

21. *Mr. Carey.*] Do you employ a domestic servant?—I am a lone bachelor.

22. Do the people who employ domestic servants compete with each other?—The boarding-house-keepers that employ domestic servants do.

23. Supposing Parliament wants to make sure that the widow and daughter keeping a boardinghouse shall not be affected by the hours regulation in this Bill, what better definition than the one proposed in the Bill can you suggest?—The only definition I could suggest is to leave out all the exemptions which I understood you were in favour of.

24. You say the hotelkeepers in Christchurch want no exemptions in the Bill at all?—Precisely.

25. Do you know that the licensee of the Clarendon Hotel in Christchurch gave the employees one whole day a fortnight for some time?—Yes, under Mr. Collins's management.

26. And it worked all right?—No, it worked badly. It was his intention if he remained in the hotel to give up the system.

27. Who stopped the practice?—Mr. Price, I believe.

28. You spoke about board and lodging for employees. As a matter of fact, board and lodging under the award is part of the wages, is it not?—Well, I suppose it is.

JOHN HENRY PAGNI examined. (No. 33.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am secretary of the Auckland Licensed Victuallers' Association, which comprises as near as possible eighty hotels, and I am also licensee of the British Hotel, Auckland. The position to my mind has been made so clear by the previous speakers that it has left very little for me to add. The Auckland hotelkeepers have gone fully into the question of exemptions, and they hold that there should be no exemptions whatsoever. If there are exemptions made in the case of an employer who has three assistants or less that employer will find that he will not be able to obtain any labour at all, because no one would work there when he could get employment at another place for six days a week instead of seven. It would be unfair to have any exemptions in the Bill, and we consider it should be the same with all. We did not know in Auckland until Saturday last that this matter was coming up so soon, so I managed to visit some hotelkeepers and get statements from them as to the extra cost which would be entailed if this Bill were put into force. In the case of the Star Hotel I obtained a statement which shows that the extra cost would amount to £8 2s. 6d. per week, or £422 10s. per annum; for the Albert Hotel the extra cost would be £6 12s. 6d. per week, or £344 10s. per annum; and in the case of the Royal Hotel £9 10s. per week, or £494 per annum. Then, taking my own hotel, which is somewhat small, if the present Bill becomes law I would have to engage two extra hands, which would mean an extra cost of £237 per annum. Regarding the question of the suggested amendments in the Bill, the Auckland association considers that something should be done by Parliament on the lines indicated by Mr. Beveridge.

2. *Mr. Windmarsh.*] Your trade resists every change in regard to the conditions of the employment of servants?—Somewhat.

3. Now, is not your opposition to this Bill very much of the same class as your opposition to the Bill relating to the employment of barmaids?—Not necessarily.

4. You know that public sentiment in New Zealand is opposed to the employment of women in bars?—I do not think so.

5. Parliament has tried twice to bring it about?—That does not prove anything.

6. Your association in Auckland has fought this matter there?—Yes, and rightly so.

7. Why?—On a question of principle that it was taking away the right of women to do that kind of work. We hold she is just as much entitled to earn a living as anybody else.

8. The same kind of opposition is shown to this Bill as to the Bill relating to the employment of girls?—What we say is that if there should be six working-days a week let us as employers have the same privilege as the employees. We are on duty practically from the 1st January till the 31st December, and if we get away for half an hour or half a day and something happens we are held responsible. Take my place in Auckland: I am responsible for everything whilst here giving evidence.

9. You are opposed to this Bill on principle, you say?—I say if any law is to be put on the statute-book it should apply to the whole community.

10. Your association opposed the non-employment of women in bars on principle?—Quite so.

11. And we may take it that a similar principle is behind your opposition to this Bill?—Yes. It is not workable.

12. *Mr. Clark.*] Do you not think it is possible to increase the tariff?—I do not think so. If you remove the restrictions against the trade probably we might be able to, but with the restrictions placed upon the trade since the local-option poll has been in existence we cannot call our souls our own.

13. Are you not going to increase the tariff at exhibition time?—It has been suggested, but no one has done so. You cannot put it into operation.

14. *Mr. Grenfell.*] With regard to engaging additional hands to provide for the holiday, in the employment of an extra man in the kitchen you would have your other wages affected by the fact of there being an extra man there?—Quite so.

15. Would not that mean that the wages of the other men in the kitchen would go up?—Yes. Under the present award in Auckland, which is applicable pretty well throughout the Dominion, if you have three or four hands the wages go up.

16. With an extra man in the kitchen it would mean that the wages of the man above him would go up?—Yes.