(2100.) NEW ZEALAND FEDERATED TAILORESSES. — ADDING PARTIES TO AWARD.

In the Court of Arbitration of New Zealand, Northern Industrial District.—In the matter of "The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1908," and its amendment; and in the matter of an award made on the 1st day of March, 1910, in an industrial dispute between the New Zealand Federated Tailoresses and other Clothing Trade Employees' Industrial Association of Workers and the New Zealand Clothing-manufacturers' Association and other employers.

TUESDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF APRIL, 1910.

UPON the application of the above-named union of workers, and upon hearing the parties, and with their consent, the Court doth hereby order that the following persons, firms, and companies be and they are hereby added as parties to the said award as from the date hereof:—

Claxton, F. H., Pollen Street, Thames.
Clark, A., and Son, Williamson Street, Grey Lynn, Auckland.
Davies, G., Albert Street, Auckland.
Greer, Mrs. A., Douglas Street, Ponsonby, Auckland.
Jordan Bros., H. N. and J. B., Alexandra Street, Auckland.
King, F. M., Albert Street, Auckland.
Meek, W. S., Dunderland Street, Newton, Auckland.
Macky, Logan, and Caldwell (Limited), Brown Street, Ponsonby, Auckland.
Seabrooke, H. H., Grafton Road, Auckland.

—— W. A. SIM, Judge.

MEMORANDUM.

The above-named employers were added as parties to the award by consent. The only question on the application was whether the award should be treated as applying to shirtmaking.

It appears that when the dispute was before the Council of Conciliation the Commissioner struck out as parties all employers who were engaged in shirtmaking only. The consideration of the dispute was then proceeded with, and an agreement was made between the union and the employers who were left as parties to the dispute. That agreement was embodied in the award in question.

The Court is of opinion that in these circumstances the award should not be treated as applying to shirtmaking. It is true that the union did not consent to shirtmakers being struck out as parties, but it did not take any steps to have the order made by the Commissioner reviewed by this Court, and to that extent acquiesced in the order. To make shirtmakers parties to the award now would be to bind them by the terms of an agreement in the making of which they had no part. The award should therefore be construed as not applying to shirtmaking except to the extent to which it is mentioned in clause 3 (*b*) of the award.

W. A. SIM, Judge.