

1893.  
NEW ZEALAND.

# REPORT OF PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE.

(HON. W. J. STEWARD, CHAIRMAN).

## ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

*Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.*

FRIDAY, THE 28TH DAY OF JULY, 1893.

*Ordered*, "That the correspondence on the subject of the appointment of the officers of the House, laid upon the table by Mr. Speaker (Paper A.—3), be referred to a Committee of Privileges, to consider the same and report its opinions thereon to the House."—(Hon. Sir J. HALL.)

FRIDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1893.

*Ordered*, "That the Privilege Committee, to which has been referred the correspondence on the subject of the Legislative officers, consist of twelve members, and that such Committee do consist of the following members—namely: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Seddon, the Hon. Sir R. Stout, the Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Mr. Guinness, Mr. G. Hutchison, Mr. W. Hutchison, Captain Russell, Mr. Saunders, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson, and the mover: the Committee to have power to call for persons and papers; five to be a quorum."—(Hon. Sir J. HALL.)

## REPORT.

THE Privileges Committee, to whom the correspondence between Mr. Speaker and the Government relative to the appointment of *Hansard* Reporters has been referred, have taken evidence and obtained information relative to the several matters which form the subject of such correspondence, and have the honour to report as follows:—

1. That the House having directed by resolution, in passing the Legislative Estimates in the second session in 1891, that the vote be reduced by £1 as an indication that the Legislative Estimates should be under the control of the Government (*see Journals*, 17th September, 1891, and *Hansard*, Vol. lxxiv., 17th September, 1891, page 729), there was therefore no invasion of the privileges of the House in the Government appointing *Hansard* Reporters Gore and Russell; and, in making the selection from the officers in the Service, such course was in keeping with "The Civil Service Act, 1886," giving as it did promotion to two deserving officers, and at the same time making a saving in the public expenditure, seeing the services of these reporters are available for reporting Commissions during the recess, and that this will in no way interfere with their independence as *Hansard* Reporters during session.

2. That the resolution carried whilst the House was in Committee of Supply, in the second session of 1891, practically set aside any decision arrived at on this same subject in the session of 1862, and was in keeping with the report of a Committee of the House appointed during the session of 1888. Further, that permanent officers of the House are ordinary Civil servants, and the Estimates are presented to Parliament by Her Majesty's command, and upon the responsibilities of Ministers of the Crown. Mr. Speaker is not in the position of a Minister of the Crown; nor has he, or any other officer, any authority to vary the appropriation of any of the votes.

3. That there are several officers receiving large annual salaries, whose duties do not occupy them at the most more than six months in the year, and in some instances four months, while officers of the *Hansard* staff are only employed during the session. There is, therefore, no good reason why such officers should not be employed during the recess for the benefit of, and with economy to, the Public Service. That the full employment of only partially employed officers will enable the Government to lessen the officers otherwise employed without affecting the efficiency of the Government service, and will in no way lessen the independence of such officers during session or trench on the privileges of Parliament.

4. That in case any vacancies arise in the offices of the House the vacancies should be filled by promoting the officers then employed at the time such vacancies occur; and that in regard to the appointment of *Hansard* reporters, and with a view to encouraging the use of shorthand by officers of the Civil Service, and by holding out promotion to those officers who are making themselves efficient therein, preference should be given (unless under exceptional circumstances) to officers in the employ of the Government—this being in keeping with the spirit of the Civil Service Act.

5. That for two weeks before, and during the session, and for one month afterwards, the *Hansard* staff be under the control of the Speaker and the Printing Committee; and that for two weeks before, and during the session, and for one month thereafter, all other officers of the House and Council be under the control of the respective Speakers.

6. That with a view to promoting due economy in the public expenditure, it is advisable that the Government should continue, as directed by the resolution in Committee of Supply in 1891, to have charge of the Legislative Estimates.

W. J. STEWARD, Chairman.

4th September, 1893.

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

MONDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1893.

THE Committee met pursuant to notice.

*Present*: Mr. Guinness, Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Captain Russell, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. Speaker, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

The Orders of Reference of the 28th July and the 11th August were read by the Clerk.

On motion of the Hon. Sir J. Hall, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Seddon, *Resolved*, That Mr. Speaker be appointed Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker pointed out a printer's error in line 20 of his memorandum dated the 22nd June, 1893 (Paper A.—3, 1893), "Vol. lxxii." should read "Vol. lxii."

On motion of the Hon. Sir J. Hall, *Resolved*, That Mr. Friend, Clerk of the House of Representatives, be requested to attend the next meeting of the Committee, to give evidence with reference to the appointments of the officers of the House, and to produce documents relating thereto.

On motion of the Hon. Sir J. Hall, *Resolved*, That Mr. Friend be requested to bring up a *précis* of all the different steps that have been taken hitherto by different Speakers and Governments, also resolutions and proposals in relation to the matter of the present inquiry, and also a copy or copies of the evidence taken by the Committee to whom was referred the question of the Legislative expenditure in the session of 1886.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Seddon, *Resolved*, That the Committee adjourn till Thursday next, at 11 a.m., and that the meeting be held in Joint Committee-room.

THURSDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1893.

The Committee met pursuant to notice.

*Present*: Hon. the Speaker (Chairman), Mr. Guinness, Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Mr. W. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Captain Russell, Mr. A. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A reporter was in attendance, and took down the evidence.

Mr. Friend, Clerk of the House of Representatives, attended, and gave evidence *re* the steps taken by various Speakers and Governments *re* the matter of inquiry.

Mr. Friend was also examined at length by the Chairman and Committee.

On motion of the Hon. Sir J. Hall, *Resolved*, That the *précis* put in by Mr. Friend be printed.

*Ordered*, That the evidence given before the Committee be printed.

The Committee then adjourned until Thursday, the 24th August, at 10.30 a.m.

THURSDAY, 24TH AUGUST, 1893.

The Committee met pursuant to notice.

*Present*: Hon. the Speaker (Chairman), Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. W. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. T. Thompson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

On the motion of the Hon. Sir J. Hall, *Resolved*, That Mr. Speaker do write his statement and submit the same to the Committee; also, that the same be printed.

On the motion of the Hon. Sir R. Stout, *Resolved*, That the Committee deems it unnecessary to call further witnesses.

On the motion of the Hon. Sir R. Stout, *Resolved*, That the Chairman do read such correspondence as has been received by him *in re* the inquiry.

The Chairman put in and read a memorandum received from Mr. Friend; also put in a statement prepared by himself.

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*: next meeting to be fixed by the Chairman.

THURSDAY, 31ST AUGUST, 1893.

The Committee met pursuant to notice.

*Present*: Hon. the Speaker (Chairman), Mr. Guinness, Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Mr. W. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Captain Russell, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Hon. Mr. Seddon put in a statement of amounts paid for sundry matters, *in re* the present inquiry, which was ordered to be printed.

The Chairman made the following statement: "I should inform the Committee that I omitted, inadvertently, to refer to the appointment of one officer, the Examiner of Standing Orders on Private Bills. That appointment was at one time held by the late Mr. Brandon, subsequently by Major Campbell, and now by Mr. Leonard Stowe, the Clerk of Parliaments. This appointment has been made conjointly by the Speakers of both Houses."

On motion of the Hon. Sir R. Stout, *Resolved*, That details be furnished to the Committee as to the items of the statement put in by the Hon. Mr. Seddon.

The Committee then adjourned until Monday, the 4th September, at 10.30 a.m.: business, to draw up a report.

MONDAY, 4TH SEPTEMBER, 1893.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice.

*Present*: Hon. the Speaker (Chairman), Mr. Guinness, Hon. Sir John Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Mr. W. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Captain Russell, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. T. Thompson, Mr. R. Thompson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Details of statement asked for by the Committee were put in by Hon. Mr. Seddon.

Moved by Hon. Sir J. Hall, "1. That the following resolution of the House of Representatives, passed on the 28th August, 1862, should be adhered to and continue to be acted upon—viz., '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.'"

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Seddon, as an amendment to the foregoing, "That all the words after the word 'That' be struck out, and that the following words be inserted in lieu thereof: 'The House having directed by resolution, in passing the Legislative estimates in the second session in 1891, that the vote be reduced by £1 as an indication that the Legislative estimates should be under the control of the Government (see Journals, 17th September, 1891, and *Hansard*, Vol. lxxiv., 17th September, 1891, page 729), there was therefore no invasion of the privileges of the House in the Government appointing *Hansard* Reporters Gore and Russell; and, in making the selection from the officers in the Service, such course was in keeping with "The Civil Service Act, 1886," giving as it did promotion to two deserving officers, and at the same time making a saving in the public expenditure, seeing the services of these reporters are available for reporting Commissions during the recess, and that this will in no way interfere with their independence as *Hansard* reporters during session.'"

Upon the question being put, "That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question," a division was called for, and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 5: Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Captain Russell, Hon. Sir R. Stout.

*Noes*, 6: Mr. Guinness, Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

And so it passed in the negative.

Words struck out.

Upon the question being put, "That the proposed amendment be inserted," a division was called for and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 6: Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Guinness, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

*Noes*, 5: Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Captain Russell, Hon. Sir R. Stout.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Words inserted.

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution as amended be agreed to," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Moved by Hon. Sir J. Hall, "2. That the officers of the House should continue to be subject to the directions and control of the Speaker, acting for the House, and be independent of Ministerial control."

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution be agreed to," a division was called for, and the names taken down, as follows:—

*Ayes*, 5: Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Captain Russell, Hon. Sir R. Stout.

*Noes*, 6: Mr. Guinness, Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

And so it passed in the negative.

Hon. Sir J. Hall withdrew his third resolution, viz.: "3. That the following are the officers of the House referred to in the above resolution: The Clerk of the House, the First Clerk-Assistant, the Second Clerk-Assistant, the Reader and Clerk of Bills and Papers, the Interpreters, the *Hansard* Reporters, and the Committee Reporters," as the previous one to be read with it had been negatived.

Moved by Hon. Sir R. Stout, "1. That all the appointments to be made of officers connected with the House should be made by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Speaker of the House, and so with officers of the Council."

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution be agreed to," a division was called for, and the names taken down, as follows:—

*Ayes*, 5: Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Captain Russell, Hon. Sir R. Stout.

*Noes*, 6: Mr. Guinness, Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

And so it passed in the negative.

Moved by Hon. Sir R. Stout: "2. That, if the Ministry decline to accept the recommendation of a Speaker, the reasons for such action shall be submitted to Parliament, and the matter referred to a Privileges Committee; and in the meantime the Speaker shall have power to appoint a temporary officer."

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution be agreed to," it was negatived on the voices.

Moved by Hon. Sir R. Stout: "3. That all appointments be made from persons who are acting as officers of the House or Council, or from the Civil Service, and that the provisions of 'The Civil Service Reform Act, 1886,' be complied with."

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, as an amendment to the foregoing: "That all the words after the word 'That' be struck out, and that the following words be inserted in lieu thereof: 'In case any vacancies arise in the offices of the House the vacancies should be filled by promoting the officers then employed at the time such vacancies occur; and that in regard to the appointment of *Hansard* reporters, and with a view to encouraging the use of shorthand by officers of the Civil Service, and by holding out promotion to those officers who are making themselves efficient therein, preference should be given (unless under exceptional circumstances) to officers in the employ of the Government—this being in keeping with the spirit of the Civil Service Act.'"

Upon the question being put, "That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question," a division was called for, and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 5: Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Captain Russell, Hon. Sir R. Stout.

*Noes*, 6: Mr. Guinness, Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson. And so it passed in the negative.

Words struck out.

Upon the question being put, "That the proposed amendment be inserted," it was resolved in the affirmative on the voices.

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution as amended be agreed to," it was resolved in the affirmative on the voices.

Moved by Hon. Sir R. Stout: "4. That during the session the *Hansard* staff be under the control of the Speaker and the Printing Committee, and all other officers of the House and Council under the control of the respective Speakers."

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, as an amendment to the foregoing, "That the following words be inserted after the word 'That,' 'for two weeks before and;' also, that the following words be inserted after the word 'session' 'and for one month afterwards.'"

Upon the question being put, "That the words 'for two weeks before and,' proposed to be inserted, be so inserted," a division was called for, and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 6: Mr. Guinness, Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Saunders, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

*Noes*, 5: Hon. Sir J. Hall, Mr. G. Hutchison, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Capt. Russell, Hon. Sir R. Stout.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Words inserted.

Upon the question being put "That the words, 'and for one month afterwards,' proposed to be inserted, be so inserted," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Words inserted.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, "That the words 'and the Printing Committee' be struck out."

Upon the question being put, "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question," a division was called for, and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 6: Mr. Saunders, Captain Russell, Hon. Sir J. Hall, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. G. Hutchison.

*Noes*, 5: Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Guinness, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Words retained.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, "That the following words be inserted after the word 'and,' 'that for two weeks before, and during the session, and for one month thereafter.'"

Upon the question being put, "That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Words inserted.

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution as amended be agreed to," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Moved by Hon. Sir R. Stout, "5. That during the recess the officers of the House and Council be under the control of the respective Speakers."

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution be agreed to," a division was called for, and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 5: Captain Russell, Hon. Sir J. Hall, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. G. Hutchison.

*Noes*, 6: Mr. Saunders, Mr. W. Hutchinson, Mr. Guinness, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

And so it passed in the negative.

Words struck out.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, "2. That the resolution carried whilst the House was in Committee of Supply, in the second session of 1891, practically set aside any decision arrived at on this same subject in the session of 1862, and was in keeping with the report of a Committee of the House appointed during the session of 1888. Further, that permanent officers of the House are ordinary Civil servants, and the estimates are presented to Parliament by Her Majesty's command,

and upon the responsibilities of Ministers of the Crown. Mr. Speaker is not in the position of a Minister of the Crown; nor has he, or any other officer, any authority to vary the appropriation of any of the votes."

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution be agreed to," a division was called for, and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 6: Mr. Saunders, Mr. W. Hutchison, Mr. Guinness, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

*Noes*, 5: Captain Russell, Hon. Sir J. Hall, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. G. Hutchison.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Words retained.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, "That the word 'following' be struck out, and that the words 'arrived at' be inserted in lieu thereof."

Upon the question being put, "That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the resolution," it passed in the negative, on the voices.

Word struck out.

Upon the question being put, "That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution as amended be agreed to," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, "3. That there are several officers receiving large annual salaries whose duties do not occupy them at the most more than six months in the year, and in some instances four months, while officers of the *Hansard* staff are only employed during the session. There is, therefore, no good reason why such officers should not be employed during the recess for the benefit of and with economy to the Public Service. That the full employment of only partially employed officers will enable the Government to lessen the officers otherwise employed, without affecting the efficiency of the Government service, and will in no way lessen the independence of such officers during session or trench on the privileges of Parliament."

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution be agreed to," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Words retained.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, "5. That the officers of the House, with the exception of the Clerk and Clerk-Assistant of the Legislative Council, Messrs. Stowe and Bothamley; the Clerk and Clerk-Assistant of the House of Representatives, Messrs. Friend and Otterson; the Record Clerk, Mr. Rutherford; and the Sergeant-at-Arms, shall be at the service of the Government one month after the session closes, and up to within two weeks of the next session thereafter. That two weeks before and one month after the session the officers of the House shall be solely under the control of the House."

Amendment moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon, "That all the words after the word 'thereafter,' to the end of the paragraph, be struck out."

Upon the question being put, "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question," it passed in the negative, on the voices.

Words struck out.

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution, as amended, be agreed to," a division was called for, and the names taken down as follows:—

*Ayes*, 5: Mr. Saunders, Mr. Guinness, Hon. Mr. Seddon, Mr. R. Thompson, Mr. T. Thompson.

*Noes*, 6: Mr. W. Hutchison, Captain Russell, Hon. Sir J. Hall, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Hon. Sir R. Stout, Mr. G. Hutchison.

And so it passed in the negative.

Resolution struck out.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon: "6. That, with a view to promoting due economy in the public expenditure, it is advisable that the Government should continue, as directed by the resolution in Committee of Supply in 1891, to have charge of the Legislative estimates."

Upon the question being put, "That the resolution be agreed to," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

Words retained.

Moved by Hon. Mr. Seddon: "That the following be the preamble to the report: The Privileges Committee, to whom the correspondence between Mr. Speaker and the Government relative to the appointment of *Hansard* Reporters has been referred, have taken evidence and obtained information relative to the several matters which form the subject of such correspondence, and have the honour to report as follows."

Amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Rolleston, "That, seeing that the decisions of the Committee indicate an absolute carelessness of the privileges and position of Parliament, as the same are recognised in every British colony, and are an infringement of the rights and liberties of the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, it is expedient that no action should be taken at variance with the custom which has obtained for many years, until there has been a new election."

The Chairman ruled that the amendment proposed was out of order.

Upon the question being put, "That the preamble be agreed to," it was resolved in the affirmative, on the voices.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Seddon, *Resolved*, That the Chairman do draw up a report from the resolutions passed, also that Mr. Guinness do bring up the report on Tuesday, 5th September, 1893.

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

THURSDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1893. (Hon. W. J. STEWARD, Chairman.)

Mr. GEORGE FRIEND, Clerk of the House of Representatives, examined.

1. *The Chairman* (having read resolution passed at previous meeting of Committee.)] Mr. Friend, I presume you have received a copy of that resolution?—Yes.

2. Have you prepared the *précis* there referred to?—I have prepared a short one, such as the limited time at my disposal would permit me. It includes everything referring to the matter, but does not go into the details, which will be found in the printed papers. I have not made extracts, because they are so voluminous, and would take up so much time. I have a statement here referring to the appointments, and so on, from the first sitting of the General Assembly.

3. It would be better, as Mr. Friend knows the scope of the inquiry, that he should detail the various steps that have been taken, from his own experience.

*Hon. Mr. Rolleston*: Giving us the different steps and the different phases of the matter.

*Mr. Friend*: I have made notes of the different appointments, and when the various disputes arose in their successive stages. I have prepared a short statement of the facts, and show where the details can be found in the various blue-books. I have made a note from the beginning, when the first Clerk of the House, Major Campbell, was appointed in 1854 by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Speaker. The second Clerk of the House of Representatives, Mr. Friend, was appointed in October, 1889, by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Speaker. The first Clerk-Assistant, Mr. Curnin, was appointed in 1856 by the Governor, on the recommendation of Mr. Clifford, I understand, who was then Speaker. The second appointment of Clerk-Assistant, that of Mr. Tyler, was made by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Clerk of the House. That is referred to in the correspondence which took place in 1862. The next Clerk-Assistant, Mr. Friend, was appointed in 1864 by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees. That is the first occasion when a dispute as to the right of appointment arose. The appointment did not take place until 1864, owing to the dispute not being settled until the session of 1862.

4. *Hon. Mr. Rolleston*.] Do you mean that communication was made directly with the Governor, and not through Ministers?—Through the Premier. There is no communication direct with the Governor. The letters appointing officers come from the Government, and say, "The Governor has been pleased to appoint."

*Hon. Mr. Seddon*: In the last case it was the Chairman of Committees.

*Mr. Friend*: The next Clerk-Assistant, Mr. Otterson, was appointed in 1889 on the recommendation of the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. The Speaker forwarded both letters to the Government, and recommended the appointment to be made. Mr. Otterson, the first Second Clerk-Assistant, was appointed in 1875 on the recommendation of the Speaker, and Mr. Rutherford was appointed Second Clerk-Assistant in 1889, also on the recommendation of the Speaker. Mr. Rutherford was appointed in 1879, on the recommendation of the Speaker, as Record Clerk and Clerk of Bills and Papers, &c., and Mr. O'Rorke was appointed Reader on the recommendation of the Speaker, and that office is now merged in the Record Clerk's office, to which Mr. O'Rorke was appointed in 1889. In the case of Mr. Friend, recommended for appointment as Clerk-Assistant by Sir David Monro in 1862, there was a correspondence between the Speaker and the Premier on the subject of appointment of Legislative officers. (*Vide* Appendix, 1862, D.-19, containing also letters showing practice in other colonies.) This correspondence was referred to the House in the session of 1862, and settled by resolution. (*Vide* Journals, 1862, page 115.) The resolution reads—"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 the Clerk of Committees, should be similarly appointed on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees." That is the course which has been followed since. After that there was a very long correspondence on the subject of making statutory provision for salaries, and also for appointment and control of Legislative officers, which took place in 1867, between Sir David Monro and the Hon. Mr. Stafford. That is to be found in the Appendix for 1867, D.-12. Mr. Stafford and Sir David Monro were unable to agree, and the whole thing resulted in the passing of "The Legislative Officers' Salaries Act, 1867," but the question of appointment was left untouched, as they could not agree.

5. *Hon. Mr. Rolleston*.] What happened at that date?—Mr. Stafford offered that the appointment of all the officers of the House should remain in the recommendation of the Speaker except the Clerk of the House, but Sir David Monro said the House would not entertain such a proposal.

6. Mr. Stafford contended that the appointment of Clerk of the House should be made by someone outside the House?—Yes. I think that would be the tenor. That was the view Sir David Monro took of it by refusing to entertain such a proposal. There is another letter from Sir David Monro to the Hon. Mr. Stafford on the subject of making legal provision for appointments, dated 5th June, 1868, and Mr. Stafford's reply dated 19th June, 1868. (*Vide* Appendix, 1868, D.-2, page 4.) The next step appears to me to have been made in 1886, when a Committee sat on the general question of Legislative expenditure and other matters, and brought up a report, with evidence taken, to the House. (*Vide* Appendix, 1886, I.-10.) That report was presented and a resolution was proposed to the House and negatived. It was on a motion for going into Committee of Supply. It referred simply to one portion of the report. Mr. O'Connor moved a resolution on the motion for going into Committee of Supply that the Government should be directly responsible for all parliamentary expenditure, and that all officers should be under the direct control of the Government.

It will be found on page 336 of the Journals of the House, 1886. In 1887, as a result of the report of the Committee (on which no action was taken by the House), there was a correspondence between the then Premier (Sir Robert Stout) and the Speakers of the two Houses on the subject of the Committee's report. (*Vide* Appendix, Session 1, 1887, A.—14.) That correspondence referred to the expenditure of both Legislative Departments, and as to whether a reduction could be made, and it resulted in a general reduction of expenditure and in the staff. The next stage was in 1888, when the whole question of the estimates and control was the subject of a long day's debate in the House of Representatives on a resolution proposed to the House by Sir Harry Atkinson—"that this House is of opinion that the Government should be responsible for the Legislative estimates," but on division by a majority of fourteen it was resolved that the House and the Speaker should continue to be responsible for the Legislative estimates.

7. Was it defined what should be done as to the estimates?—Any further information can only be gathered from the speeches in the course of the debate. (*Vide Hansard*, Vol. lxii, pages 139 *et seq.*)

*Sir J. Hall*: After that Sir Harry Atkinson refused to take any responsibility for the Legislative expenditure.

*Hon. R. J. Seddon*: The whole question of expenditure was raised on that occasion.

*Mr. Friend*: In 1887, when the estimates were before the House and general reductions were made, Sir Maurice O'Rorke persisted in moving these reductions himself in order to assert his authority as Speaker.

*Hon. Mr. Rolleston*: There is a change in that now?

*Mr. Friend*: The present Speaker sat at the table in 1891. In 1891, a motion that the Government should be responsible for the Legislative estimates was negatived on the motion for going into Supply, but in Committee of Supply a reduction of £1 was moved to indicate the wish of the House in the same direction. That was in 1891, and brings the matter up to the present stage.

8. *Hon. R. J. Seddon*.] Since that the Government have had charge of the estimates?—Yes.

*The Chairman*: Mr. Friend just now stated that a resolution he referred to was in the Journals for 1886, and Mr. Rolleston asked for its production. Here are the terms of it: "Motion made, and question proposed, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. Mr. O'Connor moved, That the question be amended by the omission of all the words after the word 'that,' and the insertion of the following words in lieu thereof, 'the Government should be directly responsible for all Parliamentary expenditure, and that all officers should be under the direct control of the Government.' And the question being put, That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question, it was resolved in the affirmative."

9. *Hon. R. J. Seddon*.] In 1888 that debate was in Committee on the estimates?—No, in Committee of the whole House on Sir Harry Atkinson's resolution. By agreement between the then Premier and the Speaker, the Premier brought down the resolution in Committee of the Whole in order that the Speaker might take part in the debate.

10. Are you a Civil servant?—I can only quote from memory an opinion of the present Chief Justice in 1872, that all officers appointed by the Governor are officers of the Civil Service. I think I have that opinion in my possession. We have got the Chief Justice's opinion, and Sir Robert Stout's, that all officers appointed by the Government are Civil servants.

11. Did Sir Robert Stout give an opinion on that?—I think so. I have the papers.

12. Will you look up those papers—it has an important bearing on the question?—I will.

13. Are you aware whether the Law Officers have given an opinion as to whether the officers of the House are Civil servants in the ordinary term?—That was Sir James Prendergast's opinion as Attorney-General. It had simply reference as to whether they were entitled to pensions. We were exempted on a later date. That was before 1866. In that year the Legislature was exempted from the Civil Service Act, and has remained exempt ever since.

14. In the session of 1891 the Legislative estimates were placed under the control of the Government?—Yes.

15. Are you aware of any alterations having been made in the salaries of officers?—The estimates of 1892 came down exactly the same as they were in the previous years, but with a slight reduction in the Contingency vote. There was no alteration in salaries. In the present estimates considerable alterations have been made, but they are not yet before the House.

16. Then the control of the estimates, which would give power of altering, decreasing, or increasing salaries, will have a bearing as to the status and retention of officers?—I have always been of the opinion that where the power of fixing the remuneration is there the control must be; but that is only my own opinion.

17. Are you aware of some instances where the Chairman of Committees has made the recommendation and appointments have been made outside the Speaker?—Absolutely none. I am not aware of cases of the kind.

18. You stated here that some appointments were made by the Governor on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees?—That was in 1862. It was absolutely decided that no recommendation should be made except that of the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. That was the only case.

19. Is there any case where he has recommended and the recommendation has been refused?—No, I know of no such case.

20. The Government, being desirous of appointing some person to an office, would consult the chief officers, the same as in other departments; but is it mandatory for the Government to accept the person recommended?—If you ask me as a matter of opinion, I should say it is not mandatory; but if the recommendation was refused, the matter would be referred back to the Speaker for further recommendation.

21. Would the Speaker have power to appoint any of the officers without reference to the Government?—Not any of the officers I have mentioned; only the subordinate officers.

22. What do you consider the Committee reporters?—Permanent officials. I have not touched upon the permanent reporters, the Interpreters, or the Sergeant-at-Arms.

23. With regard to the subordinate officers, who has appointed them?—With regard to the officers named down to the Record Clerk, I have given the mode of procedure. With regard to other officers the mode of procedure has varied at times. I find that in some cases the Speaker has appointed direct, without reference to the Government, Committee and *Hansard* reporters. There appears to be no regular procedure. The Sergeant-at-Arms has been appointed on the recommendation of the Speaker without reference to the Government. The practice varies a great deal.

24. Some of them the Government have appointed?—That I cannot tell, because we have no record in our books of such appointments.

25. Sometimes the Speaker has done it and sometimes some one else?—Yes. I have no record of any one else doing it. The only record is that of the Speaker.

26. If that power was conceded it might be a question of considerable increase or decrease of expenditure at the dictum of the Speaker?—Scarcely so. I do not understand that the Speaker would have the right to make appointments until sanctioned by the House. He would only make appointments in accordance with the expenditure voted by the House.

27. If we concede that according to this irregular practice the Speaker has the right to appoint irrespective of consulting the Government, if he has the power to appoint one he could appoint dozens?—No, he can only appoint to vacancies that occur. I am not referring to a creation of new appointments at all.

28. I thought you mentioned Committee reporters amongst these officers?—Yes.

29. There is no particular vacancy for Committee reporters?—Are you talking of extra reporters? They are taken on as the Committees require them. I am speaking of the two reporters of the House. We have no control over the number of extra reporters required. If a Committee is set up and the Chairman wishes a reporter, he has to be supplied.

30. Who makes that appointment?—There is no appointment. The reporter is sought for and is got for the day's work.

31. Who engages them?—Mr. Otterson. There is no appointment; they are only engaged for the day's work. He keeps a list of applications, and sometimes there is a great deal of trouble, because they are not available.

32. Mr. Otterson has the patronage, and can appoint whom he thinks fit?—Yes; he has to supply a shorthand reporter when required.

33. There is a considerable amount of money paid for this sort of work?—It was very heavy last year.

34. How much did it amount to?—I suppose £300 or £400.

35. And the appointment rests on the responsibility of Mr. Otterson?—Yes. It can scarcely be called an appointment; it is only an engagement for the occasion. The reporters are only taken as the Chairmen of the Committees require them.

36. Who appoints the messengers and so on?—They are appointed by the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker together. When one or two vacancies occur they are settled by the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker.

37. The Government having charge of the estimates since 1891, would it not be necessary for them to know the number of messengers and the money required for them?—There is a certain amount of money put on the estimates for the appointment of messengers, and it is within the power of the Government to reduce it or otherwise. Proposed alterations would result in correspondence between the Government and the Speaker.

38. The body having control of the estimates as to the amount to be paid, it would follow as a natural sequence that they should also control the number employed, because the number would be controlled by the amount?—I have already said they have the power to do so by reducing the estimate.

39. What is the amount paid to the officers—that is, leaving out yourself and the Clerk to the Committees—what is the amount involved in salaries to the other officers?—The permanent officers?

40. Yes.—£350 to the Second Clerk-Assistant, £250 to his junior, the Record Clerk and Clerk of Bills and Papers, and two Interpreters at £225 each.

41. The head clerk as an average receives £100 a month for the time of his services, the one getting £300 a year?—To whom do you refer? The fourth clerk receives only £250 a year.

42. Who is the other clerk at £350?—Mr. Rutherford. He is engaged the whole year round. He has to be in daily attendance at the office.

43. In Wellington?—Yes. He is never away except on leave of absence, perhaps for a month or six weeks in the course of the year.

44. Who grants him leave?—I do.

45. Without consulting any one else?—Without consulting any one else.

46. The next officer receives £250?—Yes.

47. How long is he engaged?—Only during the session, a few days before and a few days after, perhaps ten days.

48. That is to say, for three months and a fortnight he gets £250?—Yes, his services are not engaged during the recess.

49. During the remainder of the time he can obtain any employment and go where he likes?—Yes; that is Mr. O'Rorke.

50. Who is next under him?—There is none under him in the office.

51. Are those the only two—Mr Rutherford and Mr O'Rorke?—They are the only two provided for by the estimates.

52. But there are other clerks—are they paid by the session?—They are paid by the day. They are taken on and provided for the Committees.



53. What salaries do the *Hansard* reporters receive?—Under resolution of the Reporting Debates Committee they begin at £250 and go up to £300, I believe. They do not come within my cognisance.

54. What is the term of their engagement—during the session?—Yes, and a few days after, finishing up their work.

55. How many days are they required after the session?—I am afraid you would have to ask the Chief Reporter of the *Hansard* staff. They come a few days before the session, and they have to stop to wind up their work to the satisfaction of the Chief Reporter.

56. At the furthest, they are not engaged more than four months?—Yes, not more than four months.

57. For that they receive from £250 up to £300 a year as the highest?—Yes.

58. Now we come to the Interpreters—that is, the Native Interpreters; there are two engaged?—There are two engaged.

59. What are their salaries?—£225 each.

60. How long does their service last?—It is simply sessional. I have a copy of a telegram from Sir Maurice O'Rorke offering an appointment to Mr Hamlin at £245 per annum. "Attendance only during session required. Reply if you can come at once." That is dated June, 1883.

61. The Government would not be consulted in that at all?—Apparently not.

62. Sir Maurice might have made it £500?—No, it was for a vacancy he was appointed, and I suppose the amount was on the estimates at the time.

63. The salary was then £250?—It was £245.

64. There are two Interpreters in our House?—Yes.

65. And in the Legislative Council?—One, I believe.

66. And the salary would be over £200?—He gets either £200 or £225.

67. How many Committee reporters are there?—Attached to the Department there are two. There used to be four before the report of the Legislative Committee. There are only two now since 1888.

68. Do you know the number for both the Legislative Council and House of Representatives?—There are no other. There used to be four—three for our House and one for the Legislative Council.

69. What reporters do you allude to?—Mr. Kinsella and Mr. Mitchell.

70. I mean other reporters?—I cannot give you any information about the number.

71. There are three Native Interpreters and two Committee reporters besides the special Committee clerks?—Yes.

72. Mr. Mitchell's salary—what is that a year?—£150. Each of the reporters get that.

73. Mr. Kinsella gets £150?—Yes.

74. And their work is only sessional?—I think both were on the *Hansard* staff, but the work becoming too heavy for them they were given these appointments. Sir Maurice O'Rorke thought it would be better to give them these appointments than to pay for extra reporters. A great number have sometimes to be employed as extra Committee reporters. When the permanent reporters are engaged we have to employ special reporters if they are required by the Committees.

75. They vary the amount paid to the Committee reporters?—I think not. I think the scale was fixed before my time. I think it is a guinea for attendance and a shilling per folio for transcribing the notes. It comes to £4 or £5 for attendance and notes. Last year it came to £5 or £6 a day for reporting the Public Accounts Committee. The work was very heavy.

76. *Sir J. Hall.*] Is that for extra reporters?—Yes.

77. *Hon. R. Seddon.*] Within your knowledge one of these reporters made £6 or £7 a day?—No, because it might have taken him several days to transcribe his notes. One guinea is the actual charge for the day. The charge for transcribing the notes depends upon their volume.

78. Whose place is it to see whether economies could be made—is it the Government or is it that of the Clerk of the House?—The Clerk of the House has no control over it. The expenditure incurred is under the control of the Chairmen of the Committees. Mr. Guinness, I believe, incurred a great deal of expense as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I receive a requisition for a reporter, and ask Mr. Otterson, who has the engaging of them, to supply one.

79. The Committee only say they wish to have a reporter. Do you not think it would be your business to fix what remuneration he was to get?—That was a matter which, I think, was arranged between the Committee reporters and the then Speaker, Sir Maurice O'Rorke, and Mr. Barron, who knew the charges. It was a fixed scale. I do not know whether you could get reporters to do it cheaper.

80. These charges were fixed by a Speaker some years ago who is not now in existence?—The charges are approved and certified to as reasonable by the Chairman of the Committee before they are passed.

81. He does not engage the reporters, does he?—No; but he certifies to the service being necessary and approves the charge.

82. Then if the charge was £20 a day and the Chairman certified to it, it would be passed and paid?—Perhaps so; I cannot say—if the Chairman of the Committee approved the payment.

83. Does the Chairman of the Committee certify for the amount, that the services have been performed, or for the length of time for attendance?—He approves the account in every case before it is passed for payment.

84. *Mr. T. Thompson.*] With regard to the *Hansard* reporters, do you know whether in the case of two sessions in one year they get any extra payment?—No.

85. And the interpreters?—No.

86. Nothing in the shape of a bonus?—No.

87. *Mr. Guinness.*] Is it not the duty of the officer of the House who supplies to the Chairman of a Committee a reporter, when he engages that person to fix the remuneration that should be paid

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.

108. So that Mr. Rutherford was engaged in the duties of his office eleven months out of the twelve?—Yes.

109. He was not on leave of absence?—I say that in the course of the year he gets from a month's to six weeks' leave. He was never away for that time at once, but takes three or four days at a time.

110. I want to elicit, for the information of the Committee, the duties of the office held by Mr. O'Rorke. When was that office first created?—In October, 1872.

111. Who was the first officer?—Mr. Otterson.

112. What was the salary paid to that officer?—£120.

113. Who was his successor?—Mr. Ernest Bell.

114. What was his salary?—I think he began at that, or £150. I think he left off at £225.

115. Was Mr. O'Rorke appointed successor to Mr. Bell?—Yes.

116. What was the salary paid to him when he took office?—£150.

117. What is the salary paid now?—£250.

118. Now, as a matter of fact, have the duties been in any way altered, increased, or diminished during the period 1872 to 1893?—I think, as a matter of fact, the duties have been increased since that time.

119. Relatively, is the salary now paid to Mr. O'Rorke, or to any other officer holding that position, less or more than that paid to the officer in 1872?—Certainly not more, for he fulfils now the office of Reader and also succeeded to Mr. Rutherford's office as Clerk of Bills and Papers in 1889. Mr. Rutherford's services certainly were at the disposal of the office all the year round; but I should think Mr. O'Rorke was not paid exorbitantly. He took the salary of the officer engaged all the year round, but his work is only sessional.

120. The inference from that is that the salary is too high for the scope of the duties?—I have no doubt you could get the appointment filled as in the early days, provided it was only a sessional appointment, for a smaller sum.

121. Do you recollect when Mr. Brandon was Bills Clerk in the House?—Yes.

122. Who succeeded to the duties he used to perform?—He died, and I do not think the appointment has been filled up. The present Clerk of the Council does the work now, and he may get some payment out of the vote for the Legislative Council, but I am unable to say how much.

123. Is the staff larger now, equal to, or smaller than that of ten or fifteen years ago?—Since 1889, when Major Campbell retired, the vacancy created in the fifth office has not been filled. The present permanent officers number four instead of five, as in Major Campbell's time. There were always five previously.

124. As a matter of fact, is the work of Parliament performed by the present staff as great, greater, or less than at the period you mention?—It is certainly not less. During some sessions, like last session, it may be greater, but on the whole I should say about the same. Varying, however, with the length of the session.

125. Then as much work has been done and is being done by four officers as was done years ago by five?—Fully. I should have been justified in saying the work had increased.

126. Would it be possible to do the work with a reduced staff?—I think it would be fatal to efficiency. Even now the department is undermanned.

127. The First Clerk-Assistant is an absolute necessity, because he takes the duties in Committee?—The Clerk and Clerk-Assistant are an absolute necessity, because they are in attendance on the House all the time.

128. Then as regards the Second Clerk-Assistant, it would not be possible to dispense with his services?—He has charge of the Journals, which have to be written up from day to day.

129. Could any of the other officers be dispensed with?—Most decidedly not, unless you can make sure of always engaging men as competent, temporarily.

130. Would it be expedient to do that?—No, I should say not.

131. Then the final result is this: in your opinion, the number of officers could not be reduced; but as regards the office now held by Mr. O'Rorke, you think the work could be performed for a smaller salary?—If the officer was only required sessionally. I think that, as before the time of Mr. O'Rorke's appointment, the appointment should be for all the year round. I consider it necessary to have a fourth officer to fill the place of any one who may be ill or absent.

132. Then if the Record Clerk were employed all the year round, do you think the salary should be reduced from £250 to a smaller sum?—I do not think £250 would be too much to pay a clerk who would be employed all the year round. He would not perhaps be continually employed, but he would be in attendance at the office during the whole year.

133. There was a question asked by Mr. Guinness with reference to certifying to the services of reporters on Committees. The question arose as to whether the Chairman who certified, did so merely as to the time, and not as to the value of the services performed. Are the vouchers for payment prepared on printed forms?—Yes.

134. Is it not a fact that, in the form of certificate, at the bottom of the voucher, the person signing certifies that the services have been performed, and that the charges are reasonable?—Yes, that is printed on the form.

135. Therefore the person signing certifies as to two points, first, as to the time, and secondly, as to the charge made being reasonable?—Yes, by signing that certificate.

136. There has been, as stated by you, a reduction in the actual number of permanent hands employed in the Department. Has there been since or contemporaneously with that reduction any corresponding increase as to the amount paid for extras?—No; there has been one extra clerk taken on in charge of the Paper office. He is actually engaged during the session. He gets 15s. a day. It may amount to about £50 or £60, according to the length of the session.

137. *Mr. W. Hutchison.*] Do you not think one person would be enough in that room?—I do not think the members would find it so. It is for the convenience of members that the expense is

kept up. There is, in fact, only one clerk in that room. The other is a messenger, actually engaged all the session in duties as a messenger of the House.

138. *Mr. T. Thompson.*] Is it a fact that the Chairman has to accept almost without question the voucher sent in by the reporter as regards the rate of pay, as being in accordance with fixed scale?—I should think the Chairman is much in the same position as myself. I am bound to acknowledge what has been the fixed charge, and if it is not brought under my notice that the charge is unreasonable, the voucher is passed.

139. *The Chairman.*] Who prepares the vouchers?—The reporters themselves.

140. Do they send them direct to the Chairman of the Committee?—They send them to the office. Mr Rutherford is in charge of the office. He refers to them to the Chairman through the Clerk of the Committee. When they come back to him I never pass them until I get the signature of the Chairman.

141. Would it not be Mr Rutherford's duty, in the event of a person making an excessive charge, to point that out to the Chairman?—Yes, certainly.

142. In point of fact, if such a circumstance was not pointed out, the Chairman would assume that it was regular?—Yes.

143. *Mr. W. Hutchison.*] The rate charged by the reporter is a guinea a day, and a shilling a folio for the transcription of the notes taken?—Yes.

144. *Mr. R. Thompson.*] Would it not be possible for arrangements to be made for a permanent officer to perform the duties of Record Clerk—any officer from the Government Buildings?—No, it must always be the same officer. There is an immense amount of information and training required. After four or five years he becomes a valuable officer. He might be a different officer every year if he came from the Government Buildings.

145. *Mr. W. Hutchison.*] Could not your deputy with Mr. Rutherford do it?—No. He might do it sometimes. The Journals would remain unwritten.

146. I mean during the recess?—Mr. Otterson and Mr. Rutherford both supervise the work of the Journals and Appendices during the recess. The two work together. In supervising press-work it requires two persons working together to perform such service efficiently.

147. *Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] There is not much of that during the recess?—There is a great deal of it. An enormous number of papers have to be read, and there is the printing and indexing of the Journals, and compiling of the schedules, which is all technical work and has always been done by Messrs. Otterson and Rutherford.

148. How long after the session is it when the Journals are got out and sent to members?—They used to be got out in three or four months after the close of the session, but before Major Campbell left he found that there was great dissatisfaction among members at not getting the Papers out at an earlier date, and since then the printers have taken up the work of the Appendix and Papers first for the convenience of the members. The Journals, I daresay, could be got out earlier if the printers kept up an extra staff to do the work.

149. There would not be any difficulty about that?—It is entirely a matter for the Printing Office. They would have to increase their staff. It could not be done otherwise.

150. *Hon. Mr. Rolleston.*] Are not the Papers printed during the session all struck off?—Yes; but that is not one-fourth of the total number. The Papers have to be taken up and printed after the House rises.

151. *Sir J. Hall.*] Who is responsible for the Bills after they are passed by the House being correctly reprinted?—Mr. O'Rorke is, and has been since Mr. Bell's time. Previous to Mr. Bell Mr. Otterson was.

152. And the Acts themselves—who is responsible for them being in strict accordance?—The Clerk of Parliaments.

153. *Captain Russell.*] You said it was customary for officers of the House to be appointed by the Executive Government on the recommendation of the Speaker. Supposing the Government refuses to agree to the appointment as recommended by the Speaker, what course would be taken then?—I can only refer you to the case I before referred to—that is, in 1862, when Mr. Fox refused to concur with Sir David Monro's recommendation. He offered to take any further recommendation, but Sir David Monro refused to make any further recommendation and brought the matter before the House.

154. You mean to say that the appointment rests ultimately with the Speaker—no appointment could be made except with his consent?—That would be the virtual result.

155. Was there no appointment made in the case of Mr. Fox?—That was the case of reference to the House in 1862, when the House settled the question.

156. What happened for the time being before the appointment?—That will be seen in the correspondence. A legal gentleman was sent from Auckland to do the work.

157. Then the Minister did make the appointment?—No. Sir David Monro accepted his services (as he stated) to avoid inconvenience at the time, but would not accept him as a permanent officer.

158. *The Chairman.*] A *locum tenens* was appointed pending the permanent appointment?—Yes; while the question was being referred to the House.

159. *Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Suppose the Government made the appointment, and the Speaker did not recommend it, would you say it was not an appointment under the Act?—I should say it would be an appointment. There is nothing to prevent the Government making appointments.

160. Supposing it was opposed directly to the will of the Speaker, would he accept that officer?—I think, decidedly, the Speaker could refuse.

161. What would be done?—I do not know.



## MEMORANDUM BY MR. SPEAKER.

THE questions raised by the correspondence remitted to the Committee, and the action taken by the Government, or proposed to be taken by it, and upon which the opinion of the Committee needs to be expressed, appear to me to be the following, viz.:—

1. What officers are to be regarded as "officers of the House" within the meaning of the resolution of 1862 (*vide Journals, House of Representatives, page 116*)?

2. As regards such officers, should the mode of appointment in that resolution referred to continue in operation, or should it be departed from?

3. If the Serjeant-at-Arms, Interpreters, Committee Reporters, and *Hansard* reporters are not held to be included in the foregoing, then, should the precedents which have obtained under previous Speakers be followed or departed from?

4. With whom is to rest the right of dismissal or suspension for dereliction of duty?

5. Under whose control are the officers to be during the recess?

6. Is it expedient that the services of any of them should be at the disposal of the Government during the recess?

7. By whom should the Legislative estimates be prepared in the first instance? If by the Speaker's department, then,—

8. What course should be followed in the event of the Government not approving of any item or items?

9. As regards the mode of appointing, and the control of the officers, is it expedient to lay this down, as in Victoria, by statute?

In connection with queries 1, 2, 3, and 4, I have prepared a *précis* of the documents of the office, showing in what manner the appointments to the several offices have hitherto been made.

The resolution of 1862 (*vide Journals, page 116*) lays down "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 the Clerk of Committees, should be similarly appointed on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees.

Since that date, until the recent appointments made to the *Hansard* staff by the Government, all appointments appear to have been made by the Governor upon the Speaker's recommendation (in the case of the First Clerk-Assistant with the concurrence of the Chairman of Committees), or by the Speaker direct.

The following is, I think, a complete list:—

Mr. Friend, appointment as Clerk-Assistant in 1864, made by the Governor on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees. Appointment as Clerk of the House, 15th October, 1889, made by the Governor on the recommendation of Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker.

Mr. Otterson, original appointment as Reader, 25th October, 1872, made by Sir F. D. Bell, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. Otterson, appointment as Second Clerk-Assistant,\* 3rd August, 1875, made by the Governor, on recommendation of Sir F. D. Bell, Speaker.

Mr. Otterson, appointment as Clerk-Assistant, 13th November, 1889, made by the Governor, on the recommendation of Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker, and Mr. Hamlin, Chairman of Committees. (*Vide Sir G. M. O'Rorke's letter of 15th October, 1889, and Mr. Cooper's letter of 13th November, 1889.*)

Mr. Rutherford, original appointment as Clerk of Bills and Papers (subsequently Record Clerk), 12th August, 1879, made by Sir W. Fitzherbert, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. Rutherford, appointment as Second Clerk-Assistant, 14th February, 1890, made by the Governor, on the recommendation of Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker.

Mr. Grace, appointment as Interpreter, 19th November, 1877, made by Sir William Fitzherbert, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. Carroll and Mr. Hadfield, appointments as Interpreters, 7th November, 1879, made by Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. F. S. Hamlin, appointment as Interpreter, 12th July, 1883, made by Sir G. M. O'Rorke, absolutely.

Mr. Grey and Mr. Parkinson, appointments to *Hansard* staff, 20th May, 1879, made by Sir W. Fitzherbert, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. Montrose, appointment as Committee Reporter, 21st June, 1879, made by Sir W. Fitzherbert, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. Berry, appointment as Committee Reporter, 12th July, 1883, made by Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker, absolutely.

Captain Mair, appointed Interpreter by Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. Kinsella, appointment as Committee Reporter, 7th August, 1884, made by Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Kennedy, appointments as Committee Reporters, 13th May, 1886, made by Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker, absolutely.

Captain Deck, as Serjeant-at-Arms, in 1854, by the Governor, in response to a resolution of the House.

Mr. Edward Mayne, as Serjeant-at-Arms, in 1858, by the Governor, on the recommendation of Sir Charles Clifford, as Speaker.

Dr. Greenwood, as Serjeant-at-Arms, in 1865, on the recommendation of Sir D. Monro, as Speaker.

\* In connection with this appointment, it may be noted that the question of stamp duty arose, and it was decided that duty was not properly payable, on the ground that "the Second Clerk-Assistant was not an officer of the General Government." (*Vide letter from Stamp Office, 8th October, 1875.*) The duty was therefore refunded. (*Vide letter dated 15th October, 1875.*)

Major Paul, as Serjeant-at-Arms, in 1877, on the recommendation of Sir W. Fitzherbert, as Speaker.

Lieutenant Horne, appointment as Serjeant-at-Arms, 10th August, 1880; appointed by the Governor on recommendation of Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker.

Lieutenant-Colonel De Quincey, appointment as Serjeant-at-Arms, 12th July, 1889; made by Sir G. M. O'Rorke, Speaker, absolutely.

From the foregoing it will be seen that hitherto, without exception, the Interpreters and Committee Reporters have been appointed absolutely by the Speaker without reference to any other authority.

So also the officers from time to time holding the position of Record Clerk or Clerk of Bills and Papers.

The Second Clerk-Assistant has always been appointed by the Governor on the Speaker's recommendation.

The First Clerk-Assistant has since 1862 been appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Speaker, the Speaker in turn acting on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees.

The Clerk of the House has been appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Speaker.

The Serjeant-at-Arms has been appointed either by the Governor on the Speaker's recommendation, or by the Speaker absolutely.

The *Hansard* Reporters have since 1871\* been appointed—

Mr. Fisher, appointed to *Hansard* staff, July, 1873, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. E. Downey, appointed to *Hansard* staff, 8th July, 1874, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. G. Downie, appointed to *Hansard* staff, June, 1876, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. G. W. Adams, appointed to *Hansard* staff, 1st August, 1884, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. S. Spragg, appointed to *Hansard* staff, 4th August, 1884, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. W. Berry, appointed to *Hansard* staff, 13th May, 1886, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. F. Bond, appointed to *Hansard* staff, June, 1887, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. W. Leslie, appointed to *Hansard* staff, 25th April, 1888, by Government, on recommendation of Speaker.

Mr. J. M. Geddis, appointed to *Hansard* staff, June, 1888, by Speaker absolutely.

Mr. W. H. Russell, appointed to *Hansard* staff, 7th June, 1893, by Government absolutely, and contrary to recommendation of Speaker.

Mr. H. M. Gore, appointed to *Hansard* staff, 21st June, 1893, by Government absolutely, and contrary to recommendation of Speaker.

What is the practice in the sister colonies of Australia is clearly set out at pages 8 and 9 of Parliamentary Paper A.—3, being the memorandum and correspondence laid upon the table by myself at the opening of the present session. The letters from the several Speakers therein contained will, I think, be of value in connection with the consideration of questions 5 and 6.

In connection with questions 7 and 8, I desire to lay before the Committee certain correspondence which is appended to this memorandum.

This correspondence will, I think, convince the Committee of the expediency of laying down some definite course of procedure with regard to the revision of the Legislative Estimates by the Government, as suggested in my letter to the Hon. Mr. W. P. Reeves of date 22nd June, 1892, which will be found at pp. 3, 4, of Paper A.—3 of the present session before referred to.

In connection with question No. 9, I beg to lay before the Committee a copy of the Act of the Victorian Legislature intituled "The Officers of Parliament Act, 1888." I do not think all the provisions of that measure would be applicable to our own case, but, subject to necessary modifications, it may serve as a model for any proposed legislation. I may, however, note that section 6 of the Act in question provides that "every appointment to any office of Parliament after the passing of this Act shall be made by the Governor in Council upon the nomination, in the case of officers of the Council, of the President, in the case of officers of the Assembly, by the Speaker."

In connection with this inquiry generally I should also like to refer to what took place in 1862. In that year, as will be seen by the Journals, page 115, and paper D.—19 of the Appendix, a similar question to that now before this Committee was raised as between the then Speaker (Sir David Monro) and the Government, and it is worthy of note that Sir David Monro took much the same course that I have felt it my duty to take. He also took the step of consulting the Speakers of the Australian Colonies as to the practice there obtaining, and, as an enclosure in one of the replies (that of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales), is given an extract from the Votes and Proceedings of that Legislature in February, 1860, in relation to a precisely similar correspondence to that which has taken place between the Government and myself, and which now forms the subject of the present inquiry.

In the New South Wales case, as in the present, the correspondence was laid on the table of the House by the Speaker, and, after debate thereon, it was resolved as follows:—

"1. That this House is of opinion that the course pursued by Mr. Speaker in the correspondence which has been laid upon the table is entirely in accordance with the duty of Mr. Speaker as the guardian of the privileges and the depository of the dignity of this House.

"2. That it is the opinion of this House that, in order to maintain the dignity and usefulness of the office of Speaker, all the Clerks and other officers of the House ought to be appointed by the Executive upon the recommendation of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly."

In the like case in our own colony, above referred to—namely, in 1862—the discussion of the question resulted in the passing of the resolution before cited by me in the present memorandum

\* In the recess of 1871 the permanent *Hansard* staff was appointed by the Government under resolution of the House, subsequently to which appointments have been made as stated.

—namely, “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 the Clerk of Committees, should be similarly appointed on the recommendation of the Chairman of Committees.” The course prescribed by that resolution has, it will be seen, since been followed in relation to the appointments made to the offices existing in 1862, and which have since continued to exist—namely, those of Clerk of the House and First and Second Clerk-Assistant. As regards offices since created—namely, those of Record Clerk, Interpreters, *Hansard* Reporters, and Committee Reporters—the appointments have been made by the Speakers absolutely, it having evidently been held that the resolution of 1862 only applied to the offices then existing.

As regards the Serjeant-at-Arms, the appointments have since 1862 been made in the mode prescribed by the resolution, with one exception, in which case the Speaker made the appointment absolutely.

*Correspondence referred to in above Memorandum.*

SIR,—

Speaker's Rooms, 10th July, 1893.

Herewith I have the honour to forward to you the undermentioned papers, viz. :—

(A.) Memorandum from Mr. Kinsella (one of the Committee reporters), with minute thereon by Mr. Friend, to whom it is addressed.

(B.) Letter to myself from Mr. Pharazyn, Chairman of the Library Committee, on the subject of the Library estimates.

I need not say (as you are of course aware of the fact) that the omission of provision for the two reporters, and the alteration of the Library estimates, pointed out by Mr. Pharazyn, are not traceable to myself, nor consequent upon any recommendation of mine. But, as pointed out by Mr. Friend, there is not sufficient provision made in the estimates for the payment of the two reporters referred to, and I can now only suggest that this should be done by a vote on the Supplementary Estimates.

As regards the Library staff, a like course will, I suppose, have to be taken. The reasons are so fully explained by Mr. Pharazyn that it is unnecessary for me to add anything to his memorandum, from which it appears the further sum required to enable engagements to be met would be £150 in round figures—the exact difference between the proposed votes and last year's expenditure being £138 ls., *i.e.*, not taking into account any provision for cataloguing.

I have, &c.,

WM. J. STEWARD.

The Hon. the Premier.

Enclosure A.

*Memorandum for Mr. Friend, Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

JAMES LAWRENCE KINSELLA, one of the Committee Reporters of the House of Representatives, begs respectfully to bring under your notice the following facts :—

In August, 1884, I was appointed by Sir Maurice O'Rorke, then Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of the Committee Reporters, at a salary of £150 per annum. Until the date of my appointment, I occupied the position of chief reporter to the *New Zealand Herald*, in Auckland, having held that situation for a period of twenty years, without intermission, at a salary of £250 per annum.

At the time of my appointment no objection was made to Committee Reporters accepting other engagements. I, myself, suggested that there was some incompatibility between the duties of a Committee Reporter in the House of Representatives and those of a newspaper correspondent. I consequently relinquished my engagements with the *New Zealand Herald* during that session, and every session since, at a loss of between £60 and £70 per annum.

I have received no notice of any intention to dispense with the services of the Committee Reporters of the House.

I would respectfully call your attention to the fact that I have been diligent and zealous in the performance of my duties during the nine years I have held the position of Committee Reporter to the House of Representatives. I submit that the determination at which the Government has arrived involves serious injustice and cruel hardship to a person who has in no way earned exceptionally severe treatment.

I therefore beg, through you, to submit to the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Representatives the above-mentioned facts, in order that he may take such action as appears to him fitting.

JAMES KINSELLA.

*Minute by Mr. Friend.*

For the Hon. the Speaker, House of Representatives.

In submitting enclosed letter, I can only say that at present I know nothing of any such proposed change in the department. The usual provision for Select Committee reporters is certainly omitted from the present estimates, but I can scarcely conceive that the Government propose to remove two old permanent officers of this House, much at the service of honourable members of this House, without any communication to the Speaker of the House. It would also be rather scant courtesy to myself that I should receive no intimation that I was to be at once deprived during the present session of the services of two officers who have for years past been available for the work of the department. I may add that it is in Select Committees that their services are in constant requisition; and it is only right that I should be at once placed in a position to inform the Chairmen of those Committees whether their services have been withdrawn by yourself or by

GEORGE FRIEND,

Clerk, House of Representatives.

5th July, 1893.



## Enclosure B.

Wellington, 6th July, 1893.

Sir,— I have the honour to make to you the following representations regarding Library salaries, and regarding the estimates for the same for the current financial year:—

On the 17th April last I forwarded you my recommendations on this subject, and followed them up on the 26th April with an explanation, and on the 29th May with a correction. In the printed estimates for the current year these recommendations have not been carried out. These estimates provide for Library salaries, as follows:—

Librarian, <i>nil</i> .		£	s.	d.
Assistant-Librarian ... ..	...	250	0	0
Second Assistant ... ..	...	150	0	0
Extra assistance, and Mailman during session ... ..	...	144	0	0
Total ... ..	...	£544	0	0

Now, the amounts voted last year were:—

1. Librarian ... ..	...	£	s.	d.
2. Assistant-Librarian ... ..	...	250	0	0
3. Second Assistant ... ..	...	150	0	0
4. Extra assistance, and Mailman during session ... ..	...	130	0	0
5. Cataloguing Assistant ... ..	...	120	0	0
Total ... ..	...	£900	0	0

On deducting the £120 for the special work of the cataloguer (temporary), the vote for ordinary Library salaries last year was £780.

The items Nos. 1, 4, and 5 of the above vote of £900 (£250, £130, and £120) were in practice formed into one fund of £500, out of which all salaries, save those of the First and Second Assistants, were paid; and the total expenditure on Library salaries last year was as follows:—

Librarian, <i>nil</i> .		£	s.	d.
Assistant Librarian ... ..	...	250	0	0
Second Assistant (temporary)... ..	...	150	0	0
Temporary Assistant ... ..	...	126	13	0
Attendant ... ..	...	110	4	0
Mailman during session ... ..	...	45	4	0
Total for ordinary staff ... ..	...	682	1	0
Cataloguing Assistant (special) ... ..	...	156	10	0
Sub-Assistant for cataloguing ... ..	...	4	10	0
Total expenditure ... ..	...	843	1	0
Unexpended balance ... ..	...	56	19	0
		£900	0	0

So that, leaving out of consideration any special work, such as that of the catalogue, the vote for salaries this year should be at least £682, if the same staff and the same rates of pay as existed last year are to be retained. Yet the printed estimates provide, as shown above, for £544 only. I submit that the Library cannot be rightly maintained in working order for such a sum; and I desire to point out that even the sum of £682 ls., paid in salaries last year for the ordinary staff, is less than any sum voted for Library salaries for the past fifteen years. The following table shows this:—

*Amounts voted for Ordinary Library Salaries (exclusive of any Special Work or Gratuities) from 1878 to 1891 inclusive.*

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1878	£690	1885	£780
1879	715	1886	790
1880	715	1887	790
1881	735	1888	800
1882	760	1889	800
1883	860*	1890	779
1884	925*	1891	730

The Library is probably nearly three times as large as it was fifteen years ago, its importance and value are much greater than then, and the responsibilities and work connected with it are proportionately increased. Why, then, should the total of salaries paid now be less than the vote for salaries in 1878, and why should the estimates for this year's salaries be £146 less than that vote?

I subjoin a statement of the salaries paid in the Parliament Library of New South Wales, and desire to invite comparison between it and the estimates of last year and of the present year for salaries in the General Assembly Library. Be it remembered that the Parliament Library of New South Wales and the General Assembly Library are just about equal in point of size, number of volumes, and (possibly) value:—

\* NOTE.—The votes for 1883 and 1884 may include some special service.

*Salaries in the Parliament Library of New South Wales.*

	£	s.	d.
Librarian ... ..	490	0	0
First Assistant ... ..	375	0	0
Second Assistant ... ..	300	0	0
Messenger ... ..	100	0	0
Total ... ..	£1,265	0	0

Requesting that you will be good enough to urge these considerations upon the attention of the Government.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT PHARAZYN,  
Chairman, Joint Library Committee.

The Hon. the Speaker, House of Representatives.

Enclosure C.

SIR,—

Premier's Office, Wellington 17th July, 1893.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, with enclosures, on the subject of the Estimates, as relating to the Committee Reporters and the Library staff, and in reply to state that your remarks and suggestions will be considered when the Supplementary Estimates are under review.

I have, &c.,

The Hon. the Speaker, House of Representatives.

R. J. SEDDON.

Enclosure D.

*Hansard Reporters.*

*Hansard Office, 5th August, 1893.*

*Memorandum for Mr. Speaker.*

I HAVE seen the letters of appointment to *Hansard* staff of Mr. W. H. Russell, 7th June, and Mr. H. M. Gore, 21st June. Their salaries from *Hansard* are £250 a year each.

They are to receive a retaining fee of £50 each from the Government for reporting Commissions during the recess, with an allowance of £1 1s. per day each when actually at work.

With the recess arrangements, this department, of course, has nothing to do.

Would you kindly pass the accompanying voucher for payment?

C. C. N. BARRON, Chief Reporter.

THURSDAY, 31ST AUGUST, 1893.

*Examiner of Standing Orders on Private Bills.*

THE CHAIRMAN, in reference to the memorandum submitted at the previous meeting, said,—I should inform the Committee that I omitted, inadvertently, to refer to the appointment of one officer—the Examiner of Standing Orders on Private Bills. That appointment was at one time held by the late Mr. Brandon, subsequently by Major Campbell, and now by Mr. Leonard Stowe, the Clerk of Parliaments. This appointment has been made conjointly by the Speakers of both Houses.

*Cost of Committee Reporting, Interpreting, &c.*

The Hon. Mr. SEDDON laid before the Committee the following memorandum:—

	£	s.	d.
(1.) Amount paid for Committee reporting (parliamentary) last session ... ..	574	0	0
(2.) Amount paid for extra clerical assistance last session ... ..	953	4	0
(3.) Amount paid for reporting Royal Commissions or special Commissions during past three years ... ..	1,715	18	8
(4.) Amount paid for Native interpreting during last recess ... ..	1,319	4	0

R. J. COLLINS,

Accountant to the Treasury.

The Treasury, Wellington, 18th August, 1893.

MONDAY, 4TH SEPTEMBER, 1893.

*Cost of Committee Reporting, Interpreting, &c.—Detailed Return.*

The Hon. Mr. SEDDON laid before the Committee the following details of Return produced at previous meeting:—

DETAILED RETURN.

(1.) *Amount paid for Committee Reporting (Parliamentary) last Session.*

	£	s.	d.
Two reporters, at £150 per annum ... ..	300	0	0
Extra Committee reporters ... ..	274	0	0
	£574	0	0

(2.) *Amount paid for Extra Clerical Assistance last Session (Parliamentary).*

Extra Clerks—	£	s.	d.
Legislative Council ... ..	144	0	0
House of Representatives ... ..	804	9	6
Copies of notes, <i>re</i> Chemis ... ..	4	14	6
	<u>£953</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>

(3.) *Amount paid for reporting Royal Commissions or Special Commissions during the last Three Years.*

	£	s.	d.
1. Ell Commission ... ..	25	0	0
2. Fryday Commission ... ..	19	10	0
3. J. K. Johnson Special Commission ... ..	7	7	9
4. Native Land Laws Commission ... ..	396	16	5
5. Polhill Gully Commission ... ..	38	15	0
6. Public Trust Office Commission ... ..	455	11	0
7. Intercolonial Stock Conference ... ..	30	5	0
8. Reporting Labour Conference ... ..	47	9	0
9. Reporting Premier's speeches ... ..	9	16	6
10. Shelley Bay Inquiry ... ..	8	0	0
11. Dunedin Hospital Inquiry ... ..	218	6	0
12. Auckland Hospital Inquiry ... ..	82	18	0
13. Inquiry <i>re</i> death of Ah Ching ... ..	25	4	0
14. Grey Valley Commission... ..	162	0	0
15. Sweating Commission ... ..	114	1	0
16. Deaf-mute School Inquiry ... ..	7	11	0
17. Caversham Industrial School Inquiry ... ..	67	8	0
	<u>£1,715</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>

(4.) *Amount paid for Native Interpreting during last Recess.*

	£	s.	d.
Remuneration of interpreters temporarily employed ... ..	395	19	4*
Travelling-expenses of interpreters temporarily employed ... ..	32	13	10
Salaries of permanent officers acting as clerks and interpreters, Native Land Court ... ..	510	0	0
Travelling-expenses of permanent officers acting as clerks and interpreters, Native Land Court ... ..	380	10	10
	<u>£1,319</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>

\* A large part of this has been spent in the Native Land Court at Gisborne, but there is now a salaried interpreter attached to that Court. The employment is practically permanent in Native Land Courts—*i.e.*, it is continuous.

4th September, 1893.

R. J. COLLINS,  
Accountant to the Treasury.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (1,400 copies), £13 4s.

By Authority: SAMUEL COSTALL, Government Printer, Wellington.—1893.

*Price, 9d.]*

