

31. Do you indorse the evidence of Mr. Carey, not that the number of weekly hours should be reduced, but that there should be one clear day free from work?—Yes.

32. If the same number of hours were worked by each employee, can you see where it is going to greatly increase the cost to the employer?—I do not see that it would increase the cost very greatly. Take the case that was quoted of the hotel. Say there are twenty-eight employees in any one establishment, and it is necessary for each one of them to get a full twenty-four hours off in the week. To do that it would mean four to be off each day, and that might mean the engagement of another four in order to relieve them; but I think the relieving work could be very well done by two.

33. With reference to the distribution of milk: Within your knowledge are there a large number of casual workers who do odd jobs in various kinds of work, and would that class of labour be available for taking up the running of milk-walks?—Yes, there are always a certain number of employees looking for work in connection with the delivery of milk who would be available to take up the runs of milkmen. But, as I said before, there is very little in learning a milk-run. As long as a man knows the streets or something of the city, he can go a round once with the man in charge of the run, and pick it up in one round. If there were six rounds he could learn them all in a week.

34. *The Chairman.*] Do you object to the delivery of milk being exempt from the Bill—it is exempted now?—Yes, certainly.

35. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you not think there would be considerable difficulty with regard to boats—because the engineer has to be considered as well as the fireman and greaser. Would there not be considerable difficulty in replacing such men, having regard to the class of labour?—No, I do not think there would be a great deal of difficulty. Most of the intercolonial liners carry five engineers. It would be quite competent, when the vessel is in Auckland, in the case I quoted, from Sunday until Tuesday, for half of them to be off for the full twenty-four hours between Sunday and Monday, and the other half later on; or it would be competent, and could be worked, for the whole of the engineers to be away from midnight on Sunday to midnight on Monday and the vessel's engines to be left in charge of one engineer. There is no work to do of importance.

36. But there are repairs sometimes going on?—They could be done in the course of the week on working-days.

37. It is necessary sometimes to open up the machinery?—It is not always necessary to open everything up. The vessel does not leave Sydney until the Wednesday after arrival on Friday, and if there was anything to be done it could be done while the vessel was in Sydney.

38. *Mr. McLaren.*] Do you agree with the exemption of domestic servants from this Bill?—No, I see no substantial reason why that class of worker should be excluded from the concession proposed in the Bill.

39. *The Chairman.*] Have the domestic servants a union here?—They have a union.

40. Are they federated with your council?—No.

---

WEDNESDAY, 17TH NOVEMBER, 1909.

WILLIAM LAUGHTON JONES examined. (No. 3.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A seaman by profession, representing the Wellington Tramway Union just now. I might say I am representing the Wellington employees, although I am secretary of the Federation of New Zealand. The Federation has not yet considered the matter, therefore the evidence given now is simply from the union itself.

2. What is the membership of your union?—450-odd.

3. Has this Bill been considered by the union?—Yes.

4. And they authorised you to appear for them?—They have authorised me to appear before this Committee by resolution. They affirm the principle of the Bill, but considered they could not go far into it on account of the lack of machinery clauses. The union thinks that if the machinery clauses were put in and things were made clearer they would better understand the Bill, but they affirm its principle. What they are very much afraid of is that, in the event of the Bill being carried and becoming law, it might create a reduction in their wages, and they consider that that is the main thing they have to guard against. If the Bill could be made law without any great loss to them on their present wages, then they would be very pleased to see it passed. I might say that all the men for three consecutive Sundays are on duty, then on six alternate Sundays they are on duty again, so that during the greater part of the year their Sundays are occupied by work.

5. Do they get a day off during the week?—No, but they get paid not by the week, but by the hour; and the men consider that were it not for the extra emolument for the Sunday labour the job would not be worth having. If machinery clauses are put into the Bill by which the men will not lose pecuniarily what they are enjoying at the present time, then they are decidedly in favour of the Bill going through.

6. What do they suggest?—They did not go into that matter at all, because the Bill seemed to them to be lacking in machinery clauses. They did not attempt to put anything into shape. I suggested that a committee should be set up to draft something, and they agreed; but that committee will not meet until Monday week.

7. Do I understand that they have set up a committee to consider the Bill and make suggestions with regard to machinery clauses?—Not to consider the Bill, but to frame something that might be utilised.