

of the charges under the head of B are summed up in that paragraph. When asked to withdraw the statement Mr. Hutchison said, "I cannot do so. I cannot deny a fact which I am satisfied myself is capable of substantiation." With respect to charge A, I would suggest to the Committee that if you take the evidence of the two Councillors who are now living, and who took opposite sides at the time of the trial of Mr. Wylde, you should also take the evidence of the Town Clerk, of the auditor, Mr. Nicholson; the Crown Prosecutor, Mr. Harper; and Dr. Giles, who took the depositions in the Magistrate's Court. If you take the evidence of the counsel on one side, I would suggest you also take that of Mr. Henry Burger and Mr. A. C. Campbell, ironmonger.

16. *The Chairman.*] Have you Mr. Campbell's address?—Yes; Kumara. You should also have the evidence of the present Town Clerk, Mr. George Rudkin; and outside Kumara you will get the evidence of the Mayor at that time, Mr. William Barnett, now a chemist at Christchurch.

17. *Mr. Masson.*] Was he Mayor at the time referred to?—Yes. Mr. George Harper is a barrister at Christchurch. I have written to Mr. Perkins, who is in Tasmania, and who was solicitor and Crown Prosecutor, and as soon as I have his reply I will hand it to the Committee. That is all with reference to charge A. Of course, these witnesses I have named may be able to give evidence as to the existence of Bun Tuck, and as to whether I was ever known by that name. I think you might also bring the Clerk of the Warden's Court, at Kumara, in respect to charge B. He will prove by the records of the Court of the issue of miners' rights whether Bun Tuck was in existence. Mr. James McEnnis was Clerk of the Warden's Court.

18. *The Chairman.*] Do you expect him to produce the rolls of miners' rights?—Yes; the Register of Miners' Rights.

19. And to give evidence as to the existence, or otherwise, of the Chinese names?—Yes; as to whether they appear in the records of the Court, and in what capacity. We should also get the evidence of Mr. Guinness, who was counsel for Mr. Wylde. Mr. Hutchison says: "We may trace in the course of an indifferent repute" (page 63). The charge made there is as to my being of indifferent repute. Next, on page 63, he charges me with what is verbally known as "building a stonewall," with the object of preventing the adoption of the auditors' report. Then the charges culminate in the following statement of Mr. Hutchison, who says: "In the course of his examination, however, a document was put into his hands. It was an authority in his own favour from his uncle Nathaniel Seddon, under which the right honourable gentleman had to admit that he himself had been the person who had drawn the moneys so paid and overpaid." I swore before the Supreme Court that neither my uncle nor myself had received the money. The next statement is a supposition that the supposed Chinaman named was a myth, and that I was the person.

20. *Hon. W. Rolleston.*] Is that a reflection upon you?—It would be treated outside Parliament in an English fashion. The serious part of the charge is contained in the statement that Wong Shung Wai "had got the best of the squeeze, and that Tsai Chung received 20 taels to clear away." Then the charges are summarised by Mr. Hutchison, on page 65, in the remarks which I have quoted. I want the Committee to note this further statement by Mr. Hutchison on page 65: "Sir, I never intended to cast the least reflection on Nathaniel Seddon; but it is to be remarked that the explanation of Richard John Seddon was not given to the Court at the time it might have been of service, and when the unfortunate Town Clerk got twelve months." "I never intended to cast the least reflection on Nathaniel Seddon." Reading that with what he says at page 63, that I had drawn the money which was so paid and overpaid, he leaves the inference that, while he withdraws the reflection against my uncle—he leaves the accusation against me that I drew the overpaid money, £219, and put it in my pocket.

*Hon. J. McKenzie:* I presume the *Hansard* report of Mr. Hutchison must be taken as correct?

*Mr. Duthie:* What appears in *Hansard* is ordinarily taken as correct.

*Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon:* I want you to summon Mr. Marks, the *Hansard* Supervisor, in connection with both charges. It was agreed by the Committee on Sir Harry Atkinson to take the *Hansard* as correct.

21. *Hon. W. Rolleston.*] What is Mr. Marks to be summoned for?—He is to be summoned to give evidence and produce a letter which he received from Mr. Hutchison respecting the *Hansard* report.

22. *The Chairman.*] There was mention made of a Mr. William Nicholson. What was he?—He is at Palmerston North. He was the local auditor at the time, and gave evidence in the case.

23. Was not mention made of a Mr. O'Hagan yesterday?—Yes; he is dead.

TUESDAY, 11TH OCTOBER, 1898.

GEORGE HARPER, Law Clerk, sworn and examined.

1. *The Chairman.*] You have been called as a witness in connection with certain allegations made by the member for Patea against the Premier in the House of Representatives. The Committee desires any information you may be able to give on the subject?—I have seen it, casually, in the newspapers.

2. *Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] You appeared as leading counsel and Crown Prosecutor with Mr. Perkins, who was the local Crown Prosecutor at Hokitika?—Yes, I was specially retained at that time.

3. That was in Hokitika in 1883?—Yes, in April, 1883.

4. You remember the Supreme Court sitting at that time at Hokitika?—Yes.

5. Did you attend the Court, and in what capacity?—I assisted Mr. Perkins, the local Crown Prosecutor, on behalf of the Crown, in the prosecution of James Wylde.

6. What were the charges against him?—The indictment was one for embezzlement of certain