

another name, and the award should only be made in connection with a particular class of boardinghouse if it can be established with the class defined." The application was discussed, and the Court recognised the difficulty before it, and surely the difficulty is tremendously enhanced when Parliament starts out to deal with it without having before it the comment of those with whom the Court got into touch. We ask in addition that at the end of the paragraph the following words shall be added at line 20: "and also a shop carried on in conjunction with a restaurant." It is of course within the knowledge of members of the Committee that in many cases the shop and restaurant are part of the same business. The hands are interchangeable, and it would lead to no end of friction, and bother, and worry if one set of conditions were made to apply to these shops and another set of conditions made to apply to the restaurants. We ask further that housemaids should not be included as shop-assistants, nor should engineers attending electric plants and lifts be included in the term "shop-assistants." We want these two classes of workers exempted. The former are domestic servants.

8. *Mr. Fraser.*] How do engineers come in?—In the large hotels they have electric light plants and lifts. Those attending the former are domestic servants, and the latter are tradesmen. Section 4 provides that "Sections 3 to 6 of the principal Act shall not apply to hotels and restaurants or to the assistants therein." We ask that the first paragraph of subsection (2) of section 3 of the principal Act shall be retained, so as to exempt members of the occupier's family from the provisions of section 5—that is, dealing with the hours of work. The first paragraph of subsection (2) of section 3 reads, "The wife of the occupier of any shop and the members of his family shall not be deemed to be shop-assistants within the meaning of this section." Now, dealing with section 5, which is probably the most important in the Bill, after very long consideration we have decided to accept the provisions of subclause (a) so far as other than hotel-workers are concerned—that is, restaurants, tea-rooms, and that sort of thing. If we can secure sixty-five hours in the case of all hotel-restaurants we offer that in the spirit of compromise.

9. *Mr. Glover.*] Male and female?—That is the provision now in the Arbitration Court award. We ask that subclause (a) of section 5 shall be altered to read, "(a) For more than sixty-five hours (excluding meal-times) in any one week in the case of hotel-assistants, nor for more than sixty hours (excluding meal-times) in any one week in the case of male assistants over sixteen years of age in restaurants, nor more than fifty-six hours (excluding meal-times) in the case of any other workers." I would like to point out in connection with the matter of reduction of hours that if the reduction of hours asked for in the Bill is acceded to it must immediately be followed by a corresponding reduction in the wages of the workers. There is no question about that. We are advised that even without any award we can pay a proportionate rate, and if we cannot succeed we can appeal to the Arbitration Court, and with every confidence. In section (b) we ask that "twelve hours"—of course, without any extension of the weekly hours that might be provided—be inserted instead of "ten" hours. Evidence will be given that it is absolutely necessary that considerable elasticity must be allowed to provide for occasional rushes of business. In boarding-houses and hotels it is impossible to arrange one's time. One steamer or train may bring in a hundred guests, and means by which they can be handled must be found. Paragraphs (c) and (d) we pass without comment; but with regard to holidays we ask for a new proviso, and that is that hotels and restaurants should be granted six weeks' exemption in every year from the provision relating to hours of work and holidays, provided overtime is paid for any time worked in excess of the daily or weekly number of hours prescribed for workers. The reason for this is that at rush periods, such as Christmas and New Year, and Easter week, race weeks, and gala days, provision must be made for extra work. Take Carnival week in Christchurch, for instance, and Show week in Palmerston North—there should be a certain number of weeks allowed, providing that if over a specified number of hours a week are worked overtime rates should be paid. It may be said that this would give the employees a free hand; but permits would have to be granted by the Inspector before the employer could take advantage of that provision. A further new proviso, I think, should go in here, and might be designated (f) of section 5. We ask that in case of exceptional circumstances the weekly holiday may be waived by payment of overtime, and such payment shall be accepted in lieu of the holiday. We notice that the wages and overtime book will provide any necessary check. That is to provide for absence—it may be through sickness, such as in the case of a considerable number of workers being down with influenza—and that could be regulated by the Inspector. With regard to subsection (d) of section 5, we ask that the word "working" be struck out in the second line. The hotels observe a seven-day week, and should be allowed to give the half-holiday on any day in the week. With regard to subsection (2) of section 5, we ask that the words "with the previous written consent of an Inspector" in the first and second lines should be struck out, and provision made that written notice of any extended hours shall be given to the Inspector within twenty-four hours of such extension of work being done. The extension of hours in this class of business often arises suddenly, when it would be impossible to notify the Inspector before the work is done. After 5 o'clock in a hotel or boardinghouse a tremendous rush for dinner may take place quite unexpectedly. The work must be done some how or other, and unless there is provision made for this you are putting the employers in a position where they may commit a breach of the Act when there is no way of observing it. We submit that that is a position they should not be put in. We ask that one of the provisions of the principal Act be embodied here. Section 6, subsection (3), of the principal Act—the last paragraph—reads, "Provided further that no payment for such extended hours as aforesaid shall be made to any shop-assistant whose wages are or exceed £200 per annum." We ask that that proviso should be put in here as well as applying to shops and offices generally. Then, with regard to subsection (4) of section 5, which reads, "Section seven of the principal Act shall extend and apply to the limitations imposed by this section," we ask that the word "not" should be inserted after the word "shall" in the first line, so that it alters the clause altogether; it makes it read "shall not extend and apply to the