Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Gold and a committee of two from the shop. The Clothing Trade Association represented by Mr. Wheaton and Mr. Frunau of the firm.

A request was made by the Amalgamated for a change in the work system from piece to week work. The reason for this request lay in the desire of the representatives of the Amalgamated to effect a greater control over the workers in this shop and eliminate the factors which have been productive of considerable friction and unrest. The firm, it was claimed, has a working force of some 400 people of whom only about 30 are on piece work and these are distributed throughout the several sections and operations. This condition, it was asserted, was productive of irritation among the workers.

The small proportion of piece workers, it was contended, while creating difficulty for the firm was also directly responsible for breaking down the morale of the men in this particular shop. The contention of the representatives of the Amalgamated was that if the organization is to cooperate adequately with the firm, for the stabilization of production it must secure greater control and to accomplish this it was necessary in this shop to secure a change from piece to week work on the part of these few workers.

The contention of the Clothing Trade Association was that the proposal of the representatives of the Amalgamated would not guarantee the stabilization of production. The firm, it was contended, had suffered materially in the matter of production and the situation was now serious and critical. Under the agreement the
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DECISION IN CASE OF FRUHAUF BROS. (Continued - 2)

January 8th, 1930.

The firm, represented in the Clothing Trade Association, had a right to the maintenance of the status quo and this included the piece work system. It was argued that a change in system would mean a loss in production.

The case was complicated by the fact that the firm, during the month of October 1919, had entered into a special agreement with representatives of the Amalgamated whereby a change from piece to week work was effected by voluntary action. This October arrangement was a material factor in creating the unrest and disaffection among the workers with the consequent results to the manufacturer.

With the object of obtaining a basis of operation in this shop, the Chairman granted the request of the Amalgamated for a change in the system of work from piece to week work; the mutual agreement whereby representatives of both parties shall work out an arrangement to protect production is to be carried into effect simultaneously.

2. The decision is not to be taken as a precedent.

3. The change in the system of work is to apply only to the workers within the shop not to the "outside" finishers.

[Signature]

Associate Chairman.
We tested for concentration of the test group and the test individual for the test period. As we moved on to the next group, we found that the concentration was different for each group. The concentration of the test group and the test individual for the test period was lower than expected. The test group was allocated to the experimental section. The control group was allocated to the control section. The experimental group was allocated to the experimental section. The control group was allocated to the control section. With the objective of obtaining a state of observation in this experiment, we examined the results of the test group and the test individual for the test period. The concentration of the test group and the test individual for the test period was lower than expected. The control group was allocated to the experimental section. To obtain concentration of the test group and the test individual for the test period, we examined the results of the test group and the test individual for the test period. The concentration of the control group was lower than expected. The test group was allocated to the experimental section. The control group was allocated to the control section. The test group was allocated to the control section. The control group was allocated to the experimental section. To obtain concentration of the test group and the test individual for the test period, we examined the results of the test group and the test individual for the test period. The concentration of the control group was lower than expected. The test group was allocated to the experimental section. The test group was allocated to the control section. The control group was allocated to the experimental section.
101. DECISION IN CASE OF A. HOCHEM & CO.

January 13, 1920.

Complaint by the Association represented by Messrs. Greer and MoJoint and a committee. The Amalgamated represented by Mr. Weinstein and a committee from the shop.

The complaint in substance is that the decision in the case No. 90 issued on December 7, 1919, has not been complied with. At the date of the former hearing, the Chairman ruled that sufficient evidence was presented to show that the worker was not giving satisfactory production and the worker was ordered to attain and maintain a fair production. The representative of the Amalgamated, by agreement, was held responsible for better results. Since the decision was rendered on December 7th a slight improvement in production is noticeable but the results are still unsatisfactory.

The Chairman ruled that the worker should be retained by the firm. The Amalgamated is instructed to see to it that a production, at least equal to what is being given in shops doing similar work, is attained. If this result is not secured by the end of the first week after the ruling is in the hands of both parties, the Labor Manager of the Clothing Manufacturers' Industrial Exchange of New York is given complete authority to discharge the worker.

David C. Ade

Associate Chairman.
COMPLAINT OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH.
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DECISION IN CASE OF GOLDSTEIN-SENS & SIEGEL, INC.

January 14, 1930.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Senter and a committee from the shop. Manufacturers' Association represented by Mr. Greef and Messrs. Sens and Goldstein of the firm.

The complaint of the Amalgamated in substance is that the above firm laid off the cutters for three days during weeks ending December 37th and January 3rd respectively. Objection was taken to this method of dividing the time. It was claimed that the firm simply used this method in order to avoid paying wages for Christmas and New Year's day. The firm, it was claimed, had paid for holidays since July 4, 1919, and had also promised the men that work would be provided 52 weeks in the year.

The contention of the Manufacturers' Association was that the firm had not made a practice of paying for holidays but that since July 4th they had been giving consideration to the question of payment for holidays - each holiday being a separate issue. It was further claimed that a division of time had been established in the shop in order to facilitate the taking of an inventory.

The Chairman ruled:

1. That the firm's decision with reference to the division of time is justified.

2. In view of the fact that the question of payment for holidays is a market issue, the Chairman decided to withhold the ruling on this individual case and to deal with the principle of payment for holidays in a general market ruling.

[Signature]
Associate Chairman.
THE DECISION IN CASE OF C. & O. RAILWAY, & C. R.

January 15, 1890


The complaint of the American Express Company, by its attorneys, and the response thereto, have been considered by the court.

The court finds that the American Express Company is entitled to recover the sum of $1,200, together with costs and disbursements. The parties are directed to prepare the proper order.
DECISION IN CASE OF GOLDSTEIN-SENS & SIEGEL, INC.

January 14, 1920.

Complaint by the Association represented by Mr. Groef and Messrs. Sens and Siegel of the firm. Amalgamated represented by Mr. Senter and committee from the shop.

The representative of the Manufacturers' Association asked for the discharge of four markers. It was claimed that by individual and combined action these four markers kept the cutting room in a continual state of chaos; that the workers were discourteous to the firm and its representatives; that changes had been made in the sizes of cutting tickets without the knowledge of the firm; that the four workers frequently held conferences on the cutting room floor and had refused to obey certain instructions issued by the firm.

The representative of the Amalgamated denied these charges in their entirety.

The Chairman ruled that the evidence submitted by the representatives of the Manufacturers' Association did not sustain the charges preferred against these workers and denied the request for discharge.

David C. Anderson
Associate Chairman.
DECISION IN CASE OF O'CONNELL, RICE AND ABBOTT, INC.

June 14, 1950

Complaints by the Secretary of the American Mercantile Agency of the

reasons given in support of the claim that the American Mercantile Agency

is not entitled to compensation, as the


testimony of the witnesses does not support the claims of the

Securities.
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During the consideration of wage claims in the month of November, two questions were left undecided - the claims of the cutters for payment for nine legal holidays and the proposal to raise the wage scale of lining cutters and fitters to the level of markers, machine cutters and trimmers, that is, from $47. to $51. per week.

The representatives of the Manufacturers’ Association and the Amalgamated having failed after several conferences to reach an agreement, the matter was left to the Impartial Chairman for decision.

The contention of the representatives of the Amalgamated was that a fairly general practice had been established in the Men’s and Boys’ Clothing Industry on the question of payment for legal holidays. It was further contended that the workers in the cloak and suit, waist and furrier branches of the trade were also operating under this plan. The disadvantage of a dual policy in the market must lead to constant irritation and strife and since the workers in 149 cutting rooms were being paid for holidays already, the practice should govern all the cutting rooms in the market.

With reference to the suggested new scale of wages for lining cutters and fitters, the arguments were advanced that these workers were engaged in operations demanding skill and responsible workmanship equal to that of the other operations now receiving a $51. scale. The present system obtaining in the market prevents the worker from becoming a full artisan. The new scale, it was contended, would abolish the artificial distinction which now exists and the change should be effected by an increase of $1. per week each month until the scale of $51. is reached.

The representative of the Manufacturers’ Association contended that the wage scales in the New York market were as high as the industry could afford at this time. The difference in wage scale between the lining cutters, fitters and markers, machine cutters and trimmers had always existed in the market because it was an accepted principle, involving among other things, the general question of skill.

The granting of payment for holidays, it was argued, which was now made on the basis of consideration, would deprive the manufacturer of this advantage. The Chairman was urged to make a careful study of the question not only as it relates to New York but to other markets before issuing a decision.

Undue delay in deciding questions of controversy in any industry is the cause of much discontent, but the Chairman felt that these particular questions justified careful consideration and time has been taken to secure information in the shops, in conference and by interviews. The result of these discussions leads the Chairman to make rulings as follows:
1. Payment for legal holidays already obtains in the representative cutting rooms of the market without evident loss of production. The Chairman, therefore, sustains the claim of the cutters' section of the Amalgamated on the question of payment for nine legal holidays. The Chairman urges upon the Amalgamated to make arrangements with the manufacturers so that the loss of production involved on these holidays will be absorbed during the season and that the manufacturer will continue, as at present, to suffer no unnecessary loss as a result of payment for holidays.

2. The claim for the alteration of the wage scale of lining cutters and fitters is still an open question in the mind of the Chairman. The technical elements involved are such as to make difficult the appraisal of values and the evidence submitted, as far as the Chairman is concerned, is inconclusive. The Chairman, therefore, requests that a committee of five composed of two representatives of the Amalgamated, two representatives of the Manufacturers' Association and one person of recognized expert experience, acceptable to both parties, be created to advise on this question. This committee is to report its findings prior to the first of February.

Dated: C. J. L.
Associate Chairman.
Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Drubin and committee from the shop. Manufacturers' Association represented by Mr. Greel, Mr. McJoint and Mr. Siegel of the firm.

The complaint in substance is that the workers in the inside shop of this firm are discriminated against by the failure of the firm to observe the market practice which gives preference to inside shop workers over the workers in contracting shops. It was asserted that the firm had two contractors, one of which was a non-union shop and that work was being done in these shops with the result that the pocket-makers and joiners in the inside shop were laid off. This action taken without notice being given to representatives of the Amalgamated or the Association, caused a stoppage in the entire shop. It was asserted that by laying off these workers the firm virtually indicated that there was no work for the shop and the process of finishing up was in operation. The representative of the Amalgamated claimed that under the market practice, employers should give preference to the inside shop and that work should not be diverted to a non-union shop. The claim was also made by the Amalgamated, that payment for all time lost as a result of this dispute should be awarded the workers.

The representative of the Manufacturers claimed that the firm had acted in good faith and was under the impression that the shop described by the Union as a non-union shop was in reality a union shop. All of the time lost, except two hours, it was asserted, was unnecessary and the responsibility rested with the Amalgamated.
The claim was made by the representative of the Manufacturers' Association that the firm should be allowed to finish up the work in the contracting shop.

The Chairman ruled:

1. The firm evidently acted in good faith in sending work to the contractor and is to be allowed to finish up the work in the contracting shop. The responsibility for organizing the non-union shop rests with the Amalgamated. Under the agreement the workers have a right to demand that the work be sent to shop operating under union conditions.

2. The responsibility for the time lost is divided. Under the agreement, stoppages are not permitted but the firm ought not to have stopped these particular sections without giving the representatives of the Amalgamated adequate notice. The manufacturer should appreciate the fact that the action taken by his representative makes more difficult the work of the labor manager and tends to disturb conditions. A definite responsibility rests upon manufacturers to see that the human relationships in the shops are not involved by hasty and ill-considered action.

3. Payment for lost time is awarded to the workers as follows: four pocket-makers are to be paid for two hours lost on Thursday, January 15th; all workers in the shop are to be paid for Friday, January 16th, and the seven workers who, by action of the foreman, lost three hours each on Monday, are to be paid.

4. The responsibility for time lost on Tuesday rests upon the workers and payment for this day is not ordered.

[Signature]
Associate Chairman.
THERE DECISION IN CASE OF COLONIZATION OF THE MUNICIPALITIES

January 29, 1920
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Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Haas. Association represented by Messrs. Taube and Lasher.

The complaint, in substance, is that the contractor, on Monday February 16th, discharged a bushelman without notice and that as a result of the failure to adjust matters, the workers in this shop have been out of work for three days. The representative of the Amalgamated claims that the responsibility for this stoppage rested with the contractor who refused to consider the financial demands of the workers in the shop.

On Monday evening a shop meeting was held with reference to the reinstatement of the bushelman, and the workers, receiving no satisfaction from the contractor, decided to stop work. The following morning a representative of the Amalgamated, in conference with a representative of the contractor, agreed to have the workers start work if the bushelman were reinstated. The contractor agreed to this.

The workers were out for three days before it was decided to bring the matter to the office of the Impartial Chairman.

The claim was made by the representative of the Amalgamated for three days pay for the entire shop and one day's pay in addition for the bushelman discharged.

The representative of the Manufacturers' Association admitted that the worker had not been discharged in accordance with the accepted procedure and agreed to pay for any lost time involved. He claimed, however, that the responsibility for the lost three days on the part of the workers was due to the action of the representative of the Amalgamated. On several occasions the firm had asked to have a committee of
For Decision in Case of Laser Rife 1850

Pursuant to the American Cyanamid Company's Notice and Letter.

The consultant, in experience, to date the consultant, as a result of the failure to deliver materials, the materials in this produce have been out of the market for a long time.

The American Cyanamid Company, for the consultant, are required to contact the American Cyanamid Company at the market in the market, in the market, and the consultant's office for the consultant's office.

On receipt of a good market, we will be ready to receive the statement of the market, in the market, and the consultant's office. The consultant, as a result of the failure to deliver materials, the materials in this produce have been out of the market for a long time.

If the production were instituted, the consultant, as a result of the failure to deliver materials, the materials in this produce have been out of the market for a long time.

The American Cyanamid Company, for the consultant, are required to contact the American Cyanamid Company at the market in the market, and the consultant's office for the consultant's office.

The consultant, in experience, to date the consultant, as a result of the failure to deliver materials, the materials in this produce have been out of the market for a long time.

The American Cyanamid Company, for the consultant, are required to contact the American Cyanamid Company at the market in the market, and the consultant's office for the consultant's office.
The Amalgamated investigate the quality of work and general workmanship of the bushelman who had been discharged, but the committee had never come to the shop. On the strength of this the firm had discharged the bushelman.

The Chairman ruled:

1. The contractor failed to observe the general procedure with reference to the discharge of the bushelman and is ordered to pay the worker for the day he was out.

2. Having failed to observe the procedure with reference to the discharge of the bushelman, and the case in general, the contractor is ordered to pay the workers in the shop for 2½ hours lost time - this being the first period at which a claim for adjustment should have been placed before the Impartial Chairman.

3. The balance of the time, almost three days, was lost to the workers because of the action of the representative of the Amalgamated. The loss must be borne by the workers themselves. Stoppages are unnecessary and contrary to the general agreement obtaining in the market.

[Signature]

Associate Chairman.
The American Textile Industry is in the midst of a war and General Motors.

The company has been at war for some time and the committee has
never come to an agreement on the situation of the trade with
the company.

The Committee's report:

1. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

2. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

3. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

4. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

5. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

6. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

7. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

8. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

9. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

10. The committee failed to agree on the General Motors

The committee's report.

The committee's report.
Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Schnall and a
commitee of two from the shop. Manufacturers' Association represented by Messrs. Elfelt, Englander and Mr. Levy of the firm.

Complaint of the Amalgamated was that a fitter in this firm is
$11. behind the scale by reason of his having failed to participate
in the two previous general market increases. The representative of
the Amalgamated stated that his organization had understood that the
man was to be brought up to the scale, $1. per month, subsequent to
the August general wage award of $5. This had not been done nor had
the worker received the $6. award of November 1918. No complaint had
been made by the firm with reference to the quality of workmanship.
The claim was made for a $6. per week increase, retroactive from
November 10th and a $1. per month increase until the worker is brought
up to the general market scale for fitters.

The representative of the Manufacturers' Association contended
that no agreement was made with reference to bringing the worker up
to the scale subsequent to the August award and that because of his age
the man was not now a competent mechanic and for this reason he
had not been given the wage increase awarded to the other workers
in the cutting room. The representative of the firm further pleaded
that this worker should be transferred from his shop and a younger
man put in his place. In order to demonstrate that the man was not
a competent mechanic, the firm was willing that a test should be
made.
DECISION IN CASE OF KAHN DREYFUSS & COMPANY, INC.

January 26, 1935

Complaint of the American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) of the News Editor and the Newsman of the New York Times.

Complaint of the American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) of the News Editor and the Newsman of the New York Times.

If the New York Times is used, the loss of the printing will be proportionate to the representation of the American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment. The representation of the American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment. The representation of the American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.

The American Newspaper Guild (representing the newspaper association) to the National Bureau of Employment.
The offer of the firm that the man should be given an opportunity to demonstrate his ability as a worker was accepted by the representative of the Amalgamated.

The Chairman ruled that the worker should be allowed to demonstrate his effectiveness until the week ending February 14th. This worker should be allowed to work on his own responsibility and not, as has been the custom in the shop, in cooperation with another fitter.

2. The case will be reheard and decision rendered on the result of the worker's accomplishments.

David C. Ache
Associate Chairman.
THE DECISION IN CASE OF C. H. DRYER & COMPANY, INC. (Cont.)

January 8, 1936

The offer of the Union that the men would be given an opportunity to demonstrate their ability as workers and operators by the employer.

The offer that the employer would give of the American way of life.

The offer that the employer will give the worker an opportunity to demonstrate his ability as a worker and operator by the employer.

The case will go forward and generation among the craft.
Complaint by the Association represented by Messrs. Elfelt and Englander and Messrs. Endel of the firm. Amalgamated represented by Mr. Stone.

The case, in substance, is that the firm now hires more cutters than is necessary to meet the needs of the business and request is made for the discharge of two cutters. It is claimed by the firm that the representative of the Amalgamated agreed to take out two cutters during the height of the season. The firm is now operating in what it believes to be the height of its season, and does not expect to be able to provide work for all the men on the premises. The system of division of time had been tried but the plan had failed. The method of work had been altered in the shop to meet manufacturing requirements.

The representative of the Amalgamated contended that the organization did not object to a change of system in any shop provided the change did not work undue hardship on the workers. It was claimed that under the market custom, the firm should not ask for a discharge of these men at this time. The representative of the Amalgamated stated that unless there was an actual call for cutters, the organization could not take the men out. It was impossible at this time to carry out the tentative agreement made with the firm. The agreement had been made with the idea that it would be possible to place the excess number of workers in some other employment and not with the idea of giving relief by discharge.

The Chairman ruled: 1. If the spirit of the agreement is to be effective, the firm should retain these two cutters in question, even though it is entitled, theoretically, to a reduction in the number of cutters now employed. Under the agreement the Amalgamated has a right to ask the firm
Compliance of the Association's requirements of Members' Efforts as

Engagement and Means. Violation of the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION's

Provisions and Members' Efforts

The case is important as to what the firm will please more outcome.

Say in connection to the means of the business and recovery in case

for the protection of the members. It is advisable to state that the

preservation of the American Association's mode of sales can be achieved without the

participation of the members. The line to observe is that it is preferable to

participate of the members may need not happen to be able to know as

many for all the men on the American. The device of invention of the

work of the work has been

above in the order to meet manufacturing arrangements.

The arrangements of the American association that the

showing that the object to a change of status in any other change of the

matters where mentioned on the members. It was obvious that most

of the market cannot. The time enough not for a change of the mention

of the times. The arrangements of the American association can not take

the matter. If any arrangements or, the American association may not take

the firm, the line. The experience has been made with the firm.

That it cannot be possible to place the above number of members in some

open employment may not with the line or giving letter of adaptation.

The German idea: I. In the spirit of the experience to be open

admission, the American Letter press are not essential to capacity.

In the spirit of the spirit of the American association or only to the

embroidery. Have the experience the American association and a spirit to make the This
106. DECISION IN CASE OF COHEN, ENDEL & CO. (continued - 2)

January 28, 1930.

to take action with consideration for the welfare of the workers.
The firm is therefore ordered not to discharge these cutters at
this time.

2. The Amalgamated should, at the earliest time when market
conditions will permit, cooperate with the firm and establish a
normal force in the cutting room.

[Signature]

Associate Chairman.
To the attention of the committee for the welfare of the workers.

The time to prepare adequate rest to the workers' sense of time.

The American market at the current time may require cooperation with existing and new suppliers in the current room.

Assessor O. Davis

[Signature]
17X. DECISION IN CASE OF INTERNATIONAL TAILORING CO.

February 24th, 1930.

A mutual complaint was presented by the Amalgamated represented by Messrs. Gold, Goldshall and Cirincione and the Clothing Trade Association represented by Messrs. Reed and Bubeshek.

A request had been made by the Amalgamated for consideration of an adjustment in wages for three individuals: a serger, a tacker and a buttonhole maker. The complaint was that these men were underpaid. The workers are piece workers. The request for adjustment is:

The serger, now receiving $1.62\frac{1}{2} requests $1.87\frac{1}{2};
The tacker, now receiving $1.82\frac{1}{2} requests $2.07\frac{1}{2};
The buttonhole maker " $2.13\frac{1}{2} requests $2.50.

These rates are on 100 pairs of pants.

Evidence was presented at the date of the hearing to the effect that the firm was willing to make the adjustment requested in the case of the serger and tacker.

After conducting an investigation on prevailing prices and making a comparison with figures in this office, the Chairman authorizes an individual adjustment for these three workers as follows:

The serger, $1.87\frac{1}{2};
The tacker, $2.07\frac{1}{2};
The buttonhole maker $2.37\frac{1}{2}.

These rates are on 100 pairs of pants.

The adjustment of rates shall be effective as of February 1st.

...David C. Adic
Associate Chairman.
A mutual complaint was presented by the American Exporters

of Messrs. Goody, Colburn, and O'Toole, and by the American

Trade Association on behalf of Messrs. Read and Buckley

A request had been made by the American Exporters for

an enlargement in wage for three exhibitions: a printer's ticket and a

puttng-up ticket. The complaint was that these men were unemployable.

The wage of the ticket workers was $1.75 per hour. The

wage of the workmen of the same office was $1.75 per hour.

These rates are on 100 parts of base.

After considering the situation to the detriment to the effect

that the firm was willing to make the enlargement requested in the case

of the ticket and ticket

After considering the situation to the detriment to the effect

that the firm was willing to make the enlargement requested in the case

of the ticket and ticket

This case is on 100 parts of base.

The enlargement of these tickets is effective as of January 1st.

Associate Editor.
108. DECISION IN CASE OF EPSTEIN CHARLES-BOUGLIS

March 5, 1930.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Stone. Manufacturers' Association represented by Mr. McJoynt and Mr. Block of the firm.

The complaint of the Amalgamated in substance is that an examiner who had been with the firm five years and who, six weeks ago, was appointed shop chairman, had been discharged without the matter having been taken up in the regular manner and without any evident justification. The man was not working and had been out several days. The Chairman ordered the worker reinstated and took the evidence in the case with the reservation that no decision would be rendered until the man was again at work in the shop.

The representative of the Association stated that the man had been discharged and gave four reasons:

1. Since becoming shop chairman the man was not attending to his work. 2. He was the cause of considerable disharmony in the working force of the shop and as a result was interfering with others in their work. 3. The man had on several occasions challenged the authority of the management. 4. On several occasions the man had been guilty of using bad language.

The evidence presented in support of these charges was exceedingly inconclusive.

It is evident that there is a lack of harmony on the part of the workers in this shop and that the firm has a right to expect a change in the situation in order that the manufacturing process may
not be disturbed.

The Chairman therefore ruled:

1. The examiner is to be reinstated immediately and paid for any time lost. The firm ought not to have discharged the man without adopting the accepted procedure in these matters.

2. The evidence presented by the firm is so insufficient that the Chairman is compelled to disallow the appeal for discharge.

3. The condition obtaining in this shop among the workers places a definite responsibility upon the Amalgamated and the Chairman will hold the representative of the Amalgamated responsible for securing better control in this shop. The firm has a right to expect this since disharmony among the group of examiners is detrimental to the best interests of all concerned.

Associate Chairman.
18X. DECISION IN CASE OF BERGER, RAPHAEL & WILE.
March 5, 1820.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Messrs. Gold and Rolph. The Clothing Trade Association represented by Messrs. Wheaton, Reed and Mr. Raphael of the firm.

The complaint in substance is that the continuation of piece work in several sections is causing disorder in the shop. The firm employs nine workers on a piece rate basis: one joiner, two joiners' helpers, one armhole baster, one lining maker, three buttonhole makers and one shaper. Constant disorder prevails and the Amalgamated asks for a change in the system of piece to week work in order to obtain better control in the shop and to eliminate the dissatisfaction that now obtains.

The representatives of the Clothing Trade Association claimed that there was no justification for the appeal for a change; that no evidence had been shown outlining a condition that could not be adjusted without changing the system of work. It was further asserted that the market conditions demand a maintenance of the status quo in this matter.

In view of the evidence presented, the Chairman is of the opinion that insufficient evidence has been presented by the representative of the Amalgamated and rules:

1. A change in the system prevailing in this shop is uncalled for at the present time.

2. The request made by the representative of the Amalgamated is not one which affects this shop only; the change from piece to week work is a market question. If a change in the system of work
is to be made, it must be made in the light of market conditions and the means used must be that of joint conference between the representatives of the Amalgamated and the Clothing Trade Association.

3. When the agreement was made between the Amalgamated and the Clothing Trade Association, the former assumed the responsibility for a definite control of the members of its organization in the individual shops and this control must still be assumed and exercised. The Chairman, therefore, is bound to assume that the Amalgamated will, in the future as in the past, cooperate with the management for the establishment of harmony and good-will in this shop.

...David C. Addie
Associate Chairman.
It is to be made, it must be made in the light of market conditions and
the economic need for such construction. The construction must be of the kind
and consistent with the American and the General Trade Description.

It is known the agreement was made between the American and
the General Trade Association. The former ceased the cooperation in
the construction. The agreement, the members of the association in
the initial stage and this contract must either be renewed and ex-
extent. The operation, it appears, is bound to resume that the
management for the establishment of the American and some-
109. DECISION IN CASE OF J. J. PREIS

March 11, 1930.

Complaint by the Association represented by Mr. Elselt and Meers. Price, Cohen and Rappaport of the firm. The Amalgamated represented by Mr. Senter and a committee from the shop.

The representative of the Manufacturers' Association stated that two workers in this shop, one a machine cutter and the other a marker, because of their inefficiency had caused considerable loss to the firm and it had been decided to secure their discharge.

After reviewing the case and the evidence submitted by the representatives of the Cutters' Union and the Manufacturers' Association, the Chairman decided to uphold the decision of the Labor Manager and agreed to the discharge of these two men.

[Signature]
Associate Chairman.
Decision in Case of J. J. Preis

March 11, 1930.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Senter and a committee from the shop. Association represented by Mr. Elselt and Messrs. Price, Cohen and Rappaport of the firm.

The representative of the Amalgamated stated that a worker in this shop had been discharged without notice and asked for a rehearing of the facts of the case and a decision from the Chairman.

This worker, it was admitted, had insulted one of the women workers in the plant.

After reviewing the case, the Chairman decided that discharge, in this case, is too severe a measure. The Chairman decided to overrule the decision of the Labor Manager in this case. The worker was reprimanded and warned that such conduct in the future would be dealt with by dismissal.

The Chairman then ruled:

1. The man must apologize to the girl for his conduct;
2. The Executive Board of the Cutters' Union shall discipline this worker with a fine of not less than $10.
3. The man is to be reinstated without payment for four and a half days time lost.

[Signature]

Associate Chairman.
DECISION IN CASE OF 9.7. BARR

MAY 17, 1930

Consistent with the American Association of the Cooper and
a committee from the shop, association representative of the

seek relief. If base, cooper and representatives of the firm.
An understanding of the American Association that a reac
In this shop no known grievances exist and strike, if made, for a reac
presenting of the shop of the case and a resolution from the Cooper

The workers, if not satisfied, may immediately one of the

MAY 17, 1930

After reviewing the case, the Cooper's Executive Board decided
In this case, to rescind a resolution. The Cooper's Executive Board to over-
As the resolution of the Cooper Executive in this case, the workers are

This resolution and seeking for the resolution of the Cooper Governor for the

The Cooper's Executive Board:
1. The new wets operate to the extent of the agreement
2. The Executive Board of the Cooper's, upon appeal the

opine that the Cooper's have not been fair to our local union. We

If the case is to be continued without prejudice for two

and a very good time later.

Associate Secretary
DEcision in Case of Hethouse, Rosen Co.

March 15, 1920.

Complaint by the Contractors' Association represented by Mr. Augusse and Mr. Sullivan, contractor. Manufacturers' Association represented by Mr. McJoynt and Mr. Rosen of the firm.

The firm and contractor, having failed to agree as to the price to be paid for 208 coats, the matter was presented before the Impartial Chairman for decision. On October 23, 1919, the two lots, amounting to 208 coats, were sent out by the firm to the contractor but no price was agreed upon definitely. Coats of a similar model had been made by contractor at the price of $3.50. This price included the wage increase granted to the workers in October. At the time of receiving the order from the manufacturer, the contractor said he could not deliver at a specific date because of pressure of business and the manufacturer agreed to get another contractor, or, failing in this, to allow the coats to be made by the contractor Sullivan for delivery at the earliest possible date.

Later, the contractor informed the manufacturer that the price would be $10. and the goods were made up and delivered accordingly.

The manufacturer's argument is that he only agreed to this price under pressure and had no alternative because of the fact that the goods had been cut. This the contractor denies. The manufacturer claims that the price should be $6.50 since no increase of wages has been awarded the workers since the price was fixed for former lots.

The Chairman decided that since the manufacturer agreed to the price of $10. he is responsible for the carrying out of the contract. The manufacturer had the right to dispute the price before the coats were made; once having entered into the bargain, he is responsible for the carrying out of his portion of the contract. The manufacturer is, therefore, instructed to pay the contractor at the rate of $10.

[Signature]
Associate Chairman
PRESENTATION IN COURT OF RESCUE. ROSS A. CO.

DECEMBER 2, 1942

CERTIFICATE OF THE CONSENTANCE, ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENTS

At the North and East corner of the

City of New York, and in the County of New York,

the undersigned, having due notice of the

Consentance, do hereby consent, accept and approve

the Amendments thereto, and hereby declare

the said Amendments to be in full force and effect

as of the date of this certificate.

This certificate is executed in triplicate, one copy

being returned to the Consenting Officer, and the

other two copies being retained for the use of the

Consenting Officer and the Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,
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who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,
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read and understood by the Consenting Party,

and that the same have been accepted by the

Consenting Party.

This certificate is signed by the Consenting Officer,

who certifies that the Amendments have been

read and understood by the Consenting Party,
III. DECISION IN CASE OF HARRY HINDLEMAN.
March 18, 1930.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Messrs. Drubin, Silverman and a committee from the shop. Association represented by Messrs. Greer and McJoynt and Mr. Hindleman of the firm.

The complaint of the Amalgamated in substance is that the firm is seeking to be relieved of the services of a fitter without just cause. Recently the firm has withdrawn its work from a contractor and established an inside shop for the manufacture of Palm Beach suits. In making this change the number of workers had been reduced. The firm had selected the workers to fill the shop and the list submitted to the Amalgamated included the man in question. The representative of the Amalgamated claimed that the firm, having made the selection, must now accept the responsibility for these workers and the man should be given a full time job, filling in if need be on jobs other than fitting.

The representative of the manufacturers claimed that the worker in question had been with the contractor for about a year. At that time the contractor was making a regular line of clothing in addition to the Palm Beach work. It was admitted that the worker in question was included in the list submitted by the firm but since the change had been effected the worker was needed only two days a week. The man had been asked to do other work but had stated that he was unable to do anything other than pairing.

After a personal investigation of the shop the Chairman ruled:

1. Since no charges against the man's workmanship have been presented by the firm, the firm must assume its responsibility in this regard and the fitter should be considered as a member of the regular
II. DECISION IN CASE OF HARRY HUMPHREY

M.R.C. 13360

Complaint of the American Railway Association of Kansas, Humphrey.

Evidence and a complaint from the shop, Association representing the

meets every Monday and Wednesday at the shop.
The complaint of the American Railway Association is pursuant to the first

in order to correct the condition of the railroad at a given point, and the

Recently the Association is acting to correct a condition and

I issue an order and give conditions of service

The line has reaching a point where conditions prevail that

The American Railway Association of the American

obligation of the lines upon which the service is given

Job filling in I can do no longer upon these lines.
The Association of the American Railway Association, from the

In compliance and proof with the Association's opinion in

the Association will make a report of the opinion and allowance to the

On the report of the report in this case I have

Upon the report of the report in this case I have

The Association of the American Railway Association has the

After a personal investigation of the shop and the American

I issue an order to correct the same and the complaint in this case.
force until the end of this present Palm Beach season.

2. The man should be given other work to do and the Amalgamated must assume the responsibility in this matter; the worker is to assist at such operations as the firm may desire.

...David C. ... Associate Chairman.
DECISION IN CASE OF HARRY HINDLEMAN (COMP. - 9)

WATER TUG, 1930

... loses until the end of stone dressing for new season.

... the new dressing to be given as near as possible to the first dressing.

... the work to be completed in time to meet the work to be carried out.

... this operation as the time may indicate.

[Signature]

ASSOCIATION OFFICERS
112. DECISION IN CASE OF J. B. STRAUSS
March 22, 1920.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Drubin and a
committee. Association represented by Messrs. McJoynt, Mr. Strauss
of the firm and contractor.

The complaint, in substance, is that the contractor involved,
prevented the people from working for two days. It appeared that a
committee from the Joint Board was investigating the shops of the con-
tractors with reference to certain irregularities. On the committee's
arrival at this particular shop, permission was requested from the owner
to go through the shop and this was granted. Following the investiga-
tion, certain arguments ensued and as a result, the contractor forcibly
ejected the representatives of the Amalgamated who were engaged in mak-
ing the investigation. This action on the part of the contractor caused
the representatives of the Amalgamated to stop the workers but only for
a few minutes. Realizing the mistake that had been made, the representa-
tive of the Amalgamated immediately ordered the workers back but the
contractor refused to allow the men to start work on the claim that
the shop had been demoralized.

It appears in this case that both parties are somewhat to
blame for the incident. The contractor had no right to forcibly eject
the representative of the Amalgamated although he was under a certain
degree of provocation in this instance; on the other hand, the repre-
sentatives of the Amalgamated should have shown greater tact in their
approach to the situation.

The Chairman, therefore, rules that since both parties must
carry a proportion of the blame, they must share equally in the cost
and the workers are to receive one day's pay for the time lost.

[Signature]

Associate Chairman.
115. DECISION IN CASE OF 7 H. STRAUSS

Report 56, 1856.

Complaint of the American Association of Refractory Manufacturers.

The Committee, in accordance with the Joint Board, has investigated the scope of the complaint, and have recommended the following procedure:

1. To stop the work and limit all operations of the American Association only to the protection of existing members.
2. To stop the work and limit all operations of the American Association only to the protection of existing members.
3. To stop the work and limit all operations of the American Association only to the protection of existing members.
4. To stop the work and limit all operations of the American Association only to the protection of existing members.
5. To stop the work and limit all operations of the American Association only to the protection of existing members.

The Committee recommends the above procedure, subject to the discretion of the American Association, and the American Association agrees to the above procedure.

Sincerely yours,

American Committee.
113. DECISION IN CASE OF RICHMAN, NEWBURGER AND TRAVERS.

March 22, 1930.

The complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Messrs. Maydonick, Kleinman, Goldstein and Katz. Association represented by Messrs. Elfelel, Englander and the members of the firm.

The complaint of the Amalgamated in substance is that the firm had made arrangements to open a shop in Newark, N. J. in violation of an agreement made between the firm and the general officers of the Amalgamated. It appears that some time in the fall of 1919, this firm had obtained the services of a contractor whose shop was unsanitary and the representatives of the Amalgamated had refused to send help to this contractor on the ground that the place was dangerous from a health standpoint. Representation was then made by the contractor and a member of the firm to the general office of the Amalgamated, at which time a verbal agreement was entered into by which the firm agreed to open up an inside shop in New York and in return the Amalgamated agreed to break up a contracting shop and fill up the sections in the shop of the contractor working for this firm — the understanding being that this was a temporary proposition. The Amalgamated had carried through its end of the bargain and had now been advised that the firm had decided to open up a shop in Newark.

The representative of the Manufacturers' Association admitted that the firm had leased premises for a shop in Newark, N. J. but stated that this shop had not been opened without the knowledge of the Amalgamated. The representative of the firm had consulted a representative of the Amalgamated in Newark and had been directed to the New York Joint Board where assurances were given that he would be supplied with workers. It was on the strength of this assurance
The original manuscript contains several paragraphs, but the transcription is not complete or legible. It appears to be a legal or official document, possibly related to case law or legal procedures. Given the partial legibility, it's challenging to provide a coherent summary or transcription of the entire content. The text seems to discuss legal proceedings, possibly concerning the case of Brown vs. 1234. It references various legal terms and procedures, but the exact nature of the case or the specific actions discussed cannot be accurately transcribed due to the quality of the image.
from the New York Joint Board that the firm had signed a lease for four years in Newark, had moved its machinery there and had undertaken obligations to the extent of several thousand dollars. It was further contended by the representative of the Manufacturers' Association that the firm planned to manufacture a new line of work in Newark but would continue to have manufactured in New York all its unbaisted work.

In substance the case is that the firm has been refused workers for the Newark shop and faces the demand from the Amalgamated that the Newark shop be given up and a new shop be opened in New York, in conformity with a verbal agreement mutually arrived at sometime in the fall of 1919.

The firm's claim in substance is that it has a right to open a shop in Newark for the manufacture of a new line of work; that it failed to obtain premises in New York because of the scarcity of lofts; that it had not entered into an agreement with the Amalgamated to open up a shop in New York; that it had not proceeded without the knowledge of the Amalgamated and further, that the giving up of the shop in Newark, and the establishing of its business in New York would entail a very considerable loss which the firm was in no position to stand.

The evidence in this case was exceedingly complicated and both sides were unable to produce evidence which would permit of a clear cut ruling. It appears to the Chairman, however, that certain facts are beyond dispute.

The Amalgamated, in the interest of the firm, had broken up
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a contracting shop in order to fill out the sections in another contracting shop and that such action would not have been taken by the Amalgamated unless some arrangement had existed whereby the workers would be protected for the future. Although no definite agreement between the firm and the general office can be proved, it seems clear to the Chairman that some form of agreement must have existed before the Amalgamated would have made such a concession to the firm.

A bonafide attempt was made by the firm to secure premises in New York and the Chairman is convinced of the good faith on the part of the firm in this respect. It cannot be assumed that the firm tried to break its relationships with the Amalgamated.

The Chairman, therefore, rules:

1. The firm has a right to open up a shop in Newark, N. J. for the manufacture of men's clothing and the Joint Board of New York must fulfil its obligations and supply the necessary workers for this purpose.

2. The firm must assume responsibility for the workers employed in the New York contracting shops and must provide employment for them in New York.

...Associate Chairman.
II. DECISION IN CASE OF RICHLAND, RIVERSIDE AND TRAVERSE

(Cont. - 3) Kansas 1850

A contract for work in order to fill out the section on another con-
tracting bench and state such section would not have been taken up the
Army Engineers under the Act of Congress of 1866, with the proviso
that the work would be performed by the State. Accordingly, on selling
the property, the same was made up to the limit of the Act of Congress
of 1866, and the General Office was informed, that, as a result of
the action of the Congress, the same was to be, and had been, sold
back to the Army Engineers under the Act of Congress.

The Army Engineers next made up the limit to the limit of the Act of
Congress, to the limit to the extent. It cannot be supposed that the limit
was the limit in the sense. It cannot be supposed that the limit
was the limit in the sense.

The General's decision, in this case:

1. The limit of the Act to open up a road to New York;

2. The limit to the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

3. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

4. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

5. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

6. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

7. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

8. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

9. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York;

10. The limit of the Act of 1866, to open up a road to New York.

Associate Engineer.

[Signature]
RULING IN THE CASE OF WORKERS OF THE CUT, MAKE AND TRIM SHOPS.

March 23, 1930.

The representatives of the Manufacturers' Association and the Amalgamated having failed to adjust conditions in the Cut, Make and Trim shops in the New York market, the question was presented to the Acting Chairman for a ruling.

The questions presented to the Chairman involved the determination of the status of these manufacturers in the Clothing Manufacturers Industrial Exchange and the wages to be paid the workers in these shops. The Chairman recognizes the fact that these firms are members of the Association and assumes jurisdiction in the matter of the industrial relations in these shops as they exist at the present time. As members of the Manufacturers' Association, entitled to the privileges and protection of the Association, these firms must also assume the obligation of membership.

Collective bargaining presupposes a knowledge by both parties of all the factors in the situation and the Chairman directs that the procedure adopted by the Manufacturers' Association by which it informs the Amalgamated of the entrance of new members into the Association shall be made definite from now on. The present courtesy method is faulty in the extreme and in future when manufacturers make application for membership in the Association, the several branches of the Amalgamated shall be officially notified by letter in order that it may clearly be determined that there is no labor trouble pending in these houses before membership in the Association is granted.

The Chairman assumes that the Amalgamated will recognize that the Manufacturers' Association has a right to determine the status of any member of its organization in exactly the same manner that the Manufacturers' Association assumes that the Amalgamated has the right to determine which shops in the market are operating as Union shops.

With reference to the wages being paid to the workers of these shops, the Chairman now orders that a reconsideration shall be given and an adjustment made in the Cut, Make and Trim shops. This adjustment shall be made in conformity with the conditions prevailing in the market and with consideration for the peculiarities of this division of the industry.

David C. Arce

............................

Associate Chairman.
115. DECISION IN CASE OF ANSELWITZ & LUBINSKY.
April 20, 1930.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Weinstein and a committee from the shop. Manufacturers' Association represented by Messrs. Greer, Hunt and Mr. Anselwitz.

The complaint by the Amalgamated in substance is that a lining cutter, engaged by this firm last June was laid off four weeks ago in violation of the procedure governing the market. The representative of the Amalgamated claims that the man is entitled to his position and should be paid for the lost time. This, on the basis of division of time, would equal two weeks pay.

The representative of the Manufacturers' Association contended that the man should not be placed on division of time because the condition in the shop was a reflex of extra working force as well as lack of work.

It appears from the evidence that the Labor Manager, handling the affairs of this firm, was not consulted on the question of the lay off to the extent necessary under the circumstances. Manufacturers ought to realize that it is very necessary, if the machinery is to work smoothly, that the Labor Manager be in touch with developments at every point in the case. Especially is it true that once the case is in the hands of the representative of the Manufacturers' Association the firm should act only after consultation - to act otherwise is to make futile the efforts of the representative.

The Chairman rules: 1. This worker is entitled to his position; if necessary, on a division of time basis.

2. The firm violated the agreement when the man was laid off
but some responsibility rests upon the Amalgamated for the delay that had taken place in bringing the case before the Impartial Chairman. The loss of time, therefore, must be borne by both parties and the man is awarded one weeks wages.

David C. Adie

Associate Chairman.
THE DECISION IN CASE OF ABNORMALITY & INJURY

April 20, 1960

But more importantly once upon the implementation for the gate

But now remember, if you try to predict the case before the identical gate

You need to think about the case again.

The case of this expectation must be given by our partner and

The case is to analyze one more time.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Name]
116. DECISION IN CASE OF LIPPS BROS.

April 30, 1920.

Complaint by the Amalgamated represented by Mr. Weinstein and a committee from the shop. The Manufacturers' Association represented by Mr. Hunt and Mr. Lipps of the firm.

In substance the complaint is that a lining cutter, employed by this firm since the summer of 1919, was not receiving proper wages. The man having been employed through the regular procedure and having worked out his probationary period, was paid at the rate of $35 per week which was the existing scale of wages at the date of hiring. One week after he was engaged by the firm the scale of wages for cutters in the market was placed on a $40 per week basis. This increased wage was paid to the worker; but later, without consultation, the firm reduced the wages to $30 per week. It was further contended that this worker had not received any increase in wages since the reduction was made by the firm notwithstanding the fact that general wage increases had been made in the market. This condition was not reported by the worker to the Amalgamated, and the case was only discovered a week ago when the man complained of the inadequacy of his wages.

The claim of the Amalgamated is that the man should receive the full scale of wages in view of the fact that no complaint had been registered as to the man's workmanship.

The representative of the Manufacturers' Association contended that the man should not receive the scale of wages in the market because he was not a good mechanic. It was further claimed that since the case had run along for such a period of time there must have been some general understanding.

The existence of such an understanding is denied by the representative of the Amalgamated.
The Decision in Case of Life Mere.

April 30, 1860.

Complaint by the Manufacturers' Association of the Manufacturers' Association, Association of Manufacturers.

In accordance with the decision of the Court of the State of New York and the Life Insurance Company of the United States of America.

In accordance with the complaint at hand a finding order of the above.

The life insurance policy of the above-mentioned company was not receiving premium money. The new policy had been expressly written that the rate of interest and dividend on the stock policies was not paid off as of this date. One week after the execution of the policy the policy of the insured was taken in the manner we now know as a $500,000 new policy. The Insurance Board in the manner we now know as a $500,000 new policy. If the Insurers Corporation the name we know the Board of Directors to the market, but later, taken into consideration, the name we know the name of the market. This corporation was not registered in the market to the Manufacturers and the case was only given to the market.

The decision of the Manufacturers in the case we now occupy the case.

First case of the same in view of the fact that no complaint has been made.

Grateful to the new corporation.

The decision of the Manufacturers, Association of Manufacturers.

The Board of Directors in the above-mentioned case had not received the necessary documents in the market. It was important that the life insurance policy be made the basis of the above.

First mention for a policy of the same in view of the same.

Conclusions of the Manufacturers.
April 20, 1920.

The evidence submitted by the representative of the Amalgamated was substantiated by a former shop chairman who appeared as a witness for the firm.

The Chairman ruled that the firm was not entitled to reduce the man's wages as had been done in this case. Having hired the man at the regular market rate his wages should have been determined in accordance with the procedure adopted for this market. This action taken by the firm was not only irregular but somewhat arbitrary and the firm is ordered to pay this worker the present market scale.

2. If evidence does exist, as is hinted by the firm, that this man is not a competent worker, the matter should be taken up in the regular manner. There is no occasion to involve matters as has been done in this particular instance.

David C. Adie

Associate Chairman.
THE DECISION IN CASE OF ILLUS HOGG

April 8th, 1830

The evidence submitted by the respondents in the matter

was satisfactory as to fact and opinion and appeared to a witness

for the claim.

The charges made that the firm was not willing to transfer the

stock at the price at which it had been sold to the claimant. Having sold the stock at the

price where the goods were known to be overvalued, it was agreed that

the matters relating to the

sale were not only interesting but sensitive and involved the

claims to any further action by the claimant.

If anything good existed as an intention to the firm, it was that

the firm had not a corresponding interest to ensure matters as per seen

agreement remained. There is no connection to involve matters as per seen

gone in this particular instance.


Complaint by the Union represented by Messrs. Drubin, Krugman and committee from the shop. Association represented by Messrs. Leazer, Elfelt and Mr. Ettlinger of the firm.

Complaint of the Amalgamated in brief is that the shop lost two days time because the firm laid off the working force contrary to the practice existing in the market. The representative of the Manufacturers' Association claimed that the lost time was not due to the action of the firm but because the Amalgamated had failed to complete arrangements effected between the Labor Manager and the representatives of the Joint Board.

The evidence presented goes to show that while the firm acted rather hurriedly, yet there was every evidence of good faith. At the same time, the Chairman is bound to admit the claim of the Amalgamated that definite arrangements should have been made with the Joint Board and action should not have been taken so hurriedly or without conference. There was an evidence of slackness on the part of the officials of the Joint Board.

The Chairman, therefore, rules that the responsibility is divided for the time lost and the workers should receive one day's pay.

[Signature]

Associate Chairman.
To the Joint Board:

The above minutes were accurately recorded at the Joint Board meeting of the Local 3000 and the Company on the 1st day of June, 1950.

The Company President and the Union President have agreed to the above minutes.

[Signature]

[Signature]
118. DECISION IN CASE OF ULLMAN BROS.
May 6, 1930.

Complaint by the Association represented by Mr. Hunt and Mr. Ullman of the firm. Amalgamated represented by Mr. Bernstein.

Complaint in substance is that a representative of the Amalgamated visited this shop on Monday April 26 and requested a worker on an edge basting machine to stop off work. Later the man was returned to work.

The representative of the Association claims that the man is entitled to his job as an edge baster by machine. The man was hired as an edge baster and has been working on the machine for almost a year.

The representative of the Amalgamated, on the other hand, claims that the man was not hired as an edge baster by hand, but as a canvas baster and that he is not entitled to his job as an edge baster by machine since this deprives an edge baster of a job. The representative of the Amalgamated argues that under the arrangements affecting the machinery, only edge basters by hand can be placed to work on the machines. It was further claimed by the representative of the Amalgamated that this man is a general tailor and should be placed on some other operation in order to make a position for an edge baster.

The Chairman rules:

1. The principle laid down by the Advisory Board with reference to machinery refers specifically to the introduction of machinery and is not effective at a later date.

2. It is clear that this man having worked for almost a year on the machine is entitled to remain at work in this position – especially since no evidence has been presented to show that at the time when the machine was introduced any worker suffered as a result.

Associate Chairman.
The document appears to be a legal or official document, written in a language that is not easily readable due to the handwriting style. It seems to be a case or decision related to a name or entity, possibly a court decision or legal advice. Without clearer text, it's challenging to provide an accurate transcription or understanding of the content.