

for each. In the case of the housemaids I should have to engage one extra, and to keep her on permanently. She would take the place of the girl that went off. In the kitchen I should probably have to employ two more men. I would like to point out, with respect to the housemaids, that it is just a question if you can get a girl to occupy a position in which she is here to-day and in another place to-morrow. She will say, "Where are my tips to come from if I am on this floor on Monday and on another on Tuesday? I shall get no tips."

44. You suggest that if you could close up the hotel on one day—?—It would be as easy as falling off a log, and I would welcome it.

45. But you would not care about doing it, would you?—I would do it willingly.

46. I think you are about the only hotelkeeper in New Zealand who would?—I think that if you take the consensus of opinion you will find they would be only too pleased. It is a most harassing business—more especially during the last four or five years.

47. This clause 2 that you referred to: would you be satisfied if the word "exclusively" were altered to "substantially"?—I would not like to commit myself as to that. I am not prepared to say.

48. Is that the only legal ambiguity in that clause that you know of?—That is all. Would we be allowed to give the holiday on the Sunday? Could we use Sunday as a holiday?

49. Yes, I presume so—any day of the week. It is left to your discretion now as to which day you shall give the half-holiday?—It was not formerly.

50. I am asking about now: you decide now?—Yes, but we cannot give Sunday: the holiday must be given on one day of the six working-days. Under the Shops and Offices Act Sunday is not a working-day within the meaning of the Act.

51. That applies to hotels?—Yes.

52. *Mr. Okey.*] You represent a large hotel: do you not think that the evidence that would be given by some of the small hotelkeepers would be very different from what you are giving now?—It might be. That is why I say that all phases of the question should be put with respect to all classes of hotels. There are conditions that apply only to the smaller hotels.

53. A hotel, perhaps, that keeps two girls to do all the different classes of work?—Yes.

54. It would be a very different class of evidence that we would get from them?—Essentially different.

55. Do you not think there would be more difficulty with these smaller places than with the larger hotels?—At the country hotels there would be still more difficulty, I should think, than in the cities, because they would have a difficulty in keeping the hands.

56. *Mr. Davey.*] With reference to what I was saying, I find that the old Act does not include Sunday as a day for the half-holiday: but this Bill obviously does include Sunday; it says, "any day in the week"?—I am very pleased to hear it.

57. *Mr. Glover.*] In reference to the thirteen days in every three months, instead of seven days: how would that affect your business?—I have not gone into that question, but I do not see how we could do it.

#### MONDAY, 4TH NOVEMBER, 1912.

WILLIAM PRYOR, Secretary, New Zealand Employers' Federation, made a statement and was examined. (No. 3.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Will you please place your views before the Committee?—I am instructed to give evidence not only on behalf of the licensed victuallers of the Dominion, but on behalf of employers of labour generally. We submit, very respectfully, that the Bill should not be allowed to proceed, for the reason that the present Shops and Offices Acts require remodelling. The Shops and Offices Acts are easily the worst pieces of labour legislation that are on the statute-book at present. Proof of that is at once found in the fact that there are several clauses which the Government dare not put into operation. There are some other clauses which are in operation and which impose such very grave hardships on those affected that they should not be permitted to remain longer on the statute-book. Earlier in the session a statement was made that there would not be time to go on with the Shops and Offices Bill this session. For that reason my federation took scarcely any steps towards getting information to put before the Labour Bills Committee or before Parliament regarding the alterations and amendments that are required, outside altogether of this special hotel legislation. For that reason I am instructed by my federation to submit that the Bill should not be proceeded with this year; that apart from the merits of this Bill, apart from whether it is right or wrong, any dealing with the Shops and Offices Act should be left until next year, and the whole of the matters that require attention should be dealt with in a comprehensive manner. It seems to us that that is a reasonable proposition,—a businesslike proposition—that this legislation should be taken hold of, time given for consideration, and dealt with next session and not at all this session. At all events, I am instructed to enter the protest of my federation at the short time that has been allowed for consideration of this Bill or for any representations to be made regarding the very necessary amendments required by my federation in the interests of shopkeepers generally. Having stated that about this legislation generally, I desire to place some information at the disposal of the Committee with regard to the Bill itself. When you come to consider what has been done for hotel workers by means of Arbitration Court awards and by legislation, it is no exaggeration to say that hotel workers in this Dominion have received more consideration and greater concessions than any other section of workers. The first award will be found in Book of Awards, Vol. iii, page 288; that award was made in 1902. At that time evidence was led