

WELLINGTON INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT.

(10497.) WELLINGTON INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT TAILORS.—DECISION OF DISPUTES COMMITTEE.

Industrial Dispute, Wellington Industrial District.—In the matter of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1925, and its amendments; and in the matter of an application made by the Wellington Tailors' Industrial Union of Workers (hereinafter called "the union") for an interpretation of the Wellington Industrial District Tailors' award, dated the 19th day of September, 1932, Book of Awards, Volume XXXII, page 146.

UNDER the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1925, and its amendments, and in the matter of an industrial dispute to be settled

under clause 7 of the award of the Court of Arbitration, dated the 19th day of September, 1932 (Book of Awards, Vol. XXXII, p. 146), the following questions were asked :—

1. If an employer does not take full advantage of the preamble of clause (a) in the Schedule marked A—Piecework Statement, must he pay the full rate of 31s. 6d. per sac coat ?

2. What rate must an employer pay for the manufacturing of a sac coat in accordance with Schedule A—Piecework Statement, if he does not take full advantage of the preamble marked (b) for sac coats ?

3. If the bottom of a sac coat is felled and not bagged, does it come under the preamble of (a) Schedule A—Piecework Statement ?

4. Should an employer pay extra for all additional work done in the manufacture of a coat but not mentioned in the preamble (a) under Schedule A—Piecework Statement ? Suggested extras may include haircloth, wadding, puffs in scye.

The Committee appointed in accordance with section 7 of the award was as follows : C. Redman and E. B. Newton, representing the union ; and H. Gotlieb and G. Krebs, representing the employers ; and E. W. F. Gohns, Conciliation Commissioner, was unanimously elected as Chairman of the Disputes Committee.

The Disputes Committee met at Wellington on the 21st June, 1933, in the Department of Labour office, when the before-mentioned questions were fully considered, and the following decisions arrived at :—

Question 1. That if an employer does not take full advantage of the preamble (a) as set out in the Schedule A—Piecework Statement, by omitting any of the items mentioned therein, a sac coat must be paid for at the rate of 31s. 6d. per coat.

Question 2. If a sac coat is manufactured other than under (b) of Schedule A—Piecework Statement, it is to be paid for in accordance with (a) of Schedule A—Piecework Statement—viz., 31s. 6d.

Question 3. If the bottom of a sac coat is felled, then it does not comply with (b) of Schedule A—Piecework Statement, and must be paid for at the rate of 31s. 6d. as provided for in (a).

Question 4. It was unanimously agreed that one set of puffs in scye, two plies of wadding, and the making of a hanger be included in the preamble (a) of Schedule A—Piecework Statement, or as the case may be in (b) of the same schedule, and that these be not considered extras to either preamble. Should any additional wadding be added to the coat after the second fit-on, the same shall be considered an extra, and paid for in accordance with preamble (m) of Schedule A—Piecework Statement.

In respect of the foregoing answers, the committee were unanimous in their decision, but the other question contained in question 4, *re* haircloth, was left to the Commissioner to deal with.

At the sitting of the Committee the representatives of the union contended that haircloth was an extra, and should be paid for in

accordance with subclause (m) of Schedule A—Piecework Statement. It was stated that it had been a custom for many years to include haircloth as an extra, and that that had been provided for as an extra in previous awards. The representatives of the employers argued that when the award was framed it was intended to depart from the old custom of providing a full piecework time statement, and to introduce a piecework statement in a modified and simple form, that the preamble (a) in Schedule A—Piecework Statement was intended to cover coats made in accordance with the Board of Trade Regulations, and to fix a definite price for such garment.

I have given very careful consideration to the statements of the parties and the framing of Schedule A—Piecework Statement, in conjunction with the Board of Trade Regulations—Control of the Tailoring Trade, Sale of Garments made to Measure ; and gazetted on the 12th day of February, 1925.

In respect to the question of haircloth in coats it will be noted that the schedule in accordance with the regulations provides the minimum amount of work to be performed by hand in a tailor-made garment, and the special conditions for the making thereof are separately set out under various headings. For instance, coats and overcoats, minimum handwork. It will be noticed, *inter alia*, that all canvases and lapels are to be padded. Now, a canvas could not be padded without some other material was attached thereto, and if the employer desired either to have padded to the canvases extra canvas, haircloth, or other material, then I am of the opinion that the same is to be included in the said price, 3ls. 6d. per coat, as provided for in the preamble (a) of Schedule A—Piecework Statement, in the award.

Dated at Wanganui, this 29th day of June, 1933.

E. W. F. GOHNS,
Conciliation Commissioner.