

It would not mean that we should have to give eight of them a holiday on one day of the week only, but each day we should be short of six or eight servants. Of course, you will see that if we did not have the hands there, and if we got others to put in their places, it would simply mean a great inconvenience, not only to ourselves, but to the general public. We generally study the public. The class of people that we get at the Empire and other hotels pay high rates, and naturally expect to be well attended to, and to get every comfort and the best accommodation possible. I mention this to show the inconvenience to which we should be put, and also the general public. I think that, if possible, we should be left as we are now—i.e., under the Arbitration Court award, the conditions being what the Court deemed best. We seem to get on all right with the servants, and they seem to be satisfied.

*Mr. Lodder:* Under the Arbitration Court award, which is in force until March, 1904, we have to give each servant two holidays every three months—that is, if the servant has been three months in one's employ. If the servants do not get the two holidays we have to pay them wages in lieu of them—two days' wages in place of two days' holiday. As a rule, we find it better to pay them the two days' wages than to let them off. Some of them are off, you may say, two hours every day in the week. There is only a certain number of the staff kept on duty continuously, but all have to be there during meal-hours, and attend to the guests at the house. In a house where you have accommodation for 115 or 120 people you want the whole of the staff to attend on those people in order to give satisfaction. It is not only that you could not go out into the street and pick up half a dozen men at half an hour's notice, or anything like that, to take the place of the half-dozen you had let off for the half-day, but probably if you could get them it would capsize the general trade of the house. In fact, if you engage a new servant he has to be at work two or three days before he gets into the proper running of a new establishment. Therefore I hope the Committee will eliminate this clause with regard to hotels from the Bill. It is a clause that has not been asked for by the servants at all. The servants gave their evidence before the Arbitration Court—the type-written copy of the evidence on both sides containing about 150 sheets of foolscap—and the Union agreed to accept the terms, being very pleased that they had the Arbitration Court award; and there has not been any difficulty since the award was made. The servants and the employers seem to work amicably together, and get on very well. I omitted to refer to clause 13. That is a clause relating to barmaids. It mentions "female assistant." That would apply to, say, a small hotel in the country, where very likely the man and his wife were the only ones to look after the establishment, or they may have a daughter a servant. If the female was allowed to be in the bar only from 9 in the morning till 9 at night, and the proprietor himself was sick, there would be no one to attend to the establishment before 9 o'clock in the morning, or after 9 at night; and the Act says that a publican must open at 6 and close at 10. I have no doubt that Mr. Mandel will be able to express himself more clearly than I can do on this point.

*Mr. Mandel:* With regard to barmaids, I see that there is a Bill before the House to abolish barmaids. Speaking so far as the association, of which Mr. Lodder is president and I am vice-president, is concerned, I might say that we have often brought up the subject of a Barmaids Bill. I should say that the provision in this Bill is not workable at all, because if we let the barmaids go at 9 o'clock we should simply have to get other hands for the one hour; and, of course, it would not pay to keep a double staff for the sake of one hour; so we should have to abolish barmaids altogether and replace them with men. That, I think, would place the business on a better footing than if we had to let the barmaids off at 9 o'clock. To have the barmaids there from 9 o'clock to 9 would be of no use at all. I would rather say, "Abolish them altogether," than have them if they could only work those hours. That is all I have to say as far as barmaids are concerned.

*Mr. Taylor:* Do the hotel employees get a half-holiday now at all?

*Mr. Lodder:* No; with the exception of the barmen and barmaids, who are provided for in the Act. They get a half-holiday once every week.

*Mr. Taylor:* But not the other servants?

*Mr. Lodder:* No. They get their holidays according to the Arbitration Court award. If a servant has been in the employ of a man for three months he can either have two holidays or two days' pay. That is an arrangement which the Arbitration Court award allows.

*Mr. Taylor:* Would the closing of the bar altogether on the half-holiday that may be fixed upon help you at all?

*Mr. Lodder:* Not at all.

*Mr. Taylor:* Does the definition of "barmaid" in the present Licensing Act cover the licensee's wife? Is she not exempt?

*Mr. Lodder:* Yes; she is exempt.

*Mr. Taylor:* Do you object to the bar being closed on the day that the other trades observe for their half-holiday?

*Mr. Lodder:* I think so.

*Mr. Taylor:* Why?

*Mr. Lodder:* I suppose it is because it would disarrange the trade and inconvenience the public if the bar were locked up.

*The Chairman:* The question is: Is there any objection, supposing all the shops in the city were to close on Wednesday, to the bars of the hotels being closed also?

*Mr. Lodder:* Yes.

*Mr. Taylor:* What is that objection?

*Mr. Lodder:* Travellers come in by steamers and trains and want refreshment; but, if what you suggest were carried out they would find the bar closed and the barmen gone away. Then, one would have to close up at 1 o'clock—dinner-time—just the busiest time of the day; and there would be no one to supply the gentlemen coming in. They may require lemonade, or ginger-