

561. Allegations were also made in evidence before us that the dregs were used for bottling beer, but the witness who made the allegations would not supply specific instances, and we did not pursue this matter (R. 2419, 2434, and 2435).

562. Strong allegations, which we think are well-founded, have also been made to us concerning the dirty water in the sink in the bars for washing glasses and the dirty towels for drying them (R. 2560 and 2736). It is apparent that at rush hours in some hotels it is difficult to get hot water. Between 4 and 6 p.m. it may be required by the chef. Some hotels have an independent hot-water system for the bars. Some hotels have no hot water at all for washing glasses.

563. It is a fair inference from the evidence as to the conditions in the bars that their inspection by the Health Department has not been satisfactory. To carry out an efficient inspection, an Inspector would need to be on the premises after closing-hours. The need for better control may also be inferred from the detailed suggestions for the improvement of hygiene in bars made by the Federated Hotel Workers' Union (R. 7147).

564. We conclude :—

(1) There is need for effective measures to prevent the use of dregs. If drip trays are permitted, it should be compulsory to have in them Condy's crystals. Alternatively, the drip tray might be so constructed that the dregs could run away as they fell, but the outlet pipe would need to be fashioned so that it could not be readily blocked.

(2) There is need for more effective supervision of bars by the Health Department. Visits should be sufficiently frequent and at irregular intervals and sometimes at and shortly after the closing-hour.

(3) There is need for proper hot water and sterilizing-plants in the bars just as in milk-bars; need also for more clean towels. "Hot water," it should be noted is defined by the regulations to mean "water of such temperature that all grease and fat is at once liquified and removed from the surface of articles which are plunged therein" (Reg. 7 (8) of the Regulations under the Health Act 1920—*N.Z. Gazette*, 1924, p. 1712).

CHAPTER 28.—THE SAME PRICE FOR DIFFERENT MEASURES

565. There is widespread public dissatisfaction with the method of charging the same price for a 12 oz. handle and a glass of any lesser quantity. Practically all classes of workers, other than those directly connected with the trade, are opposed to a practice which would not be tolerated with other goods. On the face of it, it is absurd that the same price should be charged for a 12 oz. handle of beer as for a 5 oz. glass of beer. Another reason against the practice which was given by a witness with an apparent knowledge of drinking habits was that the present system tended to increase drunkenness, because the drinker tended to seek the best value he could get (R. 2424).

566. In 1935 the Labour Department considered the question whether the retail trade in alcoholic liquor could be regulated under the Weights and Measures Act, 1908. That Act applies only where goods are sold by standard weight and measure (R. 757). The Department ascertained at that time that it was not the custom in New Zealand for liquor to be sold by standard weight and measure. Beer was sold by the handle, which was reputed to contain 12 fluid ounces, or by a medium glass or a pony glass. Orders were sometimes given for "long beers" or "medium beers" or "small beers." None of these represented standard measure.

567. Spirits, the Department was apparently informed in 1935, were not sold by measure at all. It was said that when a customer asked for whisky, the bottle was placed in front of him and he poured out what he wanted. Subsequently an American type of measure, known as a "nip," was used. Though there were so-many nips to the bottle, the nip was not a standard measure (R. 757).

568. The Labour Department did not proceed with its proposal to fix standard measures.