

Section 28: By the deletion of the whole of this section

Section 29: By adding the words, "On some working-day" before the word "during" in the third line of subclause (a).

Section 31: By deleting section 31 altogether, or, in the alternative, by making the section read, "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any Act or in any award of the Court of Arbitration, the whole of the provisions of this Act shall operate from the day of its commencement, and all awards of the Court of Arbitration shall be deemed to be modified accordingly."

2. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] Are you aware of any country in the world, Mr. Carey, where a Judge has power over the Legislature?—No, I am not.

3. You think it is right that Parliament should be supreme?—I have read in my evidence the legislation of the Mining Act.

4. You consider Parliament qualified to fix the hours of work?—Yes, sir, I believe that Parliament should lay down a general principle, and the Court should be made to conform to the conditions laid down by the statute.

5. Is it the usual custom for Parliament to fix the hours of labour?—Yes, it is growing everywhere. It is being done in all the Australian States, and there has never been any conflict between the Courts and the Legislature, or the Wages Board and the Legislature.

6. Now, what countries in the Australian Colonies have legislation for six days a week?—No country, except that there is a Bill before the Victorian House to-day.

7. Now, in regard to the agreement entered into in New South Wales, how far does it extend?—Just over an area of thirty square miles within the precincts of the metropolitan area of Sydney. I know of no legislation that is not of general effect.

8. I think I can show you some. In Victoria the original Saturday half-holiday is continued. There is no legislation generally affecting the whole of Victoria?—No, except the Bill that is there now.

9. *Mr. Okey.*] Do you object to have two half-days during the week instead of a day?—Yes. This is what the half-day means: it only means two hours. Two half-days would only mean missing two meals.

10. You object to a man's own family—his own children—being employed by him?—Yes; the Arbitration Court and all labour legislation has made it general for the son of a father or the daughter of a father working in his shop to be the same as the ordinary worker. I know a hotel in your district, Mr. Okey, where seven or eight members of a family are employed—Inglewood. Here would be the position: The Inglewood hotel employing members of the family; right opposite a widow woman keeps a hotel employing a staff of four or five hands, and having to observe hours and holidays and other labour regulations, which would be most unfair.

11. *The Chairman.*] You quoted largely from the Italian and French legislation. Do you think the workers on the Continent are living under better conditions than in this country?—Yes, I am satisfied that the hotel workers are as far as holidays go.

12. Do you know how many hours they work in Canada?—No.

13. Do you know they work ten hours a day?—No. We work more than ten hours a day here in some cases.

14. You stated that the People's Palace and the Leviathan charged 5s. a day tariff, and they adopted the same conditions as you ask for?—Yes.

15. You think it is possible that any private hotel could prosper under a 5s.-a-day tariff?—I know, as a matter of fact, the People's Palace is a paying proposition, mainly because it is giving good conditions to its workers. The Salvation Army people have no business control over the People's Palace at all; it is run as a business proposition. The manager assured me of that. They are able to give better conditions than we ask for.

16. You say the brewers are making 20 per cent. You do not think the hotelkeeper is making 20 per cent.?—In many cases the hotelkeeper is manager for the brewery.

17. Do you know of cases where hotelkeepers have tried to sell out and could not do so?—I know of hotels sold for over £2,000 a year goodwill.

18. With regard to a man working a hotel with his family, do you think a man should not have the benefit of employing his family up to a certain age?—I say, if the conditions are fair for somebody-else's son or daughter, then they are fair for a publican's son or daughter.

19. You are not giving encouragement for families under your system?—No, I say it is unfair for a widow woman to have to compete with a hotelkeeper whose hotel is entirely free from legislation.

20. If you had a large family to assist you, you mean to say that you would not consider it hard that you could not utilize their services?—No. In the first place, I would not work them seven days a week.

21. That is not the question. The question is having to comply with the same regulations as a man with no family. Do you not believe in that man having the privilege of employing his children to assist him in business without conforming to hotel regulations?—I say No; where in the hotel business the grown-up children of the licensee are working for the licensee, then that licensee should not be given a privilege over the licensee who has the misfortune not to have a grown-up family.

22. You made a statement in regard to hotels in Westport not under unionism?—I said that until the 1910 amendment to the Shops and Offices Act workers who organized themselves into a union and went to the Arbitration Court to better their hours found that the Court used the legal loophole and imposed longer hours than the Act prescribed, with the result that instead of getting better conditions a section got worse, and really that the result of our organization was an award of thirteen hours in excess of the Act hours governing that section of workers.