

F. A. Weld, Esq.,

29 July, 1861.

7. *Mr. Fitzherbert.*] On what grounds do you frame the terms of the charge?—From my recollection of what I heard during the debate on the 14th; Dr. Featherston's speech, and Mr. Richmond's reply; in which he alluded to the charge that had been made against him. The newspaper reports and the general opinion of those with whom I have conversed have confirmed me in the correctness of my view.

8. You state that you present the charge in these terms, "as an individual," is the Committee to understand that you decline the responsibility of stating the charge as mover of the Committee?—I am ready to state it as the individual who moved for the investigation, and think I may very properly be asked to do so. I only wished to make it clear that the House had taken the matter into its own hands and affirmed the fact that a charge had been made.

9. Having omitted to have the words taken down at the time they were alleged to have been used, how do you account for the delay which was permitted to intervene between the 14th June and the date on which you applied for a Committee of Enquiry?—I do not think it is my business to account for the delay; that was a question that might fairly have been asked when the investigation was moved for in the House; this question appears to lead to irrelevant discussion into which I do not think I should be called upon to enter.

10. Are the terms of this charge (as presented by you) the very words used, or merely your recollection of the words; or do you waive the accuracy of the terms of charge, and prefer it as only correct in substance?—As correct in substance.

11. If the simple object of the Committee be to enquire whether there is any imputation on Mr. Richmond's character, would not the preliminary difficulties in which the Committee is involved, and also the character of Mr. Richmond, have a sufficient opportunity of being vindicated by conducting the enquiry without reference to the particular person who made the charge?

Mr. Weld asked that the question now put to him be read, with a view to obtaining the decision of the Chairman whether the question was relevant to the subject.

The Chairman decided that the question could not be put.

12. Did you make any notes at the time of Dr. Featherston's speech, and if so, have you them still in your possession?—I think not, at all events I have none by me that I am aware of.

No Member of the Committee desiring to put further questions, it was moved by Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., That Mr. Weld do resume the chair.

Agreed to.

Moved by Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., That Dr. Featherston, C. W. Richmond, Esq., and the Reporters of the *New-Zealander* paper, and *Southern Cross* paper, be requested to attend before this Committee for examination.

Agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., the Committee adjourned till Wednesday, at 3 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, 31ST JULY, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,
" Chairman of Committees,
" Fitzherbert,
" Creyke,
" Russell,

Mr. Crosbie Ward,
The Hon. the Speaker,
" " Mr. Henderson,
Mr. Renall.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Dr. Featherston called. (Absent.)

Mr. R. J. Creighton,

31 July, 1861.

Robert James Creighton, Reporter of the *Southern Cross* called in and examined.

13. *By Chairman*] Will you give the Committee your name?—Robert James Creighton.

14. What is your profession?—I am reporter to the *Southern Cross* newspaper. I am a reporter and short-hand writer by profession. I was employed by the Royal Commission of Refuge Harbours, and have had considerable experience in reporting law causes in England.

15. Were you present in the House as reporter on the occasion of a debate on Mr. Parris's letter?—I was. (Notes produced.)

16. Are those the notes that were taken on that occasion?—Yes; at the time.

The Witness here read several passages from his short-hand notes;

" Sir,—I am not at all surprised at the soreness manifested by the Colonial Treasurer, by the