

to him?—I have said before that the remuneration has always been the same. It has been looked upon as a fixed charge. I do not think it possible to make a special arrangement with each reporter.

88. When you say the Chairman of a Committee certifies to the remuneration to be paid, you simply mean to say that he certifies to the length of time the reporter works. His pay is fixed by custom?—Yes. The reporter sends in his account for a guinea for attendance and the charge for transcription of the notes, and it is certified to or it would not be paid.

89. The Chairman could not say he could certify for a guinea a day if it was not a certified charge?—It is within the function of the Chairman of a Committee to send the account back if the charge is excessive. A reporter cannot be employed except on the Chairman of Committee's requisition.

90. *Mr. Guinness.*] I have before me a list attached to this report brought up in 1886 by the Legislative Expenditure Committee, and I see that the clerks of Committees are paid different sums. Some are paid £1, some 15s., and some 10s. a day. Is that going on now?—An explanation is given in the report. You will find that only one clerk was paid £1 a day, because the work for his Committee was heavier. Only one clerk got more than 15s. a day. With the exception of one who gets copy ready for the printers all the clerks are paid at the same rate. He receives only 10s. a day.

91. There is one clerk here, A. F. Lowe, who gets £1?—There is an explanation of that given in the report. He has not been getting it since.

92. All the clerks now get the same rate of pay?—Yes.

93. *The Chairman.*] You were asked just now a question with regard to the appointment that was made on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees. In what year was that?—In 1862. The appointment was delayed until 1864, because the Chairman of Committees happened to be in England.

94. Was that not subsequent to the resolution of the House, passed in 1862, dictating as to the mode of appointment?—Yes. In 1863 I was appointed Acting Clerk-Assistant by the then Premier, Mr. Domett, on the recommendation of the Acting Chairman of Committees; but the appointment was not confirmed until 1864, as the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Carlton, was in England.

95. It was under that resolution?—Yes.

96. Has there been any other appointment made by the Chairman of Committees except that of First Clerk-Assistant?—I do not think so. I do not know whether he ever had anything to say about the Private Bills Clerk. The Chairman might have been consulted, but no appointment has been made by him.

97. The resolution passed in 1862 was this: "Resolved, That the Clerks and other officers of the House of Representatives should be appointed by the Executive, on the recommendation of the Speaker, with the exception of the First Clerk-Assistant, who, acting as Clerk of Committees, should be similarly appointed on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees." That is the resolution, is it not?—Yes.

98. You mentioned just now, referring to the recommendation of the Speaker—the question was asked by the Premier as to what your opinion was as to the proper procedure in the event of the Government not concurring in the recommendation made—that, in your opinion, the Speaker would be asked to make a further recommendation?—I think it will be found that that was the position Mr. Fox took up in 1862. I think it will be found in the correspondence.

99. Your view in regard to the whole matter which has taken place is that with regard to the modus of appointing these officers, the right of actual appointment rests with the Executive Government of the day?—Yes.

100. But that appointment is to be made on the recommendation of the Speaker, except in the case of the First Clerk-Assistant, where the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees comes in. That is your view?—I do not think that practice has ever been deviated from.

101. *Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Except in the case of the two last *Hansard* reporters?—I did not have the recent appointments under consideration.

102. *The Chairman.*] Are you aware if at any time there has been a resolution of the House defining what officers are to be considered officers of the House—that is to say, since *Hansard* was first established, has a resolution been passed which goes to show that *Hansard* reporters are regarded as officers of the House or not?—I am not aware of any such resolution.

103. As a matter of fact, I think you have stated that some appointments to *Hansard* have been made absolutely by my predecessors?—I have a note of two having been so appointed by Sir William Fitzherbert.

104. Is it within your knowledge whether, when vacancies occurred on the *Hansard* staff during the session, the Speaker made the appointments after consultation with the *Hansard* Committee?—I cannot give any information as regards *Hansard*. I can only speak as to cases I have known where the appointment has been made by the Speaker on the recommendation of the Chief Reporter.

105. With regard to Mr. Rutherford, Second Clerk-Assistant, as a matter of fact was he during last year actually engaged in his duties, both during session and out of session, in connection with the office he holds?—Yes, he was in daily attendance at the office. There must be attendance at the office even when there are no heavy duties to be performed; but there are at all times papers coming from the printers to be looked after. The printing lasted during nearly the whole of the recess.

106. How long was it prior to this present session that the work in connection with the printing was absolutely completed?—I should say not within a month.

107. Independently of the mere fact that Mr. Rutherford had to be in attendance, there was actual work in connection with the necessary printing for Parliament up to within a month of the meeting of the House?—Yes.