Return showing Cases dealt with under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, etc.—continued.

Industries affected.	Industrial District.	Industries affected.	Industrial District.
Awards—continued.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Awards—continued.	
Brickworkers (Tyneside) Ironworkers (Greymouth)		Coal-miners (New Zealand Coal and Oi Company (Limited), Kaitangata)	
Typographers Wharf labourers (Greymouth)	i i	Drivers (Dunedin)	
Bakers and pastrycooks	A	Engine-drivers (traction and stationary)	,,
Boot trade operatives (male)	, ,,	Gold-miners (dredgemen)	"
Boot trade operatives (female) . Coachbuilders	**	Grocers' assistants and drivers (Dunedin)	
Drivers (Christchurch)	**	Hairdressers' assistants (Dunedin)	**
Engine-drivers (traction and stationary).	. ",	Iron and brass moulders	**
Furniture trade	. ,,	Painters (Dunedin) Painters (Southland)	**
Hotel workers (Timaru and Washdyke).	. ,, `	Paper-mill workers (Mataura)	
Iron and brass moulders	• ,,	Plasterers (Dunedin)	"
Musicians (Christchurch)		Plumbers and gasfitters (Southland)	**
Printers' machinists		Printers' machinists	,,
Tailoresses, machinists, cutters, and		Storemen (Invercargill wholesale mer-	
pressers (in factories) Tailors and tailoresses (in shops)		chants) Tailoresses, machinists, cutters, and	
Timber-yards and sawmills employees		pressers (in factories)	
(South Canterbury)		Timber-yards and sawmills employees	
Typographers	· ,,	(Otago)	
Woollen-mills employees		Woollen-mills employees (Otago)	"
Bakers and pastrycooks	Otago and Southland.	··· outon mans simployees (outgo)	,,
Boot trade operatives (male)	Ditto.	Ruling by Commissioner of Conciliation re and other Conditions of Labo	
Boot trade operatives (female) Coachworkers and wheelwrights	**	Fishermen (trawler "Phantom")	Wellington.
COMOTH OF ROLD WITH A TROUBLESS	• •,	The state of the s	,, отт. 6 году.

APPLICATIONS FOR AWARDS HEARD BY THE COURT IN WHICH NO AWARD WAS MADE.

Trade.	District.	Particulars.
Bakers and pastrycooks	Wellington	In this case the workers' association applied to the Court for directions in regard to the procedure to be followed in order to obtain a Dominion award under the provisions of section 4 of the 1911 amendment to the Act. The Court advised the association to abandon its attempt to obtain an award under the provisions of section 4. The procedure appeared to the Court to be so complicated and confused
		that months would probably have elapsed before the hearing could be reached. The Court recommended the association to have pro- ceedings taken by the local unions in the industrial districts con- cerned, for the purpose of obtaining local awards in the usual way.
		and then, as there appeared to be no objection to having the whole case heard in one centre, the hearing of all the local disputes could take place in Wellington. The Court would then be able to make uniform awards for the industrial districts concerned, which would.
		in effect, be a Dominion award. (The Court's recommendation was carried out, and awards have since been obtained as suggested above.)
Brewery and Maltsters' employees	Canterbury	What purports to be an agreement arrived at between the workers' union and the employers had been forwarded to the Court, with a request that the provisions of it should be embodied in an award. It, appeared, however, that no steps had been taken to have the dispute heard before a council of conciliation, and the Court therefore held that it had no jurisdiction to embody the
Waterside workers	Northern (Auckland)	alleged agreement in an award. In this case four employers were the applicants. An application for cancellation of its registration as an industrial union had been made by the workers' union, and it was postponed by the Registrar by reason of the supposed pendency of the conciliation proceedings. It appeared, however, from the proceedings in the hearing of the dispute that while the dispute was filed by the employers before the filing of the application for cancellation the commencement of proceedings under section 73 of the 1908 Amendment, deemed to
		be when the assessors for the hearing of the dispute are appointed, was subsequent to the filing of the application for cancellation. The Court had jurisdiction therefore to made an award, but refused to do so, on the ground that the union had legally been entitled to cancellation, and for the reason that the evidence showed that the union and the employers employing 90 per cent. of the labour affected by the dispute were opposed to the making of an award.
Waterside workers	Northern (Gis- borne)	An application made under section 3 of the 1911 amendment to the Act, to declare an industrial agreement an award, was refused on the grounds (a) that the term for which the agreement had been made was in excess of the limit allowed by the Act—i.e., three years from the date of making of agreement; and (b) that the evidence did not prove that the agreement was binding on employers who
		employed a majority of the workers in the industry to which it related in the industrial district in which it was made. The Court further expressed an opinion that it would be useless to make any further application under the section in question until it had been put into an intelligible shape.