

fish-shop, especially where it is the only entrance to the restaurant, has to be kept scrupulously clean. Hotels, picture-shows, and theatres do not close until 10 o'clock, when there is always a rush for restaurant suppers, and it is 11 o'clock before the people are served on the ordinary days and 11.30 on the late nights. It is necessary to have the place washed down and cleaned before these final hours, and everybody who is employed therein to be off the premises. This cannot be done at present, and it is desirable, especially in warm weather, to have the facilities of an extra half-hour for washing-down. These difficulties might be overcome if this class of shop, as previously suggested, be defined as restaurants. Section 33: I ask this alteration for myself and others who are engaged in like businesses with me, but it has nothing to do with the union. I ask that skin-buyers and wholesale fishmongers should be exempted. They are very similar businesses to the wool-buying business. It is absolutely necessary in the oyster season, when all our oysters arrive at night and a large proportion of our fish arrive at night, and we must have the assistants in the office to deal with these perishable goods. At present under the proposal of the Act we must absolutely shut the door at 5.

3. Do you want to include that in the weekly wage?—Well, the men that are on at night are not on during the day.

4. *Mr. Anderson.*] What do you do now?—We open, as we have to do.

5. There is no law now?—Not that I know of. The boardinghouse-keepers in Dunedin held a meeting there before I came away, and I was requested by them to protest against being included in this Bill. They say that their position was threshed out in the Arbitration Court, and after a lot of evidence the Court refused to include them in the private-hotel award. They say that if the present proposals are carried they will affect five houses in Dunedin and exempt a large number who employ only two servants and those who work their establishments entirely with members of their own family. These five consider that they will be unfairly handicapped, and they cannot raise their tariff to pay for extra labour. They claim that their business is just the same as a private house on a large scale, and that their employees have as many advantages granted to them. Neither the employers nor the employees are asking for legislation to better their, at present, happy relationship, and they think that if the employee is to be solely considered, the private families employing three or more servants should be in the Bill to be consistent; that if it is decided that workers in every industry irrespective of circumstances must not work more than six days in the week, then both they and our union claim that all workers employed in railways, tramways, farms, dairy factories, police, and all public servants should receive equal consideration with other workers, and it should also include employers of all classes of labour, and doctors. They hardly see why one particular industry—

6. *Mr. Clark.*] Parsons, too?—should provide the revenue for the lot.

7. *Mr. Anderson.*] How are you going to manage it?—I am not a Legislature, sir. We do hope this: that all the members who vote for this Bill, that later on when this wedge is inserted, and when the police come along, the dairy factories come along, and the managers come along, you will all be consistent and vote for six days a week for them too; and then after that you will endeavour to have a five-days week. I myself would like to be one of those few thousands I see at Home who are not bound to work at all.

8. *Mr. Clark.*] The Bill does not go far enough, in your opinion, then?—The Bill goes too far; but if you go so far, go farther, and make it perfect.

9. *Mr. Anderson.*] You know that old law that has come down to us, "Six days shalt thou labour": do you approve of it?—Certainly, where you can possibly do it.

10. Were there any exemptions made in that law?—I was not there at that time. Likely there were people then, as now, who found it absolutely necessary to work the seven days.

11. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] You said you objected to it being compulsory on the employer to fix the holiday proposed here on a given day?—Yes.

12. If it is not fixed, how do you propose to check the employee ever getting that holiday?—From the wages-book.

13. How is that wages-book going to be kept by an illiterate man?—The Inspector will very soon see to that.

14. You said just now in regard to the overtime record that one of the reasons why it should not be in the Bill was because there were many illiterate men?—I said there were some. We say it has got to be entered into the wages-book and the Inspector has a right to inspect that book day or night. The wages-book should really show exactly what has been done, and there should be no necessity to give notice to the Inspector.

15. How is he to find out that not more than ninety hours overtime are worked in any one year?—First of all, there is the secretary of the union, and they have a whole army of pickets, and a complaint is very soon followed if a breach has been committed.

16. *Mr. J. Bollard.*] Supposing a man carries on a business that necessitates his employees working seven days a week, what holidays could those employees get?—Half a holiday.

17. You would not give a whole holiday?—To some men I would and some I would not.

18. Why not?—Difference in the men—some are better, more conscientious workers than others.

19. You believe the hours of work should be fixed?—As a rule I would certainly say Yes, but there are of necessity exceptions. I am under the trawlers award. We only work the men six days a week. At home I work seven days a week, and have done so for years. It is necessary for me every Sunday morning to go down on my bicycle to see that these men (the trawlers) are all in their places.

20. You could employ some one else to do that?—Well, when I go myself I see that it is done.