

23. You do not think that the law should discriminate between organizations and trades that are not organized?—I do not.

24. *Mr. Glover.*] Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Carey as to the Act in regard to fruiterers?—It may be necessary in the fruit trade for the trading-hours to extend over the eight-hour day. It may be necessary, as that gentleman from Auckland stated, to keep open till 11.30; but we say that they ought to readily agree to give us less working-hours than ordinary shop-assistants get. The position has been that the shopkeeper has come along to the Legislature and said, "My shop has to be kept open sixteen hours; I should have the right to have my assistants working all that time."

25. *The Chairman.*] So far as any particular day?—The section 30 is no different except that the workers shall conform to the existing law and that the hotelkeeper shall say which of his assistants shall have the half-holiday and on which day.

26. *Mr. Okey.*] I understand that there is a manager put in the People's Palace Hotel, and that it is worked by the Salvation Army and under no rent?—Yes, the rent is paid. I made particular inquiries of Adjutant Downie himself, and he told me that the hotel was purely a business proposition, and no assistance was given to it by the Salvation Army organization.

27. But do you know if it is rent-free?—No, he pays rent.

28. What amount does he pay?—I cannot say. In the last three years he tells me he has been able to pay up all his back rent.

29. He is paying a fair rent?—Yes.

30. *Mr. Anderson.*] Do you know what percentage he is paying on the capital invested?—I do not know; the manager told me it was a business proposition. You can understand my position: it would not be the thing for me to ask an employer to come and give evidence on our side of the Bill. I have never gone to the other side for assistance.

31. The point we have to get at is, What is the percentage upon the capital invested in that company that it has paid?—I could not say, but I will find out.

32. I think you ought to find out, as unless we know that it is of no value whatever. Have you had any experience of country hotels, Mr. Carey?—Yes.

33. Do you think it is possible in country hotels to give the same privileges to employees that are given in cities?—Yes, easily. It only means a little better management on the part of the proprietor. Mr. Okey smiles, but we know as a fact that all these statements about going bankrupt were made when the half-holiday was proposed.

34. You are not in favour of two half-holidays?—No, we want the whole day.

35. I may as well say I am in favour of six days a week. I asked several men, proprietors of private hotels, what their opinion was. You will be surprised to hear that in every case, with the exception of one where the hotel-proprietor runs his place by the aid of his family, they all said that two half-days was practicable and one whole day impracticable?—It may be that they think it is impracticable, but the fact that it has been done is surely sufficient evidence that it can be done. If it is done in a place like Italy it can be done here.

36. Would you like to live in Italy?—No, but I want to bring New Zealand up to Italy in this matter.

37. *Mr. Clark.*] Do you mean to insinuate, Mr. Carey, that the sons and daughters of hotel-proprietors are not working under as good conditions as those employed?—Well, if there is any paternal feelings between parent and children, I should say, under better conditions.

38. Well, suppose a case (such as I know) of a man with his wife and four of his family working a hotel, if he was compelled to grant these children a full day a week off he would have to employ outside labour, and that would mean he would have to give his profit away. He starts them now in farms out of his profits?—The minute in any statute you give the sons and daughters of an employer a privilege over other workers, then later on others will come in and ask for this to be extended. It is not fair in the interests of the other hotelkeepers who are not so fortunately circumstanced.

39. *Mr. Veitch.*] Do you believe in a parent being allowed to work his children longer hours than he would be permitted in the ordinary way?—No.

40. Assuming that the People's Palace pays a lower rent-value than any other hotel in Wellington, and that that is the reason why the People's Palace are able to give better conditions to their staff than other hotels, would not that be a proof that the workers in establishments other than the People's Palace are being sweated to enable the proprietors to pay the higher rents—in short, that these long hours are due to rents being too high?—Yes. There is this further point, Mr. Chairman: the hotelkeepers will not admit it, but it is a better arrangement than at present. As a matter of fact, in Melbourne to-day, in the larger hotels, the dining-room staff get a six-day week without a law on it.

41. *Mr. Anderson.*] Do you object to families entering into partnership?—No, the moment they do they would be exempt from the provisions of the Act. If the parent is a good parent and a good employer the section cannot be a hardship; it would only affect the unscrupulous parent who would seek to work his sons and daughters such ungodly hours as would injure their health.

42. If he did not have a son or daughter he would have to employ some one else?—He would not be there, probably, otherwise.

43. *The Chairman.*] Do you think a rent based on 6 per cent. excessive?—No.

44. We had evidence the other day here when the rent was something like £75 a week, and that showed 6 per cent.?—It was only an assertion.

45. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] Just one point about Chile: are the majority of hotel employees coloured?—I cannot say. Even if they are they are deemed worthy of legislative protection.

46. *The Chairman.*] I think it is a case of distant pastures looking green?—No, it is a case of cold facts.