applicable to that Act	2
1st. MASTER AND SERVANT ACT	2–14
Consideration of classes of servants to whom Act applies	2
Legislation on relation of Master and Servant prior to 1867	2–5
[*See* Index, Title Statutes.]	
Select Committee of House of Commons appointed to inquire into law of contracts of hiring	5
Resolutions of Committee	5
Master and Servant Act (based on said Resolution) passed 1867	6
Provisions of that Act	6
Summary of Evidence taken before Commission	7
Of witnesses against Act	7
Of witnesses in support of Act	8
Of persons engaged in administering Act	9
Objections to principle of the Act, consideration of and recommendations upon	10
To 9th Section	1
Recommended that imprisonment be in a civil prison	11
That misusage and misdemeanour be excepted from Act	11
To 14th Section	12
Division of opinion as to repeal of Section, recommended alternatively	12
1st, that it be repealed, and punishment for such cases be under 9th, with imprisonment for a longer period	13
2ndly, that it be retained and that such cases be tried by jury	13
Objections to tribunal and administration of Act	13
Consideration of and recommendation on	13
Recommended that, with the exception of places where there are stipendiary magistrates, there should be no change. But where stipendiaries, cases should be heard by them	14
Wages; question whether to be sued for under Act answered in the affirmative	14
2nd. CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1871	14–24
Laws against combination stated and considered	14–15
5th George IV. c. 95.	14
Provisions of	15
Reasons for repeal of that Act considered	16
[*See* Mr. Hughes' papers]	3–6
Appointment of Committee on that Act	16
Report of Committee	17
6th George IV. passed	17
Provisions of Act	17
Reasons for appointment of Trades Union Commission, 1867	17
Acts passed in consequence of their Report:	
1st. Trades Union Act	18
Provision of Act	18
2nd. Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871	18
Provision of Act	18
Summary of evidence on Act taken before Commission	19–20
Statement and consideration of and recommendations on objections to Act	20
Quotations from Report of Trades Union Commission as to principles upon which legislation upon combination should be based	21
Picketing, account of, quoted from same report	23
Objection to principle of Act:	
Not fair as between master and man, *e.g.*, black lists	23
To language of Act	23
To interpretation of sub-section 3 of interpretation clause of sub-section 3 of 1st section of Act	23
Reference to and approval of ruling of Mr. Justice Lush in a case of conspiracy under old law	23
Statement of number of convictions under Act	24
Recommendation that cases under Act at option of prisoner be tried by a jury	24

	Page
LAW OF CONSPIRACY - - - - - - - - - - -	24–28
How law bears upon inquiry - - - - - - - - - -	24
What conspiracy is - - - - - - - - - - -	24
Scope of inquiry, reason for limiting recommendations to the law as affecting the relation of master and servant - - - - - - - - - -	24
Objections to the Law - - - - - - - - - - -	25
1st. It is anomalous in that acts not criminal if done by an individual become a crime if done by several - - - - - - - - - -	25
2nd. That punishment is greater for act done by several than for same act if done by one - - - - - - - - - - -	25
3rd. That, by application of the law, men are made criminally liable for acts which are no longer penal by statute law, and ought not to be penally prohibited at all - -	25
Consideration of and Answers to Objections *seriatim* - - - - - -	25
To 1st objection that act if not a crime if done by one, is a wrong and becomes from its aggravated nature when done by several conspirators a crime - - - -	25
Division of conspiracy into three classes - - - - - - - -	25
Definition and illustration of different classes - - - - - -	25
Consideration whether unjust or inexpedient to apply the law to any combined and wrongful interference with rights under contract of service - - - - -	26
Cases in which such interference may occur - - - - - - - -	26
2nd objection considered and answered - - - - - - - -	27
3rd objection considered - - - - - - - - - -	27
Ruling of judges referred to - - - - - - - - - -	27
e.g. Mr. Baron Pollock - - - - - - - - - -	27
Recommendation to amend proviso in Criminal Law Amendment Act - - -	27
Reason for extending proviso to breaches of contract - - - - -	27
Proviso as amended not to extend to acts which even apart from intention to coerce would constitute criminal conspiracy - - - - - - - - -	28
Recommendations - - - - - - - - - - -	28
Dissent - - - - - - - - - - - - -	29

INDEX.

SUBJECT.	—	Page.
AMPHLETT (THE HON. MR. BARON) on conspiracy	App.	106
APPEALS:		
From convictions under Criminal Law Amendment Act	App.	107
Convictions quashed	App.	21, 22 & 41
Convictions affirmed	App.	3, 7, 12 & 33
Not prosecuted	App.	24
ASSOCIATING IRON TRADE EMPLOYERS	App. Q. 1027	93
ASSOCIATED CARPENTERS, SCOTLAND, Secretary as witness	App. Q. 166	54
Miners of Durham	App. Q. 445	71
See also YORKSHIRE.		
BENNETT, MR. ROBERT, evidence of	App.	84
BOA (MR. ANDREW), evidence of	App.	45
BLACK LIST:		
None among London BUILDERS	App. Q. 623, 628, 629, 784, 786.	77, 83
Nor among London TAILORS	App. Q. 834	85
Nor Blackburn COTTON SPINNERS	App. Q. 872	87
BLECKLEY (H., ESQ.), evidence of	1st Rep.	128
BRIDGE, JOHN, ESQ., evidence of	App.	64
BURNS v. CROSBY	App.	114
CAIRD, MESSRS., circular of	App. Q. 200	56
CALLAGHAN, MR. WILLIAM	App. 1st Report	48 134
COMBINATIONS (TRADE):		
State of law on, prior to 1824	2nd Rep. App.	14, 15 3
„ between 1825 and 1871	2nd Rep. App.	16, 17 3
Report of Trade Union Commission on	2nd Rep.	20 *et seq.*
COMMITTEE, SELECT, on 5 Geo. 4. c. 95.	2nd Rep.	16
Recommendations of	-	16
On Law of Master and Servant	2nd Rep.	5
COMMISSION, TRADE UNIONS, 1867	2nd Rep.	17
CONSPIRACY, LAW OF	2nd Rep.	24–28
Scope of inquiry into	2nd Rep.	24
Division of	2nd Rep.	25
Recommendations on	2nd Rep.	27, 28
CONTRACTS, written not necessary	2nd Rep.	14
CRAWFORD, MR. WILLIAM, evidence of	App.	71
CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1871	2nd Rep.	14–24
Convictions under, Return of	App.	107
Provisions of	2nd Rep.	18
Evidence on, summary of	2nd Rep.	19
Recommendations on	2nd Rep.	24, 28
Prejudice against	App. Q. 597	76
Notes of cases under	App.	7
Table of cases	App.	42
CROMPTON, HENRY, ESQ., evidence of	App.	100
CUTLER'S CASE referred to	1st Rep.	121
DAVIS, JAMES EDWARD, ESQ., evidence of	App. 1st Rep.	65 138
DISCHARGE NOTE:		
Not used by tailors	App. Q. 836	85
Not in Blackburn cotton spinners	App. Q. 872	87
In Glamorganshire	App. Q. 836	85
DISSENT OF MR. MACDONALD	2nd Rep.	28
DUMFRIES CASE	App. Q. 185, 197	55
ENGINEERS, AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF, resolutions of	App.	115
FRANCIS v. LEES	App.	114
GATESHEAD CASES, referred to	App. Q. 489 and others	72
GLAMORGANSHIRE, TIN PLATE MANUFACTURERS, resolutions of, referred to.	App. Q. 835	85
HANNAY, J. LENNOX, ESQ., evidence of	1st Rep.	125
HANNEN, BENJAMIN, ESQ., evidence of	App.	77
HAWORTH, RICHARD, ESQ., evidence of	App.	98
HOLME (S. H., ESQ.), Statement of	App. Q. 126	51
HOWELL (MR.), letter of, to Times quoted	App. Q. 262	58

SUBJECT.	—	Page.
HOWELL, MR. GEORGE, letter of, in matter of evidence	App.	105
HUGHES, EDWARD, evidence of	App.	48
	1st. Rep.	134
HUGHES, (THOMAS ESQ., Q.C.), papers prepared by:		
Proposed amendments, Master and Servant Act	App.	2
Memorandum to accompany same	App.	1
Amendments proposed on draft report	App.	3
Memorandum on same	App.	2
HUSKISSON, MR., COMMITTEE OF. *See* COMMITTEE.		
INQUIRY NOTE, existence of, in London	App. Q. 969.	92
JACKSON, R. RAYNSFORD, ESQ., evidence of	App.	86
JOHNSON, EDWARD, ESQ., evidence of	App.	78
JURY, whether preferable mode of trial	App. Q. 533	74
	App. Q. 561	74
	App. Q. 809	84
	App. Q. 906, 907	84
[And *see* Recommendation of Commissioners.]		
LEGISLATION ON RELATION OF MASTER AND SERVANT, prior to 1867.	2nd Rep.	2–5
LIVERPOOL MASTER BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION:		
Deputation from, as witnesses	App.	48
	1st Rep.	134
Extract from rules of	App.	53, *note*
LONDON TRADES COUNCIL	1st Rep.	148
LUMPERS CASE, FRANCIS v. LEES	App. Q. 39	46
	App.	114
LUSH, HON. MR. JUSTICE, on conspiracy	2nd Rep.	23
MACDONALD, ALEXANDER, ESQ., M.P., dissent of. *See* Dissent.		
Speech of, at Longton, report of	App. Q. 871	87
MANCHESTER ASSIZE COURTS, strike at building	App. Q. 104	50
Master Builders Association, evidence of	App. Q. 640	78
MASTER AND SERVANT ACT:		
Provisions of	2nd Rep.	6
Evidence on	1st Rep.	*passim*
,, summary of	2nd Rep.	7
Notes of additional case under	Appx.	113
Table of cases under	App.	116
Report on	2nd Rep.	2–14
Recommendations of Commissioners	2nd Rep.	28
MASTER AND SERVANT, LAW OF:		
Select Committee in 1866 on Resolutions of	2nd Rep.	5
MENELAUS, Mr. W., evidence of	1st Rep.	143
MONASTERIES, suppression of, effects of	2nd Rep.	3
MOORE, MR. ABEL, evidence of	1st Rep.	157
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF ASSOCIATED EMPLOYERS of LABOUR	App.	58
	App. Q. 862	86
NORMANSELL, MR. JOHN, evidence of	App. 4	74
PARLIAMENT, ACTS OF, on special trades, &c.	App. Q. 900	88
PATERSON, MR. WILLIAM, evidence of	App.	54
PEAL, MR. CHARLES NATHANIEL, evidence of	App.	99
PEASE, MASKELL WM., ESQ.	1st Rep.	154
PENN, JOHN, ESQ., evidence of	App.	89
PERTH CASE, Note of	App.	33
Referred to by Mr. Bos	App. Q. 33	46
,, ,, Mr. Paterson	App. Q. 174	54
PICKETING, account of, in Trades Union Commission Report	2nd Rep.	21
Description of, and opinions on	App. Q. 105, 119	50
	App. Q. 127	51
	App. Q. 53	24
	App. Q. 605	77
	App. Q. 772	83
	App. Q. 823	85
	App. Q. 879	87
	App. Q. 934	90
	App. Q. 1040	94
	App. Q. 1128	98
	App. Q. 1156	99
POLLOCK (HONOURABLE MR. BARON), on conspiracy	2nd Rep.	27
POOR RATES, institution of	2nd Rep.	3
RAVENHILL, JOHN R., evidence of	App.	90
RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSIONERS	2nd Rep.	28
REPORT, 1st	—	—
,, 2nd and Final	—	—
,, ABSTRACT OF	App.	121
REGINA *v.* COLLINGE and others referred to	2nd Report	27
	App. Q. 1256	104

SUBJECT.	—	Page.
REGINA v. HALLIDAY, summing up in	App. Q. 1251	106
REGINA v. SHEPHEARD, referred to	2nd Rep.	23
REX v. HOSEASON, referred to	2nd Rep.	5
ROBERTS, ISAAC, Esq., evidence of	App.	4, 48
ROBINSON, JOHN, Esq., evidence of	App. 1st Rep.	58 162
SALE, MR. JOHN, evidence of	1st Rep.	121
SERVANTS, CLASSES TO WHOM ACT APPLIES	2nd Rep.	2
SHIPTON, MR. GEORGE, evidence of	1st Rep.	148
SIMONS, WILLIAM, Esq., evidence of	App.	94
SLIM, MR. WILLIAM, evidence of	App.	92
SMITH, MR. SIDNEY, evidence of	App.	93
SPEEDY REMEDY, necessary	2nd Rep.	13
STATUTES cited in Report:		
23 Edw. III., A.D. 1348–1349	2nd Rep.	2
25 Edw. III., Statute second, A.D. 1350–1351	2nd Rep.	3
12 Ric. II., A.D. 1388	2nd Rep.	3
13 Ric. II. c. 8., A.D. 1389	2nd Rep.	3
7 Hen. IV., A.D. 1405–1406	2nd Rep.	3
3 & 4 Edw. VI. c. 22., A.D. 1550	2nd Rep.	3
5 Eliz. c. 4., A.D. 1562–1563	2nd Rep.	4
43 Eliz. c. 2., A.D. 1601	2nd Rep.	3
20 Geo. II. c. 19., A.D. 1746–1747	2nd Rep.	5
31 Geo. II. c. 11., A.D. 1757–1758	2nd Rep.	5
39 & 40 Geo. III. c. 106., A.D. 1800	App.	4
4 Geo. IV. c. 34., A.D. 1823	2nd Rep.	5
5 Geo. IV. c. 95., A.D. 1824	App. 2nd Rep.	4 and 5 15
6 Geo. IV. c. 129., A.D. 1825	App. 2nd Rep.	5 and 6 17
" " " provisions of	2nd Rep.	17
10 Geo. IV. c. 52., A.D. 1829	2nd Rep.	5
24 & 25 Vict. c. 97., A.D. 1862	App.	1
28 & 29 Vict. c. 127., A.D. 1865	App.	2
30 & 31 Vict. c. 141 (Master and Servant Act, 1867)	-	*passim*
34 & 35 Vict. c. 31. (Trade Union Act)	2nd Rep.	17
34 & 35 Vic. c. 32. (Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871)	-	*passim*
STATUTE OF LABOURERS, Provisions of	2nd Rep.	4
STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES, OR POLICE MAGISTRATES, OR SHERIFFS, CASES DECIDED BY:		
At Hull	App.	10
At Liverpool	App.	19
At Manchester	App.	20
At Metropolitan Police Courts	App.	24, 25, 26, 27
In Scotland	App.	31, 36
Sheffield	-	37, 38
Swansea	-	40
Sentences of, severe	App. Q. 285	63
STRIKES, LOCAL, causes of	App. Q. 99, 100, 101	49
TAILORS, number of, in London	App. Q. 848	86
TRADE UNION COMMISSION. *See* COMMISSION.		
Act, provisions of	2nd Rep.	18
(London) Congress Parliamentary Committee	2nd App.	1, 2
Letter of secretary to	App.	105
Resolutions of	App.	105
TROLLOPE, GEORGE F., Esq., evidence of	App.	82
WAGES, whether sued for under Act	2nd Rep.	14
	1st Rep. Q. 422	139
	App. 169	127
	App. Q. 305	64
Increase of	App. Q. 157	53
WILSON, JAMES, Esq., evidence of	App.	66
YORKSHIRE (SOUTH), MINERS ASSOCIATION	App.	74
Benefits of	App. Q. 579, 518	75