

I wish to refer to. I happen to be the secretary of a clerks' union. Professor Tocker says, "There is little if any evidence of sweating now in occupations quite beyond the Court's influence—for instance, amongst women typists and domestic servants, who are altogether unorganized and unprotected." In reply to that statement I wish to say that there are very few unions in the Dominion of that kind, but I think where they have the support of the workers it is certainly beneficial to the workers who take advantage of the right to form a union. Then there is another statement here by Professor Tocker. He says, "Through them we have limitation of the range of tasks to be performed by one man, the creations of jobs in order that employment may be found, men's wages for boys' work, skilled men's wages for unskilled work." In regard to that statement, I have found quite a number of industries involving exceptionally heavy work, and there I have found boys doing men's work and getting the junior rate of something about 30s. or 35s. per week. That sometimes applies to what has often been termed the sheltered industries. I have had a recent experience of organizing some workers, and I found to my surprise that the employers were in favour of an Arbitration Court award. We got the award all right, and we found that the reason the employers wanted the award was because they found that they probably could not get a contract unless there was an award in that district. The wages that were fixed by the Court were, in the junior section, practically on a par with the English union rates. The industry was the biscuit and confectionery. There is one other point I hope we shall get some information upon from our economist friends. Their figures have been based on the Statistician's. I do not pretend to refute them, but I do want to see them compared with those for each group as given in the Statistician's tables, and I think the comparison will affect the figures given by the economists. Lastly, with respect to the conditions of the farmers, I would like some information from our farming friends. I recently noticed that a man who shipped nineteen bullocks to England only got a profit of £90 out of the shipment, the total receipts being about £290. Perhaps the balance went to the shipping companies and other people who are helping on the prosperity of this country.

Mr. Martin: I think that when the sub-committees are set up we should appoint a "Professors of Economics Joint Sub-Committee," so that those gentlemen can thresh out the points among themselves and perhaps arrive at some unanimous decisions regarding the same, instead of having disagreement thereon, as their papers seem to suggest at the present time. Perhaps the most important point in the papers is the conclusion arrived at where they do agree. I particularly refer to the findings arrived at by Professor Tocker. I do not know why the professor comes in for a great deal of adverse criticism from this side of the table. He stresses the point that labour costs must be reduced in order to bring about increased production. But he goes on further to argue that it would not be advisable to decrease wages, and I take it that his suggestion really is that the proper thing to do in order to get away from the position we are placed in to-day is to increase production. Well, it seems to me that we have to prove that the Arbitration Court has been the factor in bringing about the increased production, and if that is the opinion of Professor Tocker then he must admit that it also follows logically that the Court has been the factor in placing us in the economic situation we find ourselves in to-day. I will leave the professor to answer this question also: In advocating increased production, to what extent does he think the fact has been studied of the effect of the use of up-to-date machinery in this country in industries, or the non-use of the same, and also the continued application of out-of-date methods, and inefficient management generally? I wonder if Professor Tocker will indicate to what extent he thinks there is improvement possible, and necessary, in that direction. I think he showed some apprehension on that point.

The Conference adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

THURSDAY, 29TH MARCH, 1928.

The Conference resumed at 10 a.m.

Discussion of Economists' Papers resumed.

Mr. Churchhouse: The papers that were read by the Professors of Economics, and distributed amongst delegates yesterday, contained very valuable information, and provided a good groundwork for this Conference to work upon. We probably do not agree with the other side as to the statements which the professors have placed before the Conference, but we do admit that there is very important matter contained in the papers, which will be valuable to us. What this Conference requires to do is to extend its mental vision, and go for big things: the Conference must thaw out a little bit, so to speak. Let us get together and do something in the interests of industrial stability and the financial prosperity of this country. That is our job, and that is what we are here for. Professor Murphy, whose very interesting address you, Mr. Chairman, did not have the pleasure of hearing, made the statement that before the Arbitration Court the worker was not concerned with production. Now, I want to say that it is not the function of the workers' representatives before the Court to interest themselves in the other man's business, whether it be that of a farmer or a commercial man. That is not his job. It is not for the representative of labour to say to the farmer, "If you put another udder on the other end of Strawberry's body, that would be a way out of your difficulty." That is not his job. The job of the Arbitration Court is to say "Yes" or "No." The dispute might be over money or anything else. One side says "Yes," and the other side says "No," and the Judge tries to arrive at a balance between the two. That is all that is required there. This Conference practically affords the first chance for labour to show that it is interested in production in this country. This is the first opportunity, and I say that it was a very wise move on somebody's part to bring the two sides together, and I am quite sure that some good will come from the Conference, even if we never reach finality at