

Did you see nothing offensive in that?—I did.

Yet you printed it?—I am not so sure about that. I used to send my proofs to the Censor. He would go over those proofs before I had had them corrected or read. This paper is not like one of the big city dailies in New Zealand. I am up against a very heavy proposition here. I am printer's "devil," proof-reader, reporter, and manager. In this particular case I sent the proofs up. Any further alterations I make are made on those proofs, and I do not think that would have gone into my paper.

Do you send your proofs out before you as editor have read them?—Yes, to save time.

That is an unusual proceeding, it is not?—Perhaps you know the procedure in newspaper life when you are culling from another newspaper. You paste it up, and when you have time you pass it on to the boy to have it set up. I think if I could explain to you more fully what my position is you would understand the bustle I have to put up with.

Is it your custom to cut out articles for insertion in your paper without having first considered their effect?—Sometimes. It all depends on the amount of time I have; but they are always considered before they go into the paper.

In this one particular case apparently the article was not?—It never went into the paper.

You sent it to the Censor without having first censored it yourself?—I invariably do that.

You say you have had considerable experience as a journalist?—Yes.

You read to us an article concerning some brutal affair that took place here during the early days. That went in with your approval. Had you read that before you submitted the proof?—It went up in the usual way before it was corrected.

Did you yourself make that selection? As editor of the paper did you select that article for printing in your paper?—That was not culled. It was an original article written locally.

Did you read that original article before you inserted it?—Yes. Anything that is supplied to me in manuscript form I read through.

Have you any Samoans among your subscribers?—I can only think of one full-blooded Samoan.

There are many half-caste people here. Do they read your paper?—Yes.

Do you approve of literature of this kind being circulated among a people of this kind?—I do not.

Yet you permit it to appear in your paper?—But it has not appeared in the paper.

It would have appeared if the Censor had not stopped it?—As I said, although that may have been sent up to the Censor, if I did not care about a particular thing I would alter it myself even after the Censor had done with it—as I have had occasion to do before.

You are editor of this paper?—Yes.

Do you not yourself personally peruse all that goes into that paper?—Yes.

Then you must have approved of this article appearing which you tell us you did not approve of?—No. It is rather an awkward question. I was trying to explain that from want of time very often, rather than sub-edit the stuff that appears in the New Zealand papers, I cut it out and pass it to the boys to set up. When that is done the proofs are pulled. They go up to the Censor in that form. When they come back and I have more time I go over them myself and correct them.

Then you are wasting the Censor's time by sending articles up to him which you have not perused yourself?—I have perused them roughly.

With regard to the article I was referring to, do you not think that it would have an effect upon the Samoan mind in inclining them to recognize that there is such a thing as lynch law?—No. If they felt inclined in that direction they would have been influenced many years before that article was written.

Mr. HARRIS: Has it been a usual thing for the Censor to censor articles which have been culled from the New Zealand papers?—He has only censored an article when he has thought it unfit for local consumption. It may be all right for New Zealand, but as far as Samoa is concerned it is another matter.

Are those papers from which you have taken these articles circulated in Samoa?—They are spread broadcast round this island. There are articles in the New Zealand papers—some of the extremist New Zealand papers—which I would not think of culling; but with regard to the reputable section of the New Zealand Press, if I come across anything that is of local interest I publish it. I can tell you this, however, that there has been matter even in the reputable New Zealand papers which I know would not be tolerated in the *Samoa Times*.

Mr. WRIGHT: What papers?—The *Auckland Star*.

Any others?—You have caught me napping at the moment.

Mr. ISITT: Do you not recognize that criticism of the Administration here in Samoa is safe and valuable in the New Zealand papers, and that criticism that may appear there with the possibility of doing good and with no possibility of doing harm, may, if it is copied here, do all the harm in the world with the Native population?—Yes, I realize that.

Mr. WRIGHT: I understood you to say, with reference to that passage about the banana and the coconut, that you would not have allowed that to appear in the paper. Would you have allowed that to appear?—No.

Then you approve of the censoring of that part of the article?—Quite.

Mr. HOLLAND: As a journalist, do you really think there was anything that would justify the censoring of that statement, allowing that the statement was in bad taste?—My opinion about that is this: I did think it in bad taste, because I am of opinion that our Administrator is doing his level best; I believe he is trying to carry out his task as conscientiously as any man can: but of the reasons, I hold, why there is such a lot of discontent about the place is that because of the censorship of the *Samoa Times* people are suspicious of the Administration.