

**NEW ZEALAND PRINTING INDUSTRY—APPEAL AGAINST DECISION OF  
APPRENTICESHIP COMMITTEE**

In the Court of Arbitration of New Zealand, Canterbury Industrial District—In the matter of the Apprentices Act 1948; and in the matter of the New Zealand Printing Industry Apprenticeship Order, dated the 14th day of August 1967, and recorded in 67 Book of Awards 1633; and in the matter of an appeal by the Roneo Printing Works Ltd, 196 St. Asaph Street, Christchurch, from a decision of the Canterbury and Westland Printing Industry Apprenticeship Committee.

**JUDGMENT OF THE COURT DELIVERED BY THOMSON, J.**

By a majority decision the Canterbury and Westland Printing Industry Apprenticeship Committee declined consent to an application by Roneo Printing Works Ltd. to enter into a contract of apprenticeship on the grounds that the Committee was not satisfied that the employer had the facilities for properly training an apprentice within the meaning of clause 4 (b) of the apprenticeship order.

The question in this case was whether or not an apprentice could adequately be taught commercial hand typography by the appellant, a firm which has so far not had an apprentice. The actual training of the apprentice would be done by a Mr Wilson who it is agreed is a competent tradesman and a suitable person to train an apprentice. It was agreed that the standard of work done by the firm was good. The criticism of the worker representatives on the Apprenticeship Committee was based primarily on inadequacy in book work. A good deal of emphasis was in the first instance laid on the fact that the appellant would not be able

1931

to teach the boy 32-page imposition, but this receded in importance and the criticism was generally that the training in imposition work would not be adequate, and there was also some comment on the fact that the equipment was insufficient to teach a full range of work.

The Court inspected the premises; they appeared comparable with the general run of such premises used by a smallish business. The Court appreciates and values the great efforts which are being made in this trade both by employers and workers to train apprentices and maintain the standards of craftsmanship in the trade. Ideally it may be that an apprentice should learn his trade in a rather larger business than this (though size itself has its dangers) but the Court has no doubt that given good will on both sides, which is necessary in any event, the boy will be taught his trade properly in this business.

The appeal is allowed.

Dated this 23rd day of October 1968.

[L.S.]

J. B. THOMSON, Judge.