

subsection (4), I would suggest that in the first line of that section you cut out the word "exclusively" and put in the word "substantially." I will not refer to that any further, as it has been dealt with by the last speakers. It is going to be very awkward if you make it "exclusively," but if "substantially" is put in it will, I think, be satisfactory to all parties. Now, in this other matter of "not more than three assistants," there is an exception made to any hotel or restaurant in which not more than three assistants are employed—they shall be entitled to a half-holiday. I object on behalf of my people to this exception of "any hotel or restaurant in which not more than three assistants are employed," and I would suggest that these words be deleted and that there be no exception to any hotel or private hotel; but I want it clearly understood that I do not include boardinghouses, in that we know that there must be some line drawn in connection with the boardinghouses so as to save those widow women that we hear so much about who take in boarders to supplement their earnings, or as the sole source of income. I am prepared to make a compromise or a suggestion in connection with small hotels. I would suggest that a provision be made to subsection (5) to provide for hotels having not more than two employees giving two half-holidays in one week in place of one whole holiday, leaving it optional with them to adopt either course. If they found it was more convenient to give the whole holiday they could do so; if they found it was not so convenient, then in that one week they must give two half-holidays. That principle is recognized in the English Act. I mention that in a spirit of compromise, as we know that the employers have certain difficulties to contend with, and we do not wish to handicap or put any unnecessary hardship on them; at the same time we consider that no employee should have to work more than six days in any one week. I would like to say that I agree with one gentleman who gave evidence that clause 28 should be deleted—that is the clause that deals with the accumulation of holidays. It is not taken advantage of to any great extent, and it has been a clause that has caused some little friction in Christchurch. Employers have entered into an agreement or merely told their employees, "We will let your holidays accumulate," and they were averse to giving the holiday when it came to time, but wanted to pay. We have had some little friction, but we have always prevented it going to the Court. At the same time—the Factory Inspector in Christchurch will bear me out—we have had trouble in this matter. It would be more satisfactory if the whole clause was deleted. If it is not deleted we would have to take note of the accumulated holidays in the half-holiday book or whole-holiday book that the employees are forced to sign. In the meantime no provision is made for noting accumulated holidays in the holiday-book. There is another matter: there is one clause here where the employer is enabled to dispense with the half-holiday or whole holiday six times in the year for race times, and which applies principally to Christchurch and not so much to other centres. You have here under your proposed new Act a provision that two half-holidays will be given on the subsequent week, and two full holidays in lieu of one will be given the following week. There is no doubt there is going to be trouble here—trouble for the employer—and there ought to be a way out. True, this is only for six times in the year. We are against any system of payment for holidays, but to every rule there is an exception, and this case I believe it would sweeten the working of the Act if a provision was made to the effect that to those who are entitled to receive the full holiday on the week that they did not get it, if it were suitable to both parties, they could receive payment for it as set forth in subsection (3) of section 27, which means that they would get overtime rates—would be paid at time-and-a-half rates, or 1s. per hour, whichever is the greater. I believe that it would be acceptable to employers and acceptable to employees. We have to recognize that the next week the employee would have to get the full holiday all the same, and this provision would be in lieu of two holidays. I believe that suggestion is one that would remove a certain difficulty. Regarding section 30, I have already dealt with that part referring to accumulated holidays, but subsection (2) of section 30, it has been suggested that the whole subsection be deleted, and I believe that the simplest plan would be to delete it; but I recognize this: that while in subsection (1) of section 30 it makes it imperative on the individual to sign the book, you have nothing to force him to sign the book—there is no penalty—so that it would be found almost imperative to make some penalty. I suggest that you delete the words "or who signs any incorrect record," for this reason: that we have many employees, particularly females, who do not examine what they are signing; who are too flustered, particularly when employed at first, and they will sign anything. The thing may be incorrect and they have signed it unknowingly.

2. Do you not think they should look to see the entry is correct before they do sign?—The trouble is here: you have young girls and you have men who have been "on the rocks" for a while; they get this job, and the boss asks them to come up and sign: they will sign anything. Of course, it is quite right that they should see what they are signing, but they do not always do so. We have had cases before the Court where employees (and they have been illustrated to you) have signed certain things and they were filled in afterwards; but he has no witness, so when it comes to a Court of law it is his word against the employer's, and the employee's word in nine cases out of ten is not in a Court of law of the same value as the employer's.

3. *A Member.*] Not when his signature is in the book?—Now, here we are going to penalize them if they sign an incorrect record. It may be made incorrect after they have signed it, and there is no proof to show that. I would suggest that if it is decided to retain subsection (2) the words I have referred to, "or who signs any incorrect record," be deleted, or make it imperative that a third party be present who must not be interested as an employer or owner. I submit that it should be imperative in connection with any of these sections where a fine is imposed that a large notice detailing the section and the penalty be posted in a conspicuous place accessible to the employees at all times, and, in addition to that, in any book where a penalty is attached it be made imperative that a heading should be placed on every page showing the penalty that is attached. I think that is a just proposition.