

Christchurch do it—can do that, there is nothing to prevent the lesser hotels doing it. In the larger hotels there is more actual work for the housemaids because there are so many boarders and guests coming and going, while the small hotels are mostly drink-shops, and have very few boarders. One thing, however, in this clause 2 has been omitted, we think. We do not see any reason why clubs should not be brought under it. It is a standing disgrace to members of clubs that some of their employees are allowed to work as late as 2 o'clock in the morning. We endeavoured to bring clubs under our award, but the Court held that it could not be done, because they were not run for private profit. That might be so directly, but indirectly the members of clubs derive considerable benefit. But, whether or not, they cannot be called private houses the same as domestic premises, whether they employ housemaids or not, seeing that they employ a considerable number of assistants, there ought to be some legislation to limit the number of hours. We hope earnestly they will be dealt with under this Bill. In connection with clauses 3 and 4 we have no objection to offer. Objection is made to clause 5, increasing the hours of workers in restaurants and tea-rooms. We consider this absolutely unnecessary at the present juncture, taking into consideration that the restaurants in Christchurch work even less than fifty-two hours in some cases, and we should like the sixty and fifty-six hours to apply only to hotels, whether licensed or unlicensed, and a proviso put in stating that the hours for restaurants should be either fifty-six or fifty-two, or we have no great objection to sixty and fifty-two, but we object most strenuously to increasing the hours of the women to fifty-six. I have a table here I want to put in, but I do not think it would be fair, seeing that it was given to me in confidence, to publish the name of the establishment, although I have no objection to members of the Committee getting the name. This table is for a staff of nine workers, and shows the manner in which they work in this particular restaurant:—

Table of Working-hours.

A, B, C, and D.	E, F, G, and H.
Monday, 9 to 7.30.	Monday, 9 to 2.30, 7.30 to 11.30.
Tuesday, 9 to 2.30, 7.30 to 11.30.}	Tuesday, 9 to 7.30.
Wednesday, 9 to 7.30.	Wednesday, 9 to 2.30, 7.30 to 11.30.
Thursday, 9 to 2.30, 7.30 to 11.30.	Thursday, 9 to 7.30.
Friday, 9 to 7.30.	Friday, 9 to 2.30, 7.30 to 11.30.
Saturday, 9 to 11.30 p.m. (two hours off for meals).	Saturday, 9 to 11.30 p.m. (two hours off for meals).
Sunday, off all day.	Sunday, 5 to 10.30 p.m.
Meal-hours in week, 9.	Meal-hours in week, 9.
Half-holiday, 6 hours.	Half-holiday, 6 hours.
Total hours' work, 46½ hours.	Total hours' work, 52½.

Staff to reverse working-hours each week. M. to act as relief waitress, working fifty hours a week.

Half-holidays.—Monday, H, A; Tuesday, E, B; Wednesday, F; Thursday, G, C; Friday, D, M.

There are no housemaids employed in this restaurant.

5. *Mr. Bollard.*] Who cleans up in the morning?—They do that before they leave at night. Another reason why we do not want the fifty-two hours altered is that there would be some little conflict with pastrycooks. In some of the shops pastrycooks are employed, and their award provides for fifty-one hours, not more than ten hours being worked in any one day without overtime being paid for. There is only a difference of one hour a day now, but if one party was going to work fifty-six and the other party fifty-one hours there might be some trouble, especially seeing that the pastrycook is practically assisting the general cook. It may be said that this reduction is unworkable, but I might say the same plea was put forward when we met the employers in conference in connection with the shop conditions. It was held then that it would mean an increased staff, but in no place has there been an increase. It has even been found that the enforced reorganization of the shops has been beneficial. In one of the principal places in Christchurch we have had no trouble whatever because it proved beneficial, for, where they had at one time two men in the pantry, now they only have one working a portion of his time in the pantry, and that meant an increase of pay for one man. The award makes it £1 10s. for the first man and £1 5s. for the second—that is the minimum wage. But what happened in this shop was that they took the head man out of the pantry and gave the second man his wages, £1 10s., and now this head man takes second place in the pantry, inasmuch as he goes back at stated periods of the day and assists; and when there is a rush on. No reduction has been made in his wage. He is now what might be termed a "relief man." He relieves in the bar, helps the hall-porter, and is here and there throughout the establishment. So that there has been no increase in that shop—in fact, if anything, there has been a decrease. In another establishment in Christchurch—I am only quoting the largest at the moment—they have the duties set out for every individual, and the plan acts in the same manner as in the restaurant I referred to. They are not referred to by their names, but as No. So-and-so, and the one who is working certain hours to-day takes up other hours the following day. Every minute of the day is accounted for, and there is a schedule for the kitchen staff, for the hall-porter, steward, head porter, second porter, wine waiter, and buttons, and the full sixty-five hours are taken. I made inquiries as to whether it was possible to work sixty hours, and I was informed there was no trouble about it. There was a little shifting off here and a little shifting off there as far as the men are concerned; and, as for the women, they do not believe they work sixty hours at the present juncture, or anything like it. I put in a copy of the working regulations of that place.