

the time being, and any such book used within the two years immediately preceding the date of inspection, shall be open to the inspection of the Inspector at all reasonable times." We think that two years is too long a period to go back for records of this kind. We think that six months would be a reasonable time. Six months is the period, I think, in which one can sue for recovery of wages, and it should be in keeping with that. I go on to clause 9: "In order to prevent any evasion or avoidance of the limitation imposed on the employment of shop-assistants, the following provisions shall apply in the case of every shop-assistant: (a.) The shop-assistant shall not be employed in or about the shop or its business during meal-times, or during the intervals for rest and refreshment. (b.) The shop-assistant shall be deemed to be employed in the shop if he in fact does any work in or about the shop, whether the occupier has assented thereto or not." Now, in the reference to hotels, commencing at clause 26, clause 9 is not included with the exceptions. Clause 26 says, "Except as otherwise specially provided, sections five to eight, section ten, sections twelve to nineteen," &c., "shall not apply to hotels and restaurants or to the assistants therein." That clause 9 must be included as an exception, because we feed our staffs and they live on the premises. If it were not included we should be open to prosecution. That clause 26 should read "sections five to ten." I notice that in clause 27 (c) they have allowed us the extra hour, "for more than eleven hours (excluding meal-times) in any one day." I will pass over clause 30 in the meantime. Clause 28: "(1.) In lieu of allowing a half-holiday or a whole holiday as aforesaid, it shall be lawful for the occupier of a hotel or restaurant to allow to any assistant, by mutual agreement, leave of absence on full pay at the ordinary rate for a period of seven days (including Sunday) in every three months in the case of assistants to whom subsection four of the last preceding section applies, and for a period of fourteen days (including Sundays) in every three months in the case of assistants to whom subsection five of that section applies." That means that in a year those of the staff who care to take accumulated holidays will get two months on full pay. I do not know if any professional man in the city gets two months on full pay. Accumulated holidays are of more value than a holiday once a week, and therefore the accumulated time should be lessened. I think a reduction to fourteen days in every twelve months would be a reasonable thing, because there is no provision made that the members of the staff could not remain on the premises for the two months and have their meals. It is giving them a very big pull over us to ask that they shall have eight weeks on full pay in every twelve months. We propose that there should be some substantial reduction in the accumulated holidays, say to fourteen days a year.

5. *Mr. Veitch.*] Does that mean instead of the six-days-work-a-week proposal?—Instead of the one day off every week. Then, with regard to clause 30: "(1.) In every hotel and restaurant the occupier shall at all times keep in an approved holiday-book a record of the working-day in each week fixed for the half or whole holiday of each assistant. The record shall at all times be open to inspection by any assistant employed by the occupier, or by an Inspector, and shall be signed by each assistant before entering upon his half or whole holiday." The word "fixed" there presents a very serious difficulty to us, because from the exigencies of our business we cannot say on which day of the week the chief cook, or the second cook, or a housemaid, or any one of our staff shall have the holiday. It could be read in that way. We propose that the granting of the holiday should be left to mutual arrangement, and so long as the employee gets that holiday it should be quite sufficient. Perhaps it would be better if the clause were to read, "a record of the working-day in each week on which the assistant has had his or her holiday." It would not be necessary then to make a hard-and-fast rule as to which day any member of the staff should go off duty. We are there at the beck and call of the public, and we have to work our staffs just as the business will allow us. Clause 30: "(2.) Every assistant who fails to sign the record as provided by the last preceding section, or who signs any incorrect record, is liable to a fine of one pound." That throws the onus on the employee; before it was on the employer. I am glad to note that alteration. Now I should like to refer to clause 27, subclauses (4) and (5): "(4.) Every assistant who is employed exclusively in or about a bar or private bar of a hotel, or who is employed in a restaurant which does not carry on business on a Sunday, or in any hotel or restaurant in which not more than three assistants are employed, shall be entitled to a half-holiday from two o'clock in the afternoon of such working-day in each week as the occupier, in the case of each such assistant, thinks fit. (5.) Every assistant employed in or about a hotel or restaurant other than assistants to whom the last preceding subsection applies shall be entitled to a whole holiday of twenty-four hours commencing at his usual hour for commencing work on such day in each week as the occupier, in the case of each such assistant, thinks fit." That we object to. We do not object to the principle of a six-day week—that we believe in; but we do object, and most emphatically object, to the licensed victuallers being singled out to grant this six-day week. If it is to be made universal, if everybody is to be brought into line, then we have no argument and we must give way to it. But we do think there is going to be a hardship created if this is going to be imposed on the hotelkeepers of the Dominion.

6. Do you wish us to strike out line 37—"other than assistants to whom the last preceding section applies"?—No; we desire to be exempt altogether.

7. If that line were struck out it would read, "Every assistant employed in or about a hotel or restaurant shall be entitled to a whole holiday," &c.?—We do not want to give the whole holiday. We want to remain as we are for the half-holiday. We do not believe in being picked out and asked to grant what one might call an innovation. If it is logical that the staffs of hotels should be protected, then I think it is even more logical that the seven-day workers in other employments should be protected. For instance, domestic servants—they are more entitled to protection than the employees in hotels, who are safeguarded by all sorts of laws, such as the Licensing Act and the Police Act. We are safeguarded in many ways, whereas servants in private