

are prepared by the cook in the morning, and then the housemaids and pantrymaids can run the business quite easily without the waitresses or the cooks.

28. It would be quite impossible to arrange in that way if you had to let a cook off for the whole day?—They could not do that.

29. The point is that while it is practicable for a half-day it is absolutely impossible for a whole day?—Yes.

30. *Mr. Long.*] I understand you to say that you represent the Auckland boardinghouse-proprietors?—Yes.

31. Do you know whether or not the boardinghouse-proprietors that you represent give the half-holiday to their servants?—As far as I know they do.

32. Does the proprietress of "Glenalvon" give a half-holiday to her servants?—She does not do it, perhaps, in the way that I do.

33. If I were to say that she did not, could you say of your own knowledge that I was not stating what was correct?—I could not declare that, because I do not know. I know that she gives a half-holiday, but she gives it in a different way from me.

34. You are opposed to boardinghouses being brought under the provisions of this Bill?—Yes.

35. You are opposed to boardinghouse servants getting protection of any kind?—I do not say that.

36. As one of the assessors before the Conciliation Council did you not oppose the servants getting the protection of the Arbitration Court?—I opposed their being brought under the Arbitration Act, yes. I have done so all along.

37. So that you are opposed to the servants getting protection under the Arbitration Act, and also the protection of the Shops and Offices Act?—I am not opposed to their getting protection at all.

38. Are you opposed to the servants employed in the boardinghouses of Auckland getting either the protection of the Arbitration Act or the protection of the Shops and Offices Act?—Certainly I am.

---

CHARLES GROSVENOR made a statement and was examined. (No. 27.)

*Witness:* I am secretary of the Auckland Provincial Employers' Association, and also secretary of the Auckland Private-hotel Keepers' Association and of the Restaurateurs' Association. I am here to support the evidence given by our president, Mr. A. A. Brown, on behalf of the private-hotel and boardinghouse keepers, and also that of Mr. Prior, president, and Mr. Whitehead, one of the executive, of the Restaurateurs' Association. I, as having been secretary for a number of years, hereby certify that the evidence given by them is substantially correct. I now proceed to give evidence on behalf of the Auckland Master Butchers' Association, of which I am secretary. Clause 4 (1) (b): "The kind of work on which he is from time to time employed." The butchers desire that that should be put back again to "the kind of work on which he is usually employed." The alteration of the wording will mean very considerable nuisance and impracticability. A butcher's assistant may be changed about a number of times in a day from different classes of employment, and obviously it would entail a very great amount of unnecessary book-keeping if the employer had to keep a record for every hour that the assistant might be changing his job. Butchers' assistants are classified as order men, first-goods men, small-goods men. They are put here and there—it may be two hours at one time and three hours at another. Obviously it is impossible to keep a record. With reference to subclause (3) of the same clause, the Bill provides for the preserving of the old time and wages books for a period of two years. I submit that that is not at all necessary, because under the Arbitration Act unless action be taken within six months it is absolutely dead, so to keep the records longer than six months is quite unnecessary. I desire to express the wish, on behalf of the butchers, that the provision in section 3 and section 6 (4) of the Act itself, wherein reference is made to the operation of the Act being subject to awards of the Arbitration Court, should be retained as it was prior to the amending Act of 1910 being passed. Clause 8, subclause (1), (c): "A shop-assistant shall not be employed in or about the shop or its business for more than five hours continuously without an interval of at least one hour for a meal." I respectfully urge that after the word "meal" the following words be inserted: "Provided that the meal-hours for butchers' assistants may be regulated in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon between each employer and his individual workers to suit the exigencies of the trade." The reason for bringing this so pointedly before you is that, if the clause as it stands becomes law, on every working-day in every part of the Dominion butchers must commit a breach of the Act. I have had the privilege of occupying the position of secretary of the Master Butchers for ten years, and know what I am speaking about. The custom obtaining during all my time as secretary, and long before that, is that the workers start, and must start, at about 6 o'clock in the morning.

1. *Mr. Veitch.*] Have you not the right to start them before?—We have, but we never do. We are desirous to have the hours of the Act retained, because there are occasions when we may want them to work earlier, as when a ship comes in. It might be done, but it is not the rule by any means; 6 o'clock is the usual starting-time, and to my knowledge is observed. The men work on from 6, and are allowed half an hour off for breakfast at about 8 or half past. Those men then continue right on till, it may be, 12 or 1 o'clock, when they have their midday meal. I submit that in working the men like that the employers are committing a breach of this clause. It is merely a matter of the Inspector "winking the other eye," or he must prosecute them almost every day. It has never been operative. We urge that the law be so amended that the butchers shall