

Mr. W. Griffin

2 Aug., 1861.

53. Have any members ever declined to correct the transcriptions, in consequence of the inaccuracy of reports made for the *New Zealander*; and have they ever referred you to the reports of the *Southern Cross*?—I cannot answer this question.

54. The rejoinder is very nearly similar in both the *Southern Cross* and the *New Zealander*,—whereas the reply, as corrected by Dr. Featherston, which appeared in the *New Zealander*, is very different from that which appeared in the *Southern Cross*; can you account for this?—No.

55. Mr. Chairman of Committees.] In reference to the last question and answer, are not newspaper reports of speeches usually much compressed?—Frequently, and absolutely necessarily so.

56. Is it not therefore possible that two reports may on the face of them differ essentially, although every word in each may have been uttered by the speaker: I suppose the case of two newspapers making different selections from the whole speech as delivered?—Yes; the Reporters when following a speaker do not always make the same selection: what may appear important to one Reporter will not be so to another.

57. Mr Fitzherbert.] Having read the *New Zealander*, have you any reason to doubt the accuracy of that particular report?—I read that report on the morning it appeared; I did not see any deviations, in point of matter, from the notes I furnished, and I had no reason to doubt its accuracy when reading it.

58. Have you now any doubts of the accuracy of that report, after having had your attention particularly directed to it and the report of the *Southern Cross*?—I cannot say, not having had time to compare the two reports: it would require careful reading, sentence by sentence.

59. Will you state whether, from the course of this examination, you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the *New Zealander* report in question?—The word “accuracy” is too close a term to apply to a report, because a report may be substantially correct, and, in the strict sense of the term, not accurate. We call a report an honest report when it gives the fair inference of what a speaker wishes to convey.

60. Is this *New Zealander* report in question an honest report?—To the best of my belief it is; I know nothing to the contrary.

61. Having reference to question No. 59, do you apply your observation as “to accuracy of a report” to reports in general?—To all reports that are given in the third person, because the language is changed.

No member of the Committee desiring to put further questions, this witness was discharged.

The Committee directed that Mr. Parris should be summoned to attend on Saturday.

Dr. Featherston being unable to attend, as previously requested, he was summoned for Saturday at 10 a.m.

On Motion of Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., the Committee adjourned until Saturday, at 10 a.m.

SATURDAY, 3RD AUGUST, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,
The Hon. the Speaker,

The Hon. Mr. Fitzherbert,
Mr. Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Dr. Featherston examined.

Dr. Featherston

3 Aug., 1861.

62. Chairman.] You have heard the charge, as defined in Mr. Weld's evidence, was that the charge preferred by you, in the speech referred to in the Order of Reference?—I object to having charges put into my mouth, and then being called upon to adopt them. I deny having made any such charge. My previous answer is so explicit that I have little or nothing to add to it. When an appeal was made to me (on the debate in question), by Mr. Weld (and, I think, Mr. Bell) to withdraw certain charges, I distinctly and emphatically denied having preferred any such charges: I had therefore none to retract. But I declared in substance that, when I remembered the Taranaki Petition of 1858, and considered the charge in Mr. Parris' letter, and the allegations in Mr. Abraham's Petition, and put them together, the suspicions or conviction I had professed last Session—“That an undue pressure had been brought to bear upon the Governor, with respect “to acquiring land at Waitara,” “and that a sinister influence had prevailed in the Executive “Council,” had been strengthened and confirmed. I shall be prepared to lay before the Committee documents upon which my suspicions are grounded, and call witnesses in proof of my assertions.

63. Are you aware that, immediately after your speech referred to in the Order of Reference, Mr. C. W. Richmond rose and declared that you had brought a charge against him, which, if true, would subject him to impeachment, and that he should insist upon the investigation of that charge?