

31. Dealing with this question of the midday waitresses, the position is that under the first award you had the right to employ these girls between 11.30 and 2 o'clock each day at a certain rate, and the right to employ them overtime on overtime rates?—We did. There was a test case brought in 1910 and it was referred from the Magistrates' Court to the Arbitration Court, and the Arbitration Court just said, "No breach," and since then we have been going on.

32. Then the new award came into force?—Yes.

33. By which the Court put you under the strict law of the Shops and Offices Act?—Yes.

34. Then for some time after that you still continued to do the same with your midday waitresses as you had done previously?—Yes.

35. But some little time ago you were stopped and told you could not do that?—Yes.

36. By whom were you told?—He not only told me but he summoned me.

37. And you were fined?—No, ordered to pay costs. A breach was recorded against me, but I was not fined.

38. What you want is to get back into the position that you were in under the first award?—Yes.

39. And you are quite prepared to pay overtime rates?—Yes, more than that—1s. an hour.

40. Have you any amendment to suggest in the Act by which you think you could do that?—Yes.

41. It is in clause 27 (b)?—Yes, at the end of the subclause we want these words added: "nor for more than fifteen hours in any one week in case of the midday waitresses."

42. You are prepared to pay overtime to midday waitresses after they have worked fifteen hours in any one week?—Yes.

43. You are not, as has been suggested, desiring to increase the time without any limitation, because if those words are inserted there you take it that the limitation provided by the Act—three hours a day, or ninety hours a year—would operate?—Yes.

44. You are quite prepared to accept the limitation?—Yes.

45. *The Chairman.*] Who fixes the overtime at 3s.?—The Labour Department, because they say that we must pay for a day's work.

46. But it is not fixed by any award?—Yes, the award provides for casual labour.

47. *Mr. Long.*] Would you mind pointing out to the Committee what clause in the Bill would prevent you from employing midday waitresses?—It comes in in this way: at the Arbitration Court, when we asked for this privilege, the Judge simply told us that he had wiped it right off and the Shops and Offices Act provided for it.

48. Do you want something inserted in this Bill to override the award of the Court now existing?—If we cannot get anything in the Court we must go somewhere else where we can. We cannot get it put in in the Arbitration Court, and we ask it to be put into this Bill.

49. Is there any other restaurant award in New Zealand where there is provision made for the employment of midday waitresses?—I do not know anything about it. I know it is very much wanted in Auckland.

50. Can you tell us how you came to get it in the first instance?—By an agreement between you people and ourselves at the Conciliation Council.

51. Are you president of the Restaurant-keepers' Association in Auckland?—Yes.

52. When did you last decide to increase the restaurant tariff?—Who said we had increased it at all?

53. Has the tariff in Auckland not been increased?—Not that I know of.

54. Has the sixpenny-restaurant tariff not been increased?—I do not know anything about sixpenny restaurants.

55. You were complaining about the visit of an Inspector: would you mind telling us what Inspector that was?—Mr. Hood, according to the description that my wife gave me.

56. Has Mr. Hood got anything to do with dirty kitchens?—I do not think he has. I do not think he had any right there at all.

57. Are you not making a mistake? Would it not be the Health Department's Inspector?—No. We have those as well. We had the Health Inspector there about a fortnight ago, and he gave us a very good report.

58. You said that action was taken against you some time ago?—Yes.

59. Was that action taken under the Shops and Offices Act or under the award?—I could not tell you. All I know is that I was brought up there, and a breach was recorded against me with 10s. costs.

ALBERT AUGUSTUS BROWN examined. (No. 26.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your business?—Boardinghouse-keeper.

2. Where?—Symonds Street, Auckland—"Stonehurst."

3. Yours is a private boardinghouse?—Yes.

4. I will ask you to make your statement as briefly as possible?—I may say that I have been thirteen and a half years in business. We represent directly thirty boardinghouses, and indirectly this Shops and Offices Bill would affect about one hundred and fifty houses in Auckland. The thirty houses I mention will accommodate, roughly, about two thousand five hundred people, and at exhibition time might cater for three thousand five hundred. The thirty houses would employ about 184 hands all the year round. The increased cost to me if this Bill became law would be about £285 per annum. We have increased our tariff 1s. a day per head as from the 1st June, 1913, and we find that it has made a reduction in the number of our customers very considerably. We were compelled to do it, however, as our expenses were so enormous in comparison with our profits. If it were not that it is exhibition time the public would not pay