

already given or impose worse conditions. I say now to this Committee that rather than get the six-days week at the expense of the minority of our workers who already enjoy a five-and-a-half-days week we would prefer the dropping of the Bill. I know, however, that the Minister would not stand for such an imposition. I merely mention it to prevent a faulty framing of the clause. I wish also to mention here that there are in this city several restaurants which not only close on Sunday, but close altogether on one half-day of the week by rotation amongst themselves, and that all their employees get the half-day then. There is also another defect in this part of the clause, it is the word "exclusively." That word has a very rigid meaning. A barmaid, for instance, could be asked to take the office-work of a hotel for half an hour a week, and then she would not be employed exclusively in a hotel-bar. We suggest the word "substantially" instead of the word "exclusively." There is another alteration we suggest—viz., that the half-holiday for barmen and barmaids should start at 1 o'clock. There is no reason to make it 2 o'clock in the case of workers in bars. Formerly since 1904 it was 1 o'clock, but when the Act was altered to make it 2 o'clock instead of 1 for restaurants, bars were included in the alteration. The barman getting off at 2 o'clock for his holiday has usually already performed eight hours' work. He starts at 6 a.m. Barmen have nothing to do with serving meals at hotels, and it is not fair to keep them till 2 o'clock when every other shop-assistant gets off at 1. Generally and for this part of the subsection we suggest the following wording: "Every assistant who is substantially employed 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, shall be entitled to a full day's holiday on Sunday in each week, and to a half-holiday from 1 o'clock in the afternoon in the case of assistants in hotel-bars, and 2 o'clock in the afternoon in the case of any other assistant, on such working-day in each week as the occupier in the case of each such assistant thinks fit." In this subsection we suggest that the words "or in any hotel or restaurant in which not more than three assistants are employed" be struck out. The hotelkeepers say this means unfair competition, and are opposed to it. It punishes a girl by depriving her of the six-day week merely because she happens to be working for an employer who has not capital enough to buy a business employing four hands. It is easier and less expensive to give a worker in a hotel employing only three hands a day off than it is in a larger place. There is less expert skill required, and generally the three hands are on the same footing. Subsection (5) gives the whole day. It allows of Sunday or any other day being given, and that it is practicable, I have already shown. Subsection (6) is unfair. The sons or daughters of a publican are workers the same as the others in his employ. I know of hotels where there are six and eight of a family employed. It gives such hotelkeeper an unfair advantage in trade. We ask for the deletion of "the children" from the subsection. Section 28 provides for the accumulation of holidays. We ask for its deletion. No worker should be required to work three months, seven days a week, sixty-two hours a week, without even a half-holiday. Under the present Act night-porters get a full day's holiday every two weeks. Their holidays can be accumulated, but very few of the hotelkeepers agree to such accumulation. They give them the day a fortnight. It kills the one day's rest in seven if taken advantage of. In Sydney the hotel workers get a term holiday every six months besides the five and a half days. I am certain that no hotelkeeper would give his employees a fortnight in three months in preference to a day a week. They hope to get the clause altered so as to provide a few days' holiday every three months or annually, instead of the full equivalent of the whole days missed. The hotelkeepers will offer money payment instead of the holiday. I want to impress on this Committee that it is not extra money we want but the holiday, and we want it weekly instead of three-monthly. If money instead of the holiday were permitted all that a hotelkeeper would have to do would be to pay a girl £1 3s. a week instead of £1—engage her at £1 per week and pay her regularly weekly the 3s. for the lost holiday. We ask that the section be struck out. The House divided on it in 1910, and had we lobbied it would have been defeated. The hotelkeepers were not keen on it after their proposal to the Labour Bills Committee to lessen the term holidays was rejected by the Labour Bills Committee. It may be said that provision should be made in the Bill to get over holiday weeks, such as race week in Christchurch. The next section does that. In its general sense it is not a new section as indicated. It only provides for the whole day, instead of the half-day as at present. I drafted the section on the present Act, and Mr. Millar accepted it and thanked us for the suggestion. It overcomes the race week difficulty. As stated, this new section is only altered to provide for the whole day given in section 27. It means that instead of hotel workers in Christchurch at Carnival week getting the whole day in that week they get two days the next week. This section renders the preceding section *re* accumulation of holidays entirely unnecessary. There is a defect in the wording of clause (a) of this section 29. If it is not altered, then, instead of the half-day on Saturday, say, or any working-day of the week for that matter, the Sunday might be given as the whole holiday and the weekly half-holiday lost. We suggest the addition of the words "on one working-day" after the words "a whole day's holidays" in the third line. Section 30, holiday-book: It has been suggested to the Committee that this makes it compulsory for the occupier to fix the holiday beforehand; but it does not. All that is new in the section is that the worker shall sign the book. He only signs on leaving for his holiday, not a week beforehand. At present a holiday-book is kept and the employer always has the choice of the day. Section 31: This section is loosely drafted. It is of no effect. The period for which any award is made is only three years at the utmost. On December next the period for which any award in force in December, 1910, was made will have expired. We ask for the deletion of the section altogether. His Honour Judge Sim, the President of the Arbitration Court, has intimated that it is better for the Court to await the decision of Parliament on this Bill before making any further awards in the trade. We are content, too, with that intimation. It is fair to all parties. The following are the awards and agreements