

any regulation limiting the age of persons employed in such duties. I should not think it expedient to appoint as sub-enumerator a person seventy-five years of age and unable to read without a powerful magnifying-glass. If I knew of such a case I should have refused to sanction the appointment. I do not think that the work in an enumerator's office would necessarily be materially affected by dismissing one clerk and taking on another. There might be some particular work which would make such a course inexpedient.

4. The work of superintending and completing the agricultural statistics for such a district as Mr. King's might occupy about five months—*i.e.*, from January to May, including preparations which may be made in January. I think the remuneration offered Mr. King in 1892 was £20 or £25; it may have been £20. I have not been employed in official duties since the end of April last. I understood at that time that Mr. King had not been paid. The census returns are usually expected in Wellington by end of May or early in June; but sometimes they have been delayed until July.

5. Mr. Mitchelson was in office at the end of 1890, but he had nothing to do with Mr. Seaman's appointment; it was done on my recommendation. I consulted Mr. Mitchelson as an Auckland member, and he did not consider Mr. Seaman too old. I think I telegraphed to Mr. Mitchelson about it. I recollect receiving the telegram, of which the one now in my hand purports to be a copy, dated the 21st November, 1890, in which Mr. Mitchelson recommends Mr. King as census enumerator. The recommendation came too late, and had it been otherwise I should have strongly protested against the appointment on the score of expense. Mr. Mitchelson did not press the matter, and the Government appointed Mr. Seaman on my recommendation. In the returns of agricultural statistics for 1890, out of twenty-eight collectors ten received only constables' pay—*i.e.*, 2s. 6d. per day and expenses, in addition to their ordinary pay.

6. With regard to the industrial returns, I can only say that the method adopted in some instances of showing the value of completed manufactures as the same as that of the mere material is faulty and erroneous. The returns are merely for statistical purposes, and no motive can be suggested for wilful inaccuracy.

JAMES GLENNY sworn and examined.

I am a general agent in Nelson Street, Auckland. I was employed by Mr. King on the census returns of 1886 for the District of Mount Albert. There was no agreement as to terms prior to the work being done, nor any stipulation, condition, or understanding. I received either £16 or £17—I am not certain which. I got it by cheque from Wellington. I do not think there was any deduction. I got the whole of the amount. Very likely I refunded some of it. I find an entry in my cash-book of a sum of £13 10s. received. I must have given the balance back to Mr. King. I had no particular reason for giving him back £3 10s. I cannot remember now. It may have been a week or a fortnight after I received the cheque. I cannot say when I agreed to give it back. I do not think Mr. King asked me for it. I gave him cash, £3 10s. out of Government cheque.

7. *Mr. Campbell.*] The statement made to Mr. Seaman signed by me is not in my writing. I had several conversations with Mr. Seaman about the matter. There were no inducements or threats used to get me to sign it. There was no arrangement made for me to return £3 10s. I had received no advance from Mr. King on this account. I never had any dealings with Messrs. King and Whewell. I am not prepared to say that Mr. King got the £3 10s.; I suppose he got it. I have had no conversation with Mr. King about this, nor has he attempted to influence me. I applied to Mr. King in January, 1892, for employment as sub-enumerator, but he could not give me a district. I was employed by Mr. Seaman in 1891.

JOHN HENRY SMITH sworn and examined.

I am a labourer, living at Ponsonby. I was employed by Mr. King on the census of 1886 for the District of Surrey Hills. I made no agreement beforehand about the terms. I completed the work, and got £18 or £20 for it—I am not sure which. I received it in cash from Mr. King. I believe I signed the receipt myself [on being shown the voucher]. I know nothing of King, Walker, and Co. in the matter. I remember now I wanted money to defray some funeral-expenses, and Mr. King advanced me £16 in his own office. I was quite satisfied to take the £16 in full. I received a note from Mr. Seaman asking me to give evidence. I signed the memorandum of the 27th July in his office.

8. *Mr. Campbell.*] I do not recollect going to King, Walker, and Co. I may have done so. On reflection, I think there was some talk of their giving a cheque for £17 11s., deducting 9s. for discount. [Entry in King and Walker's cheque-book of cheque received from King, Walker, and Co., £17 11s.] I gave an acknowledgment for cheque. [Butt put in.] I am now satisfied on seeing these entries that I really received £17 11s., and my first statement about £16 was a mistake. I gave Mr. King nothing out of that cheque. He gave me the amount in cash. Mr. King has not attempted in any way to influence my evidence in this business. When I approached him he declined to discuss the matter with me.

SAMUEL PASCOE sworn and examined.

I am a commission agent at Onehunga. I was employed on the agricultural statistics of 1892 by Mr. King. My claim came to £9, which I received from Mr. King, less about 10s. for discount. He got it discounted for me by Mr. Edmiston: it was done at my request.

9. *Mr. Campbell.*] Whatever discount was paid was to Mr. Edmiston?