

Hon. Dr. Featherston  
24th July, 1861.

1. *By Chairman.*] Have you perused the report of your reply as it appears in the *New-Zealander*?—I have.
2. Is it correct?—I believe it to be substantially correct. Being a speech in reply, I cannot vouch for its entire accuracy. I corrected the notes for the *New-Zealander*.
3. Have you perused the report as it appears in the *Southern Cross* of the 18th June?—I have.
4. Is that a correct report?—It is not.

5. *Hon. the Speaker.*] Which are the incorrect passages?—They are these:—

“I do candidly avow that this correspondence has strengthened and confirmed the supposition which I had long entertained that undue pressure had been brought to bear upon the Government for the acquisition of that land; and I will go further, and say that that undue pressure was not merely on the part of the Taranaki settlers but I believe also on the part of my honourable friend the Colonial Treasurer.”

“I can come to no other conclusion than that the present Ministry is in some way responsible for the conspiracy which Mr. Parris charged against the settlers, that they are not only responsible but that they are themselves in the conspiracy, and that there was an undue pressure, both by the settlers of Taranaki and the Colonial Treasurer.”

There is also a general inaccuracy in that report. I disavow having made use of the expressions above quoted as they are reported in the *Southern Cross*.

6. *Mr. Russell.*] Do you wish the Committee to understand that you did not on the 14th June last prefer a charge against Mr. Richmond of being in a conspiracy to exterminate William King and to get possession of his land at the Waitara?—In the first place I protest against being called upon to frame a charge which I never preferred. I expected that the Chairman of the Committee would be prepared to specify the charge which he alleges I made against Mr. Richmond. The remarks I made in my reply on the day in question, went to the effect, after alluding to the suspicions I had expressed last Session as to a sinister influence being exercised at the Executive Council with regard to the Waitara, and after stating the charge against the Taranaki Settlers contained in Mr. Parris' letter, was made, not by myself, but by Mr. Parris, and that the charges contained in Mr. Abraham's Petition against Mr. Richmond are not charges preferred by me, I stated that the charge preferred by Mr. Parris against the Taranaki Settlers and the allegations in Mr. Abraham's Petition against Mr. Richmond, coupled with the fact that negotiations for the purchase of Teira's block commenced in March, 1859, a few months after Mr. Richmond had entered into the arrangement with Mr. Carrington, as mentioned in Mr. Abraham's Petition, strengthened and confirmed the suspicions I had expressed in 1860, that an undue pressure had been brought to bear in the Executive on the Waitara question.

Adjourned to Friday at half-past 10.

Witnesses ordered to be summoned:—The Hon. Dr. Featherston, C. W. Richmond, Esq.

---

FRIDAY, 26TH JULY, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Creyke,  
“ Chairman of Committees  
“ Russell,

Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ Renall,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Fitzherbert.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

The Chairman stated that in consequence of certain Members of the Committee having expressed a wish that a direct charge should be framed by this Committee, he had prepared a statement of what, in his opinion, the charge was, which had been referred to by the House, but that before proceeding to lay the statement before the Committee, he should move, That the examination of Dr. Featherston be continued previously to any definition of the charge being made by the Committee.

On the Motion being put, a point of Order was raised.

*By Chairman of Committees.*] Was the definition or framing of a charge by the Committee or the Chairman, within the instructions of the House to this Committee?

The Chairman ruled, after consultation with the Honourable the Speaker, that the definition of a charge is within the instructions of the House to this Committee.

And, on the original Motion being put by the Chairman, the Committee divided, when there were:—