

6. The working-day is desired to be exempted. In section 3 it means any day except Sunday. If this be omitted, does it not mean that you can give every hotel employee Sunday as a holiday?—Not every one of them.

7 So far as the Act is concerned, would not that be the effect if you strike that out? Take the case of the night-porter, you could give him the whole of Sunday?—If you permit me to go back a bit in regard to the question of the night-porter, if the holiday in respect to the night-porter is not defined it renders it very awkward for us, because it limits us to five days in the week. He generally starts at 10 o'clock at night, and finishes at 8 in the morning. If he starts on Saturday night it may be assumed that he was working on part of Sunday. If we give it on Sunday night he was also working part of Sunday. You are limiting us to five days in regard to him.

8. I do not want it widened out too much, but we must try and do something to meet such a case?—It only deals with night-porters.

9 Section 8 you say is impracticable?—For the reasons I stated.

10. If the other suggestions made by you are approved of by the Committee, how would it meet the case if section 8 were amended to put in a proviso that the holiday-book should be kept, and signed by every assistant when getting a holiday?—We are doing that now.

11 If we put that into the Act it would give the protection that is necessary?—We are doing that now for our own protection, but what you say would be a simple way out of it. The onus is on the employee to come along and sign for his holiday.

12. Supposing we allow, instead of fixing a day, that a half-holiday should be given in accordance with the requirements of the trade. The man should duly sign that book when he goes off?—At 2 o'clock, when he takes his holiday. That is a protection for both sides. That will get over the difficulty easily.

13 If he is told in the morning that he must go off at 2, he signs this book?—The way we have it at present is that every day is ruled off with sufficient spaces to allow of a number going. Sometimes I have eight or ten off in the one day.

14. That will be all right so long as we have a check?—It will be a hardship to do what is required here.

15. I understood from the evidence given last year that neither one side nor the other was particularly anxious about clause 7?—The small hotelkeepers want it. In the case of large hotelkeepers it does not matter much. In my case I have two night-porters, and I can with very little hardship make one man do the work of the two; but, as Mr Dwyer will point out, it will be a hardship in the case of the smaller ones.

16. You would be quite agreeable to have the sixty-two hours for males and fifty-eight for females?—It will take some working in, but we are quite prepared to meet you in the matter.

17 *Mr Luke* ] How often do you want these eleven-hour shifts for rush days?—We could not take very much advantage of it, because we should have to square that up again in the week. It would only occur now and again, in the case of a big dinner or a rush of that kind. We should have to pay overtime in any case.

18. Assuming in the case of the big hotels that the occupier should be the determining factor in regard to the term holidays, I suppose that would be necessary on account of confusion which might arise should two or three want to get away together?—Half our staff might come along and ask to do so. For instance, we might have half a dozen sports amongst the waiters, and they might come along simultaneously and say, "We want to get away to the races next week." You can see that it would constitute a breach of the Act if we refused it.

19 You were satisfied that it would be quite sufficient if you sent a notification to the Inspector afterwards that it had been done?—We only want to make the Act workable. Under the other circumstances it would not be so.

JOSEPH DWYER examined. (No. 7)

1 *The Chairman.* ] You wish to make a statement, Mr Dwyer?—I am one of the committee of the Local Licensed Victuallers' Association appointed to come here and speak on behalf of the smaller hotels—principally in relation to the question of the night-porter. In Wellington there are only four hotels that have two night-porters, and it would not put these hotels to a great deal of trouble to give their men a full night off, because they have another to fall back upon. In regard, however, to the smaller hotels, we would rather have the term holiday, because we should have to have a man in charge, and it would not do to leave a stranger in that position, particularly in a wooden house such as my own. If we had the option of four days in three months, that would meet the case. We would put in a man to take charge of the house, and that sort of provision could work during that period. That applies to fourteen hotels in Wellington.

2. *Mr Fraser.* ] You were speaking of section 7?—Yes. For that reason we would ask for the term holidays. We would much rather give our men the term. The position of night-porter is one of trust, and you must have a man who will keep awake—a good man and an honest one—and the danger in regard to fire is what I look to. We require a man who will give an alarm in case of fire; and out of the fourteen hotels in this position there are about eight wooden houses. That is why we ask for the term holidays. We could put another man in, and the man in office would get the benefit of his holiday. I do not know really how the smaller hotels would get over the difficulty if you do not.

3 With regard to clause 6, you heard just now Mr Millar's question with regard to striking out the words "on such working-day." Would that not enable you to give the whole holiday on Sunday?—This clause specifies night-porters, and is confined to them particularly. It would, I take it, enable the hotel-proprietors to give the night-porter his holiday on that particular night,