

agreeable to refer the whole matter to the Arbitration Court and abide by their decision. On the other hand, we say, bring all other classes of seven-days-a-week workers in with us and we are prepared to start off scratch with the rest of them, but we do object to being singled out to first initiate this system of six days a week. The employees of the hotels are already safeguarded quite sufficiently by the awards in force at present.

12. *Mr. Hindmarsh.*] As an abstract question, do you not think that the exclusive right to sell drink should at any rate carry with it the burden of one day's holiday a week to the employees engaged in its sale?—Not at all. If everybody else is brought in we will come in too.

13. Others have not the monopoly you have?—We have to pay for a license which others do not pay.

14. There are about seventy thousand people in Wellington, and they give to about fifty men the exclusive right to sell liquor in Wellington?—Yes, that may be so.

15. Do you mean to say, then, that it is too much to ask you to give your employees one day's holiday a week?—An extra half-day; we already give one half-day.

16. A whole holiday to those engaged in the sale of liquor?—Speaking in an abstract way, I might say that we do not desire to keep our staffs hanging about the premises when we do not require them, and we allow them as much liberty as possible.

17. Is it too much for the Legislature to ask you to give to the employees one day's holiday a week when seventy thousand people in Wellington have given forty-seven hotelkeepers the exclusive right to sell liquor?—I say it is too much.

18. They should not ask you in return to give every man and woman engaged in the sale of liquor one day's holiday a week?—No. We have to pay heavily for our business. We are there for the convenience of the public and must be there day and night, and we must have servants at our beck and call.

19. You are there, unfortunately, to look after the landlord?—If the Legislature would look after the landlord for us we might be able to do something for you.

20. You think the whole matter should be fixed by the Arbitration Court?—Yes.

21. Why not try and bring it about?—We cannot; we are helpless in the matter. That would be a step in the right direction.

22. *Mr. Clark.*] In connection with the provision where one man employs three or less assistants, do you think his family should be counted?—No, I do not. If he employed three he could run his family in, and without paying them wages could still compete with the hotel-keeper or private boardinghouse.

23. Supposing he had three daughters and three paid assistants, you think he should not be exempt?—No; why should there be any exemptions at all?

24. If he had three assistants and his wife working there too?—What they do for their own benefit is a different thing. They might take advantage of a wife or daughter being employed without being counted as an employee—they might take advantage of that to get the benefit of the exemption, and yet be in direct competition with others.

25. You think no place should be closed for one day a week unless every one closes?—What do you mean by closing?

26. To give them one day a week off?—We cannot do it; it is going to cost us too much. We could close the whole hotel.

27. Do you think nobody should get a full day a week off till everybody does?—Yes, that is so. Let them all start off scratch.

28. In the case of those who have got a day a week off, would you make them work seven days till everybody gets the concession?—Who gets one day a week off?

29. Take the printing-office?—That is a different class of business. We are talking about domestic servants.

30. You quoted the ferry service?—Yes, I say, bring those in. If you are going to be logical you must bring them all in together.

31. *Mr. Veitch.*] You remarked that you would be agreeable to closing the hotel: what do you mean?—In closing a hotel people do not quite understand what is meant. The average person thinks that means closing the bar. We have got staffs that run the bar portion of the hotel who are exempted on Sundays. Then we have the domestic part of the hotel that runs the residential portion: that portion of the hotel cannot be closed. To close the hotel for even two hours a day we must have special permission. We must keep open at all times to meet the convenience of the public.

32. You would agree to legislation that would close up the whole hotel for one day?—Yes, so that there would be no meals or anything else to get.

33. How can you afford to do that when you cannot give one day a week?—I would accept the loss provided I can participate in the holiday.

34. You say you can afford the loss by closing the whole hotel for one day, but you cannot afford to give the employees a whole holiday each week?—The position is quite different. If we have to grant a holiday to every one of the staff for a whole day it means that we have to go to the expense of getting some one in their places, but if we could close the whole hotel and keep every one out for the one day there is no extra expense.

35. You must lose the same in the profits if you closed the whole hotel for one day?—If a guest comes into the hotel, and it is the law of the land that he cannot get meals on a Sunday or the holiday, that is different. We are prepared to do that if we can participate in the holiday.

36. You say that the hotelkeepers have made certain agreements—that is to say, entered into leases?—Yes.

37. Your own lease is running out?—Yes, but that is beside the question.