The status of Contractors in relation to the Agreement.

The Union filed a request that the Board of Arbitration consider the status of contractors with especial reference to the application of the principle of the preferential shop. At a previous informal conference it was stated by Mr. Hillman that in the New York market all conditions which apply to firms of manufacturers apply to contractors. It was maintained by the Union that the contractor was in several respects been asked for its co-operation as regards the work done by contractors. The Union has for the most part been dealing not with the contractors directly but through the labor managers or the firms. It appeared on inquiry by the Board that as regards hours and wages the conditions in shops managed by contractors are, so far as definitely known, the same as in the shops directly controlled by manufacturers. The forty-four hour week was put into effect and an adjustment made as the result of a survey by manufacturers. As regards discipline, it appeared that one case had been before the Trade Board but the Trade Board held that in this case the contractor was virtually an agent or foreman for the manufacturer rather than an entirely independent party, inasmuch as the manufacturer furnished the space and equipment.

It was stated by Mr. Abt that there were several types of contractors. One type has close if not exclusive relations with a particular firm, whereas another type may do work occasionally for various firms and indeed for some firms not having agreements with the Union. In his opinion, employers as far as possible have tried to get contractors to observe the regulations governing the industry under the Agreement.

Notice was taken of the fact that in the decision of this Board December 22 it was provided on the request of both labor managers and the Union that the award then made should apply to both the manufacturers and their contractors.

The Union felt that there were very serious possibilities of friction and disturbance if there is not co-operation between the union and the employers in this matter. If, for example, a firm should send out certain work to a non-union shop of a contractor and if something in that shop should lead to a strike being called—the Union being perhaps in ignorance that the given contractor was doing work for some firm with whom it has an Agreement—it would be extremely difficult to prevent trouble in the shop of the firm. Union members would not wish to work upon garments going to or coming from a contractor's shop in which a strike had been called. In a recent case a contractor who had been doing work for one of the firms under the Agreements had resisted efforts to organize the shop. This the Union believes to be contrary to the spirit of the Agreements and likely to lead to trouble.

It was evident that there were many possibilities of serious friction if the Union and the firms should stand respectively on their extreme rights instead of attempting to co-operate. By common agreement
To start funding, let's determine the amount of funds that are needed for the project. This includes: 

- [List of expenses]

Once we have the total amount needed, we can start looking for potential investors or grants. A common way to do this is through networking events or by submitting proposals to relevant organizations. 

In conclusion, securing funding is a crucial step in bringing our project to life. With careful planning and perseverance, we can achieve our goals and make a positive impact.
it was decided that a committee containing representatives of the labor
managers and of the Union should endeavor to work out a plan covering
the status of contractors and the best method of dealing with the whole
situation.

JAMES H. TUFTS,
Chairman.
To the president of the committee on the safety of the lives of the workmen of the Union Broth Gang, of the item now in dispute, and the matter of hearing and the mode of settling the dispute of the committee and the board of management with the works.

S"
RIGHT OF THE COMPANY TO EMPLOY CONTRACTORS.

The Union has given notice to the company it intends to file a case before the Board of Arbitration claiming a violation of the agreement. The union believes that the company violated the agreement by engaging contractors to employ colored help. They also claim that the company violated the agreement in not giving notice to the union of contractors engaged.

The company welcomes a hearing on this subject by the Board of Arbitration. Any accusations of breaches of the agreement on either side should not be delayed or allowed to lapse, but should be definitely settled. The more cases which can be settled definitely and finally, the fewer occasions there will be for differences of opinion.

When the question of engaging contractors first arose on account of the inability of the manufacturing department to produce machinery in our own plants, the labor department was asked for an opinion. Careful scrutiny of the agreement failed to find in the agreement and in the decisions of the Trade Board or Board of Arbitration any limitation on the company in its right to engage contractors. The labor department have always maintained the general principle that the company had complete liberty to act until it gave up that liberty by voluntary agreement or by decisions of the Boards interpreting the agreements. The Board of Arbitration has never given any order nor rule deciding questions as to the restrictions of the management. The labor department maintains that this is the fundamental in our agreement.

The question also arose as to whether there was any restriction upon the company in engaging contractors employing colored as well as white help. Inasmuch as there was no restriction upon the employment of contractors in general, the labor department could see no reason why any particular class of contractors should be excluded, and so advised the company.

As to the obligation of the company to notify the union of contractors engaged, the labor department could find no regulation or order in the agreement or in the decisions requiring the company to do this. It is a matter of fact the union was aware the company was employing contractors wherever they could get work done the same as other manufacturers in this city, and yet no claim of this sort was ever made before. The labor department cannot see why an obligation should not be applicable to contractors employing white persons should exist as to contractors employing colored.

H. D. HODGARD.
The status of Contractors in relation to the Agreement.

The Union filed a request that the Board of Arbitration consider the status of contractors with especial reference to the application of the principle of the preferential shop. At a previous informal conference it was stated by Mr. Hillman that in the New York market all conditions which apply to firms of manufacturers apply to contractors. It was maintained by the Union that in Chicago the Union has in several respects been asked for its co-operation as regards the work done by contractors. The Union has for the most part been dealing not with the contractors directly but through the labor managers or the firms. It appeared on inquiry by the Board that as regards hours and wages the conditions in shops managed by contractors are, so far as definitely known, the same as in the shops directly controlled by manufacturers. The forty-four hour week was put into effect and an adjustment made as the result of a survey by manufacturers. As regards discipline, it appeared that one case had been before the Trade Board but the Trade Board held that in this case the contractor was virtually an agent or foreman for the manufacturer rather than an entirely independent party, inasmuch as the manufacturer furnished the space and equipment.

It was stated by Mr. Abt that there were several types of contractors. One type has done if not exclusive relations with a particular firm, whereas another type may do work occasionally for various firms and indeed for some firms not having agreements with the Union. In his opinion, employers so far as possible have aimed to get contractors to observe the regulations governing the industry under the Agreement.

Notice was taken of the fact that in the decision of this Board December 22 it was provided on the request of both labor managers and the Union that the award then made should apply to both the manufacturers and their contractors.

The Union felt that there were very serious possibilities of friction and disturbance if there is not co-operation between the union and the employers in this matter. If, for example, a firm should send out certain work to a non-union shop of a contractor and if something in that shop should lead to a strike being called—the Union being perhaps in ignorance that the given contractor was doing work for some firm with whom it has an Agreement—it would be extremely difficult to prevent trouble in the shop of the firm. Union members would not wish to work upon garments going to or coming from a contractor's shop in which a strike had been called. In a recent case a contractor who had been doing work for one of the firms under the Agreements had resisted efforts to organize the shop. This the Union believes to be contrary to the spirit of the Agreements and likely to lead to trouble.

It was evident that there were many possibilities of serious friction if the Union and the firms should stand respectively on their extreme rights instead of attempting to co-operate. By common agreement
The purpose of the present letter is to bring to the attention of the American public the facts and figures that are of vital importance in the present crisis. The situation is one of grave danger to the nation and to all who are affected by it. The Union, in its efforts to organize and unify the industry, has made many sacrifices and has done much to promote the interests of the workers. However, the efforts of the Union have been met with opposition from some quarters. The Union has been criticized for its methods and its leaders have been accused of various charges. These charges have been denied by the Union and have been proved to be baseless. The Union has been forced to take strong measures to protect its members and to maintain its organization. The Union has been successful in its endeavors and has achieved many important gains. It is hoped that the present crisis will be resolved through peaceful means and that the Union will be able to continue its work in the interests of the workers and the nation.
it was decided that a committee containing representatives of the labor managers and of the Union should endeavor to work out a plan covering the status of contractors and the best method of dealing with the whole situation.

JAMES H. TUFTS,

Chairman.
It was decided that a committee consisting of representatives of the Ipara should be assigned to work out a plan concerning the future policy and the future organization of the state of the Ipara and the best way to conduct with the people.

JAMES H. Tuite

Continued...
The status of Contractors in relation to the Agreement.

The Union filed a request that the Board of Arbitration consider the status of contractors with especial reference to the application of the principle of the preferential shop. At a previous informal conference it was stated by Mr. Hillman that in the New York market all conditions which apply to firms of manufacturers apply to contractors. It was maintained by the Union that in Chicago the Union has in several respects been asked for its co-operation as regards the work done by contractors. The Union has for the most part been dealing not with the contractors directly but through the labor managers of the firms. It appeared on inquiry by the Board that as regards hours and wages the conditions in shops managed by contractors are; so far as definitely known, the same as in the shops directly controlled by manufacturers. The forty-four hour week was put into effect and an adjustment made as the result of a survey by manufacturers. As regards discipline, it appeared that one case had been before the Trade Board but the Trade Board held that in this case the contractor was virtually an agent or foreman for the manufacturer rather than an entirely independent party, inasmuch as the manufacturer furnished the space and equipment.

It was stated by Mr. Abt that there were several types of contractors. One type has close if not exclusive relations with a particular firm, whereas another type may do work occasionally for various firms and indeed for some firms not having agreements with the Union. In his opinion, employers so far as possible have aimed to get contractors to observe the regulations governing the industry under the Agreement.

Notice was taken of the fact that in the decision of this Board December 28 it was provided on the request of both labor managers and the Union that the award then made should apply to both the manufacturers and their contractors.

The Union felt that there were very serious possibilities of friction and disturbance if there is not co-operation between the union and the employers in this matter. If, for example, a firm should send out certain work to a non-union shop of a contractor and if something in that shop should lead to a strike being called—the Union being perhaps in ignorance that the given contractor was doing work for some firm with whom it has an Agreement—it would be extremely difficult to prevent trouble in the shop of the firm. Union members would not wish to work upon garments going to or coming from a contractor's shop in which a strike had been called. In a recent case a contractor who had been doing work for one of the firms under the Agreements had resisted efforts to organize the shop. This the Union believes to be contrary to the spirit of the Agreements and likely to lead to trouble.

It was evident that there were many possibilities of serious friction if the Union and the firms should stand respectively on their extreme rights instead of attempting to co-operate. By common agreement
The nature of a concise account of the history of the American copper industry is limited by the scope of the inquiry and the facts available. The history of the American copper industry is a story of the rise and fall of many great companies, and the development of new methods of production. The United States, which was the first to exploit the copper resources of the western states, became one of the leading copper-producing countries of the world. However, the industry faced many challenges, including the depletion of the copper reserves and the increased competition from abroad.

In recent years, the copper industry has undergone significant changes. The use of copper in various industries has increased, leading to a rise in copper prices. The industry has also faced challenges from environmental regulations and the need to find sustainable sources of copper. Despite these challenges, the copper industry remains an important part of the global economy.
it was decided that a committee containing representatives of the labor
managers and of the Union should endeavor to work out a plan covering
the status of contractors and the best method of dealing with the whole
situation.

JAMES H. TUFTS,
Chairman.
The status of Contractors in relation to the Agreement.

The Union filed a request that the Board of Arbitration consider the status of contractors with especial reference to the application of the principle of the preferential shop. At a previous informal conference it was stated by Mr. Hillman that in the New York market conditions which apply to firms of manufacturers apply to contractors. It was maintained by the Union that in Chicago the Union has in several respects been asked for its co-operation as regards the work done by contractors. The Union has for the most part been dealing not with the contractors directly but through the labor managers of the firms. It appeared on inquiry by the Board that as regards hours and wages the conditions in shops managed by contractors are as far as definitely known, the same as in the shops directly controlled by manufacturers. The forty-four hour week was put into effect and adjustment made as the result of a survey by manufacturers. As regards discipline, it appeared that one case had been before the Trade Board but the Trade Board held that in this case the contractor was virtually an agent or foreman for the manufacturer rather than an entirely independent party, inasmuch as the manufacturer furnished the space and equipment.

It was stated by Mr. Abt that there were several types of contractors. One type has close if not exclusive relations with a particular firm, whereas another type may do work occasionally for various firms and indeed for some firms not having agreements with the union. In his opinion, employers so far as possible have aimed to get contractors to observe the regulations governing the industry under the Agreement.

Notice was taken of the fact that in the decision of this Board November 22 it was provided on the request of both labor and management that the award then made should apply to both the manufacturers and their contractors.

The Union felt that there were serious possibilities of friction and disturbance if there is not co-operation between the union and the employers in this matter. If, for example, a firm should send out certain work to a non-union shop of a contractor and if something in that shop should lead to a strike being called—the Union being perhaps ignorant that the given contractor was doing work for some firm with whom it has an Agreement—it would be extremely difficult to prevent trouble in the shop of the firm. Union members would not wish to work on garments going to or coming from a contractor's shop in which a strike had been called. In a recent case a contractor who had been doing work for one of the firms under the Agreements had resisted efforts to organize the shop. This the Union believes to be contrary to the spirit of the Agreements and likely to lead to trouble.

It was evident that there were many possibilities of serious fiction if the Union and the firms should stand respectively on their extreme rights instead of attempting to co-operate. By common agreement
The estimate of contingency in relation to the Agreement.

The Union feels a regret that the Board of Appointment cannot take into consideration a matter of importance in its relation to the Metropolitan Association of Retail Drapers. At a meeting of the Association held in New York recently it was stated by the President that the Metropolitan Market, which was the subject of the meeting, was in a state of depression due to the lack of supplies to meet the demand. The Union feels that this situation demands immediate attention and that the Board of Appointment should take steps to prevent a recurrence of similar conditions in the future.

The Union appreciates the efforts of the Board in this regard, but feels that more vigorous action is necessary to ensure the stability of the market. It is, therefore, of the opinion that the Board of Appointment should take steps to prevent a recurrence of similar conditions in the future.

The Union feels that the Board of Appointment should take steps to prevent a recurrence of similar conditions in the future. It is, therefore, of the opinion that the Board of Appointment should take steps to prevent a recurrence of similar conditions in the future.
On method of discipline to be employed in the case of shop chairman. Appeal from decision of the Trade Board, Case No. 46.

An appeal was taken from the decision of the Trade Board in this case not with a view to the particular case, which the Union does not care to have reviewed, but with regard to the method of procedure. It was suggested by the Trade Board in previous decisions Case No. 20, that although the full right of discipline and discharge remains with the employer according to our Chicago Agreements, it may nevertheless be advisable to proceed by a different method, either by taking up the matter through the labor manager with the deputy of the Union, or by bringing charges against the shop chairman before the Trade Board, instead of exercising the right of summary suspension and discharge upon the spot and leaving it to the Union if it pleases to ask for re-instatement.

The Board of Arbitration sustains the Trade Board in its decision that the employer has the right to proceed directly in the matter if he wishes to exercise his strict privilege under the Agreement. As stated by the chairman of the Trade Board in Case 20, the change in practice which now obtains under the Hart Schaffner & Marx Agreement was introduced by a voluntary agreement of the two parties and was announced by the Board of Arbitration as a better method of giving dignity to the officials of the Union and thereby enabling it to perform its function of maintaining order and peace in the industry.

The experience thus far under the arrangements at Hart Schaffner & Marx has been on the whole satisfactory. The Board believes that every step which can be taken in the direction of substituting a deliberate, orderly, and calm method of procedure before an impartial tribunal for direct personal action is of decided educational value. The Board further believes that the only way in which the purposes of the Agreement can be secured is by the co-operation of the Union officials, who in turn must be able to command the respect of all members of the Union. One way toward giving these officials increased respect is by granting them a different status as regards discipline. This is intended to make them less, but more responsible. It is intended to teach them the importance of the impartial machinery, and to make them less disposed to hasty or undignified action, or to disrespect for officials or for the impartial machinery.

The Board therefore strongly urges upon all labor managers that in the case of discipline which involve shop chairmen, they shall proceed by filing charges before the Trade Board rather than by summary action. In many cases of course the best method will be to proceed by bringing the matter first of all to the attention of the Union deputy.

JAMES H. TUFTS,
Chairman.
MEM'S CLOTHING INDUSTRY, CHICAGO

Hand of Affidavit

February 6, 1930

The undersigned woman is employed to be employed by the Union as a dressmaker. She has been employed under the control of the Union for the last ten years. She has received all the benefits afforded by the Union to its members. She is aware of the rights and privileges of the Union. She is willing to work for the Union at a reasonable wage.

The Board of Arbitration has determined the amount of wages for the dressmaker. The wages are as follows:

[Details of wages and benefits]

The undersigned affirms that she is entitled to the benefits of the Union.

SIGNED

[Signature]

[Reference]