

RETURN SHOWING CASES DEALT WITH UNDER THE INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT, ETC.—*continued.*

Industries affected.	Industrial District.	Industries affected.	Industrial District.
<i>Awards—continued.</i>		<i>Awards—continued.</i>	
Cheese-factory managers	Otago and Southland.	Plumbers and gasfitters	Otago and Southland.
Coal-miners (Nightcaps)	Ditto.	Quarry-workers (Dunedin)	Ditto.
Coal-miners (Waronui)	"	Retail soft-goods trade employees (Dunedin and suburbs)	"
Coal-yards employees (Dunedin)	"	Saddlers, harnessmakers, and collarmakers	"
Drainers (licensed), (Dunedin and suburban)	"	Stonemasons (Otago)	"
Drivers (Gore and Mataura)	"	Storemen (wool and grain, &c., merchants'), (Southland)	"
Drivers (Invercargill)	"	Tailoresses and skirtmakers (shop)	"
Electrical workers (Dunedin)	"	Tailors (shop)	"
Farriers (Dunedin)	"	Tramways (Invercargill)	"
Fellmongery and tannery employees (Southland)	"	Trawlers	"
Flour-mill employees	"	<i>Rulings by Commissioner of Conciliation re Wages, Hours, and other Conditions of Labour.</i>	
Gold-miners (Lawrence)	"	Fishermen (trawler "Beatrice")	Wellington.
Labourers (builders and contractors'), (Dunedin)	"	Fishermen (trawlers "Nora Niven" and "Countess")	"
Labourers (local bodies'), (Dunedin)	"		
Metal-workers' assistants	"		
Musicians (Invercargill and Oamaru)	"		

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

Trade.	District.	Particulars.
Drivers (motor-vehicle) and livery-stable hands	Canterbury ..	Whilst these disputes were under consideration of the Court it was reported in the newspapers that the members of the union had decided to engage in a strike and had carried this decision into effect. The Court caused inquiries to be made, and the report was substantiated. The Court held it was clear that the union had been guilty of a breach of section 6 of the Amendment Act, 1908, by instigating a strike, and was liable under the Act to have its registration suspended for two years. Under these circumstances, the Court refused to make any award, and the applications were dismissed.
Slaughtermen	Wellington ..	In this case the applicant union had cited eight respondents (employers) for the purpose of obtaining an award. It was proved that five of these respondents were working under industrial agreements (relating to the conditions of employment of their slaughtermen) made with other slaughtermen's unions duly registered under the Act, and that the remaining three were about to enter or were in process of entering into similar agreements with the respective unions of their employees. The Court, in these circumstances, decided not to interfere by making an award as an award in the case of those respondents already bound by industrial agreements would be useless, whilst in the case of those not already bound, the Court considered that an opportunity of completing the proposed agreements should be given. The application was accordingly dismissed. It might be mentioned that the applicant union had a short time previously cancelled its registration under the Act for the purpose of enabling it to take part in a strike without being subject to the penalties imposed by the Act upon registered unions.
Tailoresses (Hawke's Bay)	Wellington ..	This was an application of an employer for a new award, the period of the currency of the award then in force to which he was a party having run out. The award now applied for was to be on the same terms as the old award with the omission therefrom of a provision to the effect that the employer's registered workroom in which bespoke work is to be done must be within the district covered by the award. The Court held that it would not be proper for an award to be made unless the other employers covered by the old award were cited as parties. It expressed the opinion that the question whether an employer's registered workroom was to be within or without the territory covered by an award did not come within the definition of "industrial matters" as contained in the Act, and that therefore the Court had no jurisdiction to deal with it. The Court held that the award ought to be read as if the words "within the district covered by this award" had been struck out (its attention not having been drawn to the provision when the award was made, and the parties having previously agreed on the terms of the award). The Court therefore gave authority that the award may be read accordingly.