

adequate protection for the workers employed in private hotels and boardinghouses. (2.) The injustice of the proposal to extend the daily hours of employment. (3.) The justice of bringing all licensed hotels under subsections (4) and (5) of section 27, as shown by the hotelkeepers' evidence. (4.) The injustice of allowing the aggregation of the half or whole holiday. (5.) The absurdity of section 31, and a necessity for a provision for the Act coming into operation as soon as it receives the signature of His Excellency the Governor. (6.) The necessity for the recasting of section 4 for the purpose of preventing fraud. In conclusion, I desire to state that I am in entire agreement with the amendments suggested by Mr. Carey, and will conclude with thanking the Chairman and members of the Committee for their patience in listening to my lengthy evidence.

2. *The Chairman.*] Mr. Long, can you suggest some limits of time each day during which the hours of employment should be worked? Take the case of a night-porter?—In Auckland the night-porters' daily hours are between 9 p.m. and 9 a.m.

3. The effect of this Bill would be that that man would be expected to work any time—his ordinary daily or nightly hours could be spread over the twenty-four?—A reasonable limitation in the case of a night-porter would be that his actual hours from the time of commencing to ceasing work should not be more than twelve or thirteen. At the present time we find our people working from 6 in the morning to 10 and half past 10 and 11 at night. A barman goes on at 6 in the morning, he works all day, goes off in the afternoon, and is working again at night. It is only a matter of reorganization, so that a man is not on sixteen hours at a stretch.

4. You referred to the United Service Hotel in Auckland: they do not keep boarders, do they?—No.

5. From what I know of the hotel it is not a fair sample to select?—I selected it because there were seven of the hands getting two full days a week off and four hands getting one full day a week off.

6. Now, as to waitresses taking up the duties of the housemaids: do you think they would consent?—Yes, sir; it is done now. The housemaids relieve the waitresses and the waitresses relieve the housemaids.

7. *Mr. Glover.*] Mr. Long, regarding the remarks that you made in reference to Mrs. Dingle, of Onehunga, and Mr. Smith, of Tauranga, what is your opinion—of course, you have had a great deal of experience—so far as the majority of hotelkeepers in Auckland are concerned?—They are generally anxious to conform to the Act.

8. Have you had trouble with the hotelkeepers?—If I did have trouble I did not have it a second time. If we find that there is anything not in accordance with the award we point it out to them and give them an opportunity to rectify the matter, and if they fail to rectify it we institute proceedings against them; but we have never yet instituted proceedings against a hotel-keeper without first giving warning.

9. Have the hotelkeepers in Auckland absolutely carried out every instruction?—Not always.

10. In reference to hotels, boardinghouses, or restaurants where not more than three are employed, you do not intend it to apply to them?—As far as boardinghouses are concerned, the people who employ not more than three are exempt.

11. You do not want that?—No. We have been asked in connection with boardinghouses, where do you intend to draw the line? To show that we were anxious to protect a widow and her family it was our suggestion that there be a limitation of three.

12. I have had intimation from Auckland that it is not understood: they think it is applying to every small boardinghouse?—No.

13. Mr. Godber said he would be glad to see a clause in the Bill to compel every one?—No, we will be satisfied with the limitation.

14. I suppose the employers generally apply to you for a servant: if, now, you find that there is any malingering on the part of any of your people, you would stand by the employer?—Yes, certainly, we have done that in a number of cases. We have rules dealing with a worker who commits a misdemeanour, and in that case he is dealt with by the committee.

15. Is it a fact that a great many housemaids employed in the boardinghouses, in Rotorua especially, are brought down to act as waitresses?—Yes, and the housemaids are in the dining-room every meal-hour; in all the boardinghouses in Rotorua they all come in the dining-room at meal-time to assist.

16. One more question: It was admitted by several of the proprietors of hotels in the evidence given two years ago that the night-porter was one of the most responsible servants they had, inasmuch as he had, practically speaking, charge of the house; he had perhaps a key to the safe and handled the money. Do you think night-porters are paid wages commensurate with their duties?—No, I do not think so at all.

17. *Mr. J. Bollard.*] Mr. Long, you spoke of certain private hotels making their employees work very long hours—the "Glenalvon" and several others. Do these employees get any extra remuneration for these hours?—No; in fact, my evidence will show 15s. for a housemaid—a good deal less than the wages paid in licensed hotels.

18. You positively assert that?—Positively.

19. What proof have you of that?—The evidence given in the Arbitration Court and not refuted by employers.

20. Do you know if they get any longer holidays?—They do not get any holidays in a number of cases. It is a case of working the seven days a week, week after week and month after month, and no holiday.

21. In regard to what you stated about employees changing places, such as housemaids doing waitresses' work, is it a usual thing for barmaids to act as waitresses in the best hotels?—No, it is not.