

and genuinely come under the scope of the Court they are equitably entitled to preference of employment, subject to proper safeguards against a labour monopoly. The union, however, thinks that preference should not be given in the absence of loyal adherence to the spirit of the Act, and that if a union adopts direct action, the strike, or irritation, or go-slow tactics the preference clause should lapse automatically. It is felt that preference has perhaps been conceded too easily at times in the past.

The Court itself has held that if a union goes on strike it forfeits the benefits of the award, including the preference clause; but in spite of the above decision—*Greymouth Wharf Labourers v. Union Steamship Co.* (Book of Awards, Vol. xvi, p. 554)—it is felt that the position requires clearer definition. The union accordingly asks for the enactment of a clause to the effect that where the union concerned has deliberately committed, connived at, or instigated a breach of award, or refused to accept employment, the preference clause shall automatically thereupon lapse; and where in or in connection with any establishment or locality any section or substantial body of the workers in a union either refuse to accept employment or systematically commit a breach of award, the union shall be deemed to have committed, connived at, or instigated such breach or refusal to accept employment.

The Farmers' Union, while sympathetic with the objects of legitimate trade-unionism, feels that labour cannot have it both ways; they cannot have the benefits of the arbitration system and those of direct action at the same time.

(I) *Improved methods of avoiding industrial disturbances and other like delays in carrying on industry.*

(J) *Such Alterations, if any, as are desirable in the industrial legislation of the Dominion.*

These two have been answered incidentally to the discussion of the previous paragraphs. The union would be content to see the principle of the Labour Disputes Investigation Act, 1913, in conjunction with voluntary conciliation, in place of the present compulsory system. The union recommends that sections 20 and 21 of the 1927 amending Bill be passed into law.

(K) *Apprenticeship.*

This union has no comment to make on this heading.

(L) *Immigration.*

Owing to their inability in general to pay wages for labour incurred in improvements, &c., the farmers of the Dominion are unable to absorb much of the unskilled labour drifting about the country. From an economic point of view this union deplores such a sad state of affairs as a considerable amount of recently retrieved land is fast deteriorating, and increase in our production is being hindered.

The following immigration policy has been advocated by this union for some time:—

- (1) A better application of the nomination system for all classes of migrants than is at present the case.
- (2) A more careful examination of migrants from all sources from the point of view of health.
- (3) A closing-down of immigration under the various schemes from April until September in each year. This aspect is regarded as highly imperative.
- (4) The establishment of an Immigration Board to handle the whole question at this end, with power to control migrants for a certain definite period, to acquire land for the settlement of migrants, and to administer such lands until the migrants are capable of managing for themselves.
- (5) The encouragement of the group system of immigration on somewhat similar lines to the West Australian scheme.
- (6) The establishment of numerous farm schools where both native-born New-Zealanders and suitable immigrants could be trained to farming pursuits. A more careful selection of farm labourers should be made in England, as the present financial position of our farmers prevents them from employing any but experienced farm hands.
- (7) A closer co-operation and consultation with the Imperial Government in order to take full advantage of the Acts passed by the British Parliament for the encouragement of inter-Empire migration. This union is of the opinion that this has been somewhat neglected in the past.

Business Committee's Report.

Mr. Bishop: I beg to bring up the report of the Business Committee and move its adoption. There is an error in the report of the business transacted at the last meeting of the committee. It states that there is only one sub-committee to be formed, whereas the committee recommended that two sub-committees should be set up from the two main committees, the second one to deal with economics and finance. That should be noted.

To-day's report is as follows: It is recommended—

- (1) That the Conference adjourn to-morrow evening and resume on Wednesday, 18th April, at 10 a.m.
- (2) That the whole of the proceedings of the Conference be printed on the conclusion of the present sitting, and copies made available for all delegates on resumption.
- (3) If the papers have all been dealt with before the adjournment to-morrow evening the committees shall commence their work on the 18th without a further meeting of the general Conference. If the papers are not concluded to-morrow the consideration of the remaining papers to be taken in general Conference on the 18th.