

preceding these days respectively." Well, they should be paid for that. We believe that they have no right to work the men on New Year's Eve and Christmas Eve—exceptionally heavy days—without paying for it.

2. Supposing they received an equivalent holiday, what then: even then they should be paid?—Yes. Working under pressure as they do they cannot enjoy the holiday. I have seen numbers of my union as limp as worn-out rags, unable to use it. We consider there should be some relief when they work under pressure. Subsection (3), section 8: "Provided that the hours of employment under this subsection shall not exceed the hours limited by paragraph (a) of the last preceding subsection by more than three hours in any one week." The grocers' assistants had to work under that until the award superseded it, but we are not in favour of working overtime. There should be some system of regulation for overtime, and we believe this should be safeguarded by the use of permits by the Inspector of Factories, the same as in clause 27, subsection (2). This provides for hotels: "Such working-hours may be extended for not more than three hours in any one day, nor more than ninety hours in any one year. Written notice of the extended time worked is to be given to the Inspector within twenty-four hours thereof." We consider the shops should be under the same regulations as hotels. There is too much trusting to the honour of the shopkeepers. They are only human. In fact, the hotelkeepers have a higher character. They are the best characters you can put into the business, according to the papers they have to furnish. Yet we cannot trust these men of honour, but the shopkeepers are treated on their word of honour. Shops should be treated as hotels, and overtime regulated by permits. From 9 down to the end of 10 we consider reasonable, but with regard to 10 it is more often honoured in the breach than in the observance. The provisions are right—they can be enforced—but there are shops in which seating-accommodation is provided, but heaven help the woman who avails herself of it! They are not allowed to use these seats, and if they do a system of signalling is resorted to. The word goes along, "Hist, here comes the shop-walker!" and they start up till he goes by; but they need it all the same. Clause 12, the weekly half-holiday: The only thing in that I would like to see is a new clause for a compulsory Saturday half-holiday in the four chief centres.

Mr. Okey: You will never get it in.

Witness: It is merely a suggestion on my part.

Mr. Okey: It is left to the people.

Witness: It is in force in Melbourne and Sydney under the Act.

Mr. Okey: We tried it here, but the House would not support it. I moved and voted for it myself.

Witness: The intervening clauses up to page 11 we have no objection to, but in clause 17 (I am speaking now personally) I say there will be a difficulty in administering the latter part of subclause (a): "Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not be deemed to authorize a book-stall keeper on a railway-station or wharf to carry on his business on the Saturday closing-day except for the purpose of supplying *bona fide* passengers." The Devonport Ferry Company issue annual family tickets, and it would be very hard indeed to differentiate between them and casual on the wharf.

3. Mr. Anderson.] Does the union require the book-stall on the railway-station to be closed?—No, I do not think they should be, and if necessary the ticket should be produced; but there is a difficulty where it says "*bona fide* passengers" on the ferry steamers where families are carried for £5 a year.

Mr. Davey: Well, we can take a note of the objection.

Witness: Then, page 12, clause 18, subclause (c)—we approve of that: "Where any such special day falls on a Monday the occupier of a shop that is usually closed for a half-holiday on Saturday may, if he observes a whole holiday on Monday, keep his shop open on the Saturday next preceding such special day, provided that he has closed his shop at one o'clock in the afternoon of some other working-day in the week." That is a new provision, and it will settle the vexed question as to which day a man can keep open as a compensation. Then, clause 20, the 11th line: "Where a person is the occupier of both a shop and a factory, and employs any person partly in one establishment and partly in the other, such last-mentioned person shall for the purpose of the Act be deemed to be employed exclusively in that part of the establishment in which he is chiefly employed as certified by the Inspector." I would like to compare this with clause 21 of the 1908 Act. This is an extension of the clause to cover the purposes of the whole Act, whereas in the 1908 Act, clause 21, the words were, "for the purposes of the weekly half-holiday and the wages therefor." Now it is proposed to increase it for the purpose of this Act. We object to increase the scope of the clause, because it was clear that so long as the half-holiday and the payment for the half-holiday were not called into question they were treated the same as other shopkeepers. Now it is "for the purposes of this Act," which widens the scope. And then, in regard to clause 33, there is a further sweeping provision that the offices and shops shall be closed "not later than one o'clock," but this proviso takes away the provision. The union wants to know whom this clause does not exempt: "Provided that this section shall not apply to shipping, railway, tramway, mining, newspaper, telegraph agencies, cable companies or telegraph companies' offices, or offices of freezing companies, or offices of forwarding agencies, or offices of solicitors, auctioneers, banks, Harbour Boards, insurance companies, wholesale warehousemen, wool-brokers, wool-buyers, or miners' unions." There are very few people the Act would refer to after these exemptions were made. Why exempt the miners' unions more than other trade-unions? We say, if it applies to the miners' unions, it should apply to all offices. Take my office: I am not allowed to have a girl back. Why should miners' unions be allowed to bring back their employees? I do not want to bring my girl back, but why provide a loophole?