

69. *The Chairman.*] You heard Mr. Brown's evidence the other day; you remember that he stated that he gave his servants a good deal of time off?—Well, you see the position is this, Mr. Chairman: Mr. Brown has a large business and he employs a large staff; he is only one instance of the boardinghouse people in Auckland who gives his staff a weekly half-holiday. I must admit that Mr. Brown has tried to be fair in that respect.

70. I wanted to make that point clear, as I thought you included Mr. Brown among the sweaters. You recognize that he gives all the time off he can?—I recognize that he gives some concessions, whereas some give none.

*Witness* here stated that he would like to put in a petition.

*The Chairman:* That should be put through the House.

*Witness:* I want to ask the Committee to compare the signatures on the front page of our petition with the signatures handed in by the proprietress of the Hotel Bristol.

*Mr. Massey:* I think the Committee might accept it.

*Witness:* There are eleven hundred signatures there.

Hon. J. BARR, M.L.C., examined. (No. 44A.)

*Witness:* I am secretary of the Canterbury Hotel and Restaurant Employees' Union. I will endeavour to be brief in what I have to say, and I can do so best by saying this morning that I have read the evidence of Mr. Carey and the evidence given by Mr. Long, and as far as it affects the Bill before you, and as far as it concerns the hours of work in private hotels and boardinghouses, the evidence submitted by Mr. Long this morning can be borne out by me. I would like to point out that the class of workers that I represent and that it is intended to deal with under this Bill are the only workers who are asked to work 365 days in the year. Now, I do not think it often strikes people that here in this country the general public do ask employees in hotels to work 365 days. There is no such thing as one day of rest in the seven, neither is there any stipulation in any award, nor is it set forth in this particular Bill, that there should be any provision for holidays for those workers, whereas for other shop-assistants that are provided for under this Act holidays are provided for them. I want to draw attention to that fact, Mr. Chairman, to show that it is a fair claim that we have been making this number of years for one complete day in seven. Now, I might refer to a matter that was dealt with by Mr. Long, a matter that I had some experience with in Christchurch. He dealt with the fact that in the matter of private hotels the Judge had refused to give an award. There was some little confusion, I have not the slightest doubt, in the minds of some people relative to this matter so far as it affected Auckland, as numbers were under the impression that it only affected boardinghouses—that is to say, those large places that charge the moderate fees (as submitted by one member) of £28 for four days. But in Christchurch and in Wellington I am aware they do supply meals to those not residing on the premises. In Christchurch I approached the Court and asked for an award. The Judge refused it, but he said, "Mr. Barr, if you come before the Court and show us that you have drawn a line, then we will be prepared to consider the matter next time." The Court came to Christchurch and I submitted eleven private hotels, and I showed that in each of these private hotels meals were provided for those who did not reside on the premises. The Judge threw the case out, even although it was pointed out by the workers' representative in the Court that I had done what the Judge asked me to do. In this particular industry—in this branch of what we may term the hotel industry—we have the Judge absolutely refusing any conditions. That is the position. It is a matter that ought to be dealt with by the Arbitration Court, but the Arbitration Court has absolutely refused to deal with the matter in Christchurch, and, as pointed out by Mr. Long, has absolutely refused to deal with it in Auckland. Now, another matter that I would like to mention just before dealing with the Bill: that I regret exceedingly, as an individual and as representative of the hotel employees, that there is no provision yet in this Bill dealing with clubs, where to my knowledge they work till 2 o'clock in the morning. Under the present Act the Arbitration Court holds that the clubs do not come under the Act because they are not being carried on for remunerative gain. That is so directly—indirectly we know they are. Furthermore, we submit that no matter what the place is where they employ workers there should be some provision for those workers, and it is a great shame on the patrons of those clubs that they keep their workers till 12 and 2 in the morning. I may say there was a slight agitation in Christchurch in connection with a working-men's club (an odd name for a club that sweats its workers). The result was, however, that the wages of the employees were raised and the conditions bettered. Now, one more matter—the request signed by employees. I understood that a request, or some form or another, was sent up here from Christchurch signed by employees employed in such places as the Federal Hotel and the Palace Hotel. I was not aware that this was being done until the matter was nearly through; it was stopped then. But here is the position: the employees were told to sign this or leave. They did not know the contents of it.

1. *Hon. Mr. Massey.*] Referring to any particular hotel?—Yes, sir. The matter was brought before me by the chef at the Palace Hotel in Christchurch. He was asked to sign it and said, "I cannot sign this." "Well," was the reply, "we will have to part company," so he left the job and reported the matter to me. I went down, interviewed the proprietor, and said that this was hardly fair. The proprietor—or manager, to be correct, as it is a Salvation Army establishment—professed that he was not against the six-day-week proposal, and quoted the Wellington branch, where the system was in operation, and confessed to not having clearly understood the contents of the requisition. This petition should have no force. A number of those who signed it were new in the country, they knew nothing about conditions, nothing about a Bill before