

1893.
NEW ZEALAND.

CHARGES AGAINST MR. J. KING, OF AUCKLAND.

(REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE CHARGES MADE BY THE
HON. E. MITCHELSON AGAINST MR. JOHN KING, OF AUCKLAND; TOGETHER WITH MINUTES
OF EVIDENCE, &c.)

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by command of His Excellency.

REPORT.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

In pursuance of your Excellency's Commission dated the 3rd December, 1892, and of the subsequent instrument of the 29th of the same month, whereby the time for completing the inquiry by the first-mentioned instrument directed to be held was extended to the 11th February, 1893, I have completed the inquiry so directed, and have now the honour to report the results. The number of days wholly or partly occupied by sittings in this business was six—namely, the 16th and 21st December, 1892, and the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 23rd of January, 1893.

The subject-matter of the inquiry consisted of "certain statements or charges" made by the Hon. E. Mitchelson in Parliament on the 6th October, 1892, against John King, and reported in *Hansard* of that date, pages 719, 720, 721.

The *Hansard* report shows that the Hon. Mr. Seddon promised at the time that the Government would have a searching investigation made. Your Excellency's Commission also recites that Mr. John King had also requested an inquiry, and the evidence taken shows that this was the case.

At the outset of the inquiry Mr. Mitchelson attended and stated that he did not intend to take on himself the office of prosecutor, or to lead evidence in support of the statements he had made in Parliament. Mr. Mitchelson also emphatically asserted that it was the duty of the Government, having promised an inquiry, to appoint some one to conduct it, and to place it in proper shape before the Court.

Mr. Mitchelson, however, handed me in a list of witnesses who, he thought, ought to be called; and I at first expected that he would continue to attend, watching the case and making suggestions as occasion might arise. But Mr. Mitchelson afterwards wrote to me saying that, in consequence of the failure of the Government to employ counsel, he had been advised to withdraw altogether from the case.

I do not pretend to give an opinion as to the correctness of Mr. Mitchelson's view of the duty of the Government; but it is obvious that where there is no one to place a case before the Court, and the evidence on any material point gives a negative result, there is left an opening for saying that something more might have been elicited had questions been put by some one duly instructed by brief. Whether such a suggestion can reasonably be made in the present case will, perhaps, more clearly appear after I have summarised the results of my inquiry.

The statements made by Mr. Mitchelson reflecting on Mr. King fall under the following heads:—

(1.) That Mr. King conducted the business of obtaining census and agricultural statistics in such a way as to put the Government to much greater cost than was the case when the work was done by Mr. Seaman.

(2.) That in many cases Mr. King charged the Government with larger sums as the remuneration of his sub-enumerators than were actually paid to those officers, pocketing the difference himself, amounting to £95.

(3.) That Mr. King, in collecting schedules of industries for census returns, had in some cases caused the persons concerned to sign the schedules in blank, to be afterwards filled in by him, and that he filled them in incorrectly.

(4.) That Mr. King made it a condition of employment of persons wishing to be appointed sub-enumerators that they should insure their lives in the Government office, of which he was an agent, and that this "was done in order that King might take the premiums."

I shall deal with these heads *seriatim*:—

(1.) The difference in cost of returns when taken by Mr. King and Mr. Seaman, respectively, is shown by a return to an order of the House of Representatives of the 7th July, 1892, made on the motion of Mr. Mitchelson. [Exhibit A.]

The figures shown in this return are, no doubt, striking and important, but I consider this a matter for the Registrar-General's Department. I accordingly declined to enter into any details of this question unless evidence were adduced to show some positive misconduct on the part of Mr. King. I certainly did not conceive myself commissioned to enter upon an inquiry at large into the items of all the accounts paid for collecting census and agricultural statistics during a long series of years. In so far as the excess of expenditure is alleged to arise from a greater charge made against the Government in Mr. King's vouchers than the sums paid to the sub-enumerators, the matter would fall under head (2) of the charges.

From any other point of view than that of some specified misconduct on the part of Mr. King, it is the business of the department to decide whether Mr. Seaman has been judiciously economical and Mr. King carelessly extravagant; or whether, as alleged by the latter, his apparent lavishness was due to his desire to get good work and to pay well for it. The cost of these returns has been a subject which has received the attention of the department, and has apparently been the subject of much friction between Mr. King and Mr. Brown, the late Registrar-General.

I have only to report on this head that no evidence has been put before me to implicate Mr. King in any charge of misconduct in connection with the cost of returns, except such as falls under head (2), and I have no light to throw upon this part of the business in addition to the information furnished by the return itself.

(2.) This is the most serious part of the allegations made, since Mr. King is here charged with direct fraud, and fraud of such a character, as, if proved to have been committed in the unqualified manner stated in Mr. Mitchelson's speech, would seem to be a fit subject for investigation by a criminal Court.

Upon this matter of the vouchers, the only witness who has given evidence in a sense distinctly adverse to Mr. King is Mr. F. H. Heighway. His evidence and Mr. King's are absolutely at variance as to the facts of the case. Heighway's assertions are: That he signed some form in blank, that he only signed once; that he only got £12; that he did not know the voucher was made out for more; that he was not in need of money, and gave no authority to any one to draw it for him; and that he was not paid until fully three months after the completion of the work.

Now, the evidence is conclusive that he signed his name twice, once at the foot of the claim on the face of the voucher and once to the authority to an agent on the back. It is also proved to my satisfaction that Mr. Heighway did know the amount for which the voucher was made out, because in the authority indorsed he filled in with his own hand in writing the words "eighteen pounds ten shillings."

Now, Mr. Heighway's assertion, that he signed the claim on the face of the voucher in blank, is based upon the conviction that if he had seen the amount of £18 10s. stated thereon it must have attracted his attention, and is clearly deprived of all force when it is shown he did know the amount was £18 10s., and had filled in those very words on the back himself.

The same reasoning applies to his statement that he only received £12; for that statement, so far as it constitutes a charge against Mr. King, is indissolubly linked with the other statement that he did not know the voucher was made out for more than that sum. But this latter statement is disproved; therefore, if he only received £12 he knew he was receiving less than the amount stated on the voucher. In this general collapse of Mr. Heighway's memory, it would be quite unsafe to accept his statement that he only received £12, rather than Mr. King's that the amount he actually received was £17 11s. Nor does there seem to me to be the slightest reason to believe that he only received his money three months after the work was completed, in the face of his own statement that he got it the day he signed the voucher. My opinion, therefore, is that whatever charge against Mr. King may be supported by Mr. Heighway's evidence alone falls entirely to the ground.

The next point that I shall notice in connection with the vouchers is the statement of Mr. W. J. Angove, that a month or two after the completion of his work he sent Mr. King a sum of two or three guineas, the reason or motive of which he seemed unable or unwilling to explain.

Mr. King says it was £2, and was sent to his wife in consideration of some bacon which turned out bad.

It is denied by both King and Angove that there was any understanding or condition that any money should be refunded; and it is agreed by both that Angove and Mrs. King are relatives.

I do not wish to minimize the force of the suspicion which would be naturally suggested by the occurrence of anything like a refund either direct or indirect from a sub-enumerator to his employer; but if this sort of thing were common, it seems unfortunate for the prosecution that the only case in which the fact of the payment is proved should be one in which the relationship between the parties is such as to render possible a view consistent with the innocent character of the transaction.

I have spoken of Angove's as the only case in which such a payment was proved. A similar one was asserted in the case of James Glenny; but I cannot regard anything asserted in Mr. Glenny's evidence as proved if it is contradicted, and is uncorroborated; and Mr. Glenny's evidence is both. A perusal of his statement will show that he contradicts himself; and I consider his statements untrustworthy, either from a deliberative suppression of the truth, or from a quite unusual degree of intellectual confusion and incoherence.

There is no evidence whatever that of the £78 passed in favour of the three brothers Fitzpatrick they only received £45. This statement seems to have proceeded upon some loose answer made by E. Fitzpatrick to a question of Mr. Seaman's, when he had no data to found upon. It seems that the three Fitzpatricks were appointed for three separate districts, but E. Fitzpatrick did all the work and drew all the pay. He got his brothers' authority to draw theirs, and upon his own he got an advance from the National Bank at the usual discount. There is not the slightest evidence that Mr. King ever had any of this money.

I do not think it a right or satisfactory arrangement that three brothers should be allowed to work in this way—two of the three districts, in fact, being represented by dummies; and it is not apparent how each of these persons got over the difficulty of making the declaration required by "The Census Act, 1877." Mr. King does not appear to have concerned himself with the manner in which the three brothers distributed their work, and perhaps a little more strictness—to avoid any possible abuse—may have been desirable; but this is a very different thing from the charge of pocketing part of the remuneration, a charge which in the case of the Fitzpatricks is unsupported by any evidence whatever.

There is no proof that Mr. King received from Albert Board more than 10s. out of the £42 shown on his voucher, and that was for advances made by the firm of King and Whewell during the progress of the work, amounting to £15 15s. Mr. Board made some statements at variance with this view, but these were deprived of all their force by his answers given upon cross-examination, as a perusal of his evidence will show.

Mr. John Brown's evidence has a note of uncertainty about it. If it is unreliable, it cannot support the charge; if reliable, it conclusively refutes it.

The evidence of Walter Graham only shows that he got an advance from a money-lender, and not that King got any part of the discount. There is some reason to think that the amount of discount in this case may have been exaggerated.

The evidence of J. H. Smith, like that of several of the others, established little, except the uncertainty of memory in matters of detail, that occurred six or seven years ago. The variance in the statements of witnesses, before and after they have had the documents put into their hands, is remarkable; but the conclusion is inevitable, that such evidence can never avail to support a charge against any one. Of Mr. Smith's evidence, it may be said that both parts of it, however contradictory to each other, go to exonerate King from the charge made against him.

The sum of the matter under head (2) is that King was in the habit of referring to money-lenders those who wanted payment in advance of the receipt of the Government cheque, but there is nothing to show that he was in the habit of discounting the vouchers himself; still less that he misled the sub-enumerators as to the amount stated on the vouchers, with the view of putting a portion of the Government payment in his pocket. The last-mentioned charge is so gross and calumnious that I am surprised that it should ever have been made upon such worthless data as appear to have been collected in this case.

The data in question were collected by Mr. Seaman, upon a request made to him by Mr. Mitchelson, to supply what information he could to explain the great cost incurred in the years when Mr. King had the collection of the returns, as shown by the parliamentary return already referred to. Previously to this Mr. Seaman had found occasion to notice that persons applying to him for employment had mentioned sums that had been paid to them by Mr. King of smaller amount than that shown on the vouchers. Mr. Seaman, therefore, upon receiving Mr. Mitchelson's request, sent notes to the sub-enumerators, or some of them, asking for a statement of the amounts received by them; and it is upon these statements alone, so far as I can ascertain, that the charges against King as regards the vouchers have been founded. It seems never to have been considered that memory might be fallacious after a lapse of six or seven years; nor that the persons concerned might have got an advance upon their accounts, upon which discount would have to be paid, although this, one would think, was strongly suggested by the vouchers themselves, many of which showed an authority to agents to draw the money. But everything was interpreted in whatever sense seemed most adverse to King, and no explanation was ever asked of him from first to last.

I am warranted in supposing that Mr. Mitchelson had no further information on the subject than what had been supplied to him by Mr. Seaman in the manner above described, because he told me himself that he relied upon Mr. Seaman for his facts; and because, if Mr. Mitchelson had himself collected statements and inquired into their value he would scarcely afterwards have so emphatically repudiated in Court the character of prosecutor, which on that supposition he would have so unmistakably adopted out of Court. But if Mr. Mitchelson had made no independent effort to verify the truth or value of the statements made to him by Mr. Seaman, I cannot refrain from expressing my surprise that any man's character should be assailed upon such flimsy grounds.

(3.) The question of the industrial statistics will not detain me long. No evidence was adduced to show that King had in any case caused the parties to sign the schedules in blank in order that he might fill them up afterwards himself. I did not think it right to press this part of the inquiry beyond what might be shown by voluntary statements, because all the schedules were filled in under a solemn pledge of secrecy, which would be clearly broken if the parties were called to explain their schedules in a public Court.

The gist of the charge against Mr. King under this head seems to be that he filled in, or caused to be filled in, some of the schedules of industries in such a way as to show the value of the manufactured articles for the year as no more than that of all materials operated upon during the year. Mr. King says that is what was told him by the parties concerned, but I do not think this is quite satisfactory. The bare statement that a business has been carried on at a loss is, unfortunately, one which need not excite either overwhelming surprise or total incredulity; but I should suppose it to be unusual for the value of the manufactured article to equal precisely that of the raw material, together with wages and all other outlay in the manufacture, without showing a penny to the account of either profit or loss. I am certainly inclined to think that there was some degree of either negligence or incompetence on the part of Mr. King in the preparation of these returns, which, again, is mainly a question for the department.

It must be remembered that these industrial returns have only a statistical value, and do not form a basis for rates or taxes, so that there is no room for imputing to the sub-enumerators any collusion or interested motive. Mr. Seaman so fully admits this that he falls back upon the suggestion that Mr. King purposely bungled the schedules in order to bring discredit upon his

employer's work. Such a statement throws little light upon Mr. King's state of mind, but a good deal on Mr. Seaman's.

The same point is further elucidated by a reference to the file of papers relating to the same subject, from which it appears that whilst Seaman was employing King in his office he never made any complaint to him, nor asked him for any explanation of the manner in which he was doing his work; but he was all the time writing to the Government, making the strongest assertions about King, and the quality of his work, without ever saying a word to King on the subject.

(4.) There is proof that Mr. King asked some of those applying for employment as sub-enumerators to insure their lives in the Government Office, for which he was agent. There is no proof that he in any case made this a condition of the employment. Nevertheless, it does seem to me that the mere request to insure under such circumstances is almost equivalent to the use of undue influence, and would be felt so by a person seeking employment. But I venture to hope that Mr. Mitchelson's statement in *Hansard* (page 720), that this was done in order that King might take the "premiums" was not intended to imply, as it seems to do, that King took the premiums and did not account for them. Perhaps the word "premiums" ought to read "commissions." At all events, there is no evidence of anything more than what I have above stated.

My review of the whole matter shows that in my opinion all the graver charges against Mr. King have completely broken down. In the face of the gross and scandalous character of those charges I do not like to dwell much upon some very minor points which may be regarded as wholly or partly proved. There may have been some instances of laxity, or carelessness, or, perhaps, of incompetence, and there may have been one or two incidents which, if known to the head of the department and not satisfactorily explained, might give rise to a feeling of uneasiness or suspicion; but these things, even when combined with the important statement showing the great cost of Mr. King's work, would hardly, I apprehend, have induced your Excellency's Ministers to advise a Commission of Inquiry, but would have been left for departmental action.

I have only to add that, although I cannot tell what unknown statements might have been made by unknown witnesses had they been present, yet I see no reason to think that my conclusions would have been substantially different had the case been conducted by counsel. My reason for so thinking is that in statements and letters to me Mr. Mitchelson has assigned, as a chief reason for employing counsel, the great importance of cross-examining the witnesses, whom he has roundly accused of prevarication and shuffling, and keeping back the truth; and the only other evidence that he has suggested was to show that the witnesses had made different statements in other places to those which they made on oath in the witness-box.

I scarcely know what to say to this view of the mode in which a prosecution ought to be conducted. It would seem that a charge of fraud and embezzlement may be proved by calling witnesses who deny it, and then proving by their own or other evidence that they are untrustworthy witnesses. Further comment seems needless.

I have now the honour to return with this report, and the minutes of evidence taken in this case, your Excellency's Commission, and subscribe myself,

Your Excellency's most obedient servant,

Auckland, 25th January, 1893.

J. GILES.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

WEDNESDAY, 21st DECEMBER, 1892.

FRANCIS HUMPHREYS HIGHTWAY sworn and examined.

I am a commission and insurance agent residing at Mount Eden. In the year 1886 I was employed as sub-enumerator in collecting census returns and agricultural statistics. I was employed by Mr. John King about the months of March, April, and May. There was no arrangement about my remuneration; but after the work was done Mr. King asked me what I should want for it, and I said I would leave it to him. I got the money about three months afterwards. I went into Mr. King's office, and he presented to me a document (which I think was in a book) to sign. I said, "I had better fill it in;" and Mr. King said, "Oh, never mind, I'll fill it in." I signed the document, accordingly, in blank. I think the document was about half the size of a page of foolscap, and it had printed words on it; but I cannot speak particularly to it. Mr. King then filled in a cheque, and then went with me to the National Bank. The cheque was paid over the counter, and Mr. King counted out twelve sovereigns and gave them to me. I do not know how much he drew—the cheque was never in my hands; I was satisfied at the time. Nothing had been previously said about the amount, except that I may have mentioned the sum of £10 or £11; and Mr. King said, "Oh, I'll give you more than that." I have no idea how the amount was distributed, as regards the different descriptions of work—that is, the agricultural returns and the census schedules. I never made any specific charge for those specific items. I never gave him a written note of the number of days occupied. I think I told him the number of days I was employed. I think the document I signed would be a receipt; but I did not see it after I signed it. I do not recollect a person named Edmiston. I was never asked to sign an authority to any one to draw the money for me. I was not well at the time, and my sight was weak, when I signed the document. [Copy of indorsement on voucher shown to witness.] The paper I signed may have been a similar one to the one now shown me. I am quite sure no one ever asked me to sign any authority to any one else to draw the money for me. This is the first time I ever heard of it. I cannot remember the name of Mr. Edmiston at all.

1. *Mr. Campbell.*] After receiving the money my mind was never directed to the subject again until I received the letter (A) from Mr. Seaman. I was at that time engaged as clerk to the Eden Terrace Road Board; also as house and land agent. I did not keep a bank account. I was Inspector of Public Works for Government before 1886; also in the Property- and Land-tax Office. I often signed vouchers for my salary in those offices. I sometimes received payment when I was up country without signing a receipt—perhaps for a twelvemonth at a time. My acknowledgment would be in the next letter I wrote about the works. It would be a weekly salary paid monthly. I think it was £4 10s. a week.

2. I only signed my name once in the transaction with Mr. King, which I have already described. I never sent a voucher to Wellington. I do not recollect going with Mr. King to Mr. Edmiston's office in the Arcade. I certainly did not do so on that day. I did not tell Mr. King I wanted the money at once. I should not have asked him for it if he had kept it two or three months longer. I will not undertake to say what form of voucher I may have signed when I was drawing pay. [This was said on being shown a pay-abstract and a contingency voucher.] When I signed for Mr. King I put my name at the bottom. So far as I can remember, the form was not like the one now shown me [contingency voucher].

3. I first knew what amount Mr. King was going to pay me when he gave it to me. When I signed I did not know what I was signing for, and had no curiosity to know. I did not tell Mr. King I wanted the money at once; nor do I remember his saying it would cost me a little to get it. He did not tell me he could get an advance upon my voucher for me. He never asked me to sign an authority to Mr. Edmiston, nor did he give into my hands a cheque for £17 11s.

MONDAY, 16TH JANUARY, 1893.

F. H. HEIGHWAY'S examination resumed.

Since the date of my previous evidence I have seen the original voucher, which I have now in my hand. I recognise the signature to the particulars of claim as mine, but the address "Victoria Arcade, Auckland," is not in my writing, and I believe the particulars of claim have been filled in since I signed it. I think it was blank when I signed it. I also recognise my signature on the back of the voucher; that form was blank when I signed it; it was signed in Mr. King's office; I think in August. I am sure it was on the same day that I got the money; I am sure I did not sign my name twice on that day. I cannot remember the occasion of my signing the particulars of claim, but I think if they had been filled in I should have noticed the amount. I never signed my name, that I know of, except at Mr. King's office. I am sure I did not get the money soon after the work was completed; it must have been three months or more.

Mr. J. C. Campbell.] The writing in the authority enclosed is not mine. I cannot be sure whether the words "eighteen pounds ten shillings" are in my writing; the writing seems similar. I never went to Mr. Edmiston's office with Mr. King on 27th May, 1886. I never produced the voucher to Mr. Edmiston, and asked him to discount it for me; I had no need to do so. I was never in his office. I never knew the amount of the bill until I saw it in Court. I did not receive on 31st May from King and Whewell a cheque for £17 11s. [On being shown the butt of cheque G11914]: I never saw such a cheque. The whole of the work was completed on 17th April. I had no conversation with Mr. Seaman after I got his circular—not a word except in writing.

2. *The Court.*] Prior to getting Mr. Seaman's memorandum of 20th July, I heard nothing of the matter, nor did I communicate with any one about it. I have received numerous payments from Government and local bodies for services rendered, but I never on any occasion asked any one to make me an advance or to discount my account. There was no necessity for me to do so on this occasion if Mr. King had kept the money until now. I was not in want of money.

3. In Mr. King's office, when I signed the voucher, he asked me if I would purchase some papers which he had in his hand, saying they were promissory notes, and of good value. I declined, and he asked me questions about my money—whether it was invested on mortgage or fixed deposit.

WILLIAM ROBERT EDWARD BROWN sworn and examined.

I was until recently Registrar-General of the colony. I recognise the file of papers now produced (91/255) as an official record of the Registrar-General's office. Mr. Seaman employed Mr. King in collecting census information in 1891. Mr. King had been employed as enumerator in 1886. I do not know of anything done improperly or inaccurately by him on that occasion. Upon Mr. King's appointment in 1892 to collect agricultural statistics I strongly objected to his appointment on account of his being such an expensive officer. If Mr. King caused the schedules to be left blank, as stated by Mr. Mitchelson in *Hansard* (bottom of first column, p. 720), I did not discover it, nor had I any means of doing so.

DAVID BURNSIDE sworn and examined.

I am a farmer residing at Woodside, Great South Road. In the year 1886 I was employed by Mr. King in collecting census returns in March and April. I made out an account in writing for my services. I think the account was nearly £40. I got paid after the voucher was returned from Wellington. I think I received close on £40. Mr. King paid me, I think by cheque. I cannot say whether I signed a receipt for it. I believed I signed a voucher as a receipt. I think that was before the money was paid. I drew the money myself. No one was authorised to draw it for me. I cannot speak certainly to the amount; it may have been £35. No one was authorised to sign the receipt instead of me [after seeing the voucher]. I asked for an advance, and went with Mr. King to Mr. Abbott, who advanced it. I think Mr. Abbott made a deduction, but I

cannot say how much. I asked Mr. King for the money, and he told me he could not give it to me, but he thought he could get it for me. I think Mr. Abbott gave me a cheque. I made no complaint of any deduction. I was glad to get it at the time.

WILLIAM JOHN ANGOVE sworn and examined.

I am a farmer at Warkworth. I was employed by Mr. King in 1886 in taking census returns. I believe my account was £42. I received the amount of the voucher by cheque from Wellington: the receipt at foot is signed by me. The cheque came by post from Wellington to Warkworth. I may have given Mr. King something, but if I did there was no understanding to that effect before I did the work. I cannot say how much I gave him; it might have been two or three guineas. It might have been a month, or two or three months, after I got the cheque. I cannot say whether I gave it to him or sent it to him when I was in Auckland; it is more likely I sent it. I suppose I gave it to him because he gave me the appointment, but there was no understanding beforehand. I did not consider I was overpaid for my work, but I considered I had earned the full amount. I cannot say whether I agreed beforehand to do the work for £42, or whether the amount was fixed afterwards. I cannot say whether Mr. King has employed me since that time. I cannot say that at the time I had the thought that he might employ me again.

4. *Mr. Campbell.*] I was not employed last year by Mr. King. I cannot say whether the money I sent was sent to Mrs. King: I think it was to Mr. King. Mrs. King is a relative of mine. I have no recollection of Mr. King ever asking me for any money.

EDWARD FITZPATRICK sworn and examined.

I am a farmer at Pakuranga. I was employed by Mr. King in 1886 in collecting census returns and agricultural statistics. I undertook the work of the Howick Riding, which was divided for the purposes of the census into three sub-districts. I employed my two brothers Lawrence and John to help me. I cannot now quite remember the arrangement made with Mr. King before the work was done. There was a sum named, which I think was £60, or perhaps something over that. Mr. King said if the work was well done he would recommend an extra payment to be made to me. He approved of my brothers being employed. The work was done in March, April, and May. I do not recollect giving any authority to any one to draw my money. I believe Mr. King paid me by cheque: it was between £20 and £30, on the National Bank. I think that was the full amount of the claim for which the voucher was made out. [Voucher produced.] The signature to the claim and to the authority to the National Bank are mine. It is very probable that I went to the National Bank and got an advance. If so, there must have been a deduction made with my full consent and acquiescence. My brothers' vouchers were paid by cheque from Wellington in the ordinary course. I had their authority and signed the receipts. I satisfied them for their services. I cannot specify the sums I paid them; it would be something very small, for I did most of the work. The vouchers were made out one for each sub-district. My letter to Mr. Seaman (2nd August, 1892) was written in haste and without much consideration. I have no doubt I got what I signed for, except only whatever deduction may have been made by the National Bank on the advance made on my own voucher. I never considered that I had any cause for complaint. I never gave Mr. King back any of the money, or any equivalent or consideration for the employment.

5. *Mr. Campbell.*] I have no cause for complaint. The charges for the work are fair.

6. I was employed on the census in 1891. Mr. King was employed in the office by Mr. Seaman. Mr. King asked me many questions, which were the means of eliciting a good deal of information about my district, whereby my returns were made more full and accurate.

7. I think Mr. Seaman showed as much knowledge and interest in the work as Mr. King.

JOHN FITZPATRICK sworn and examined.

I am brother of the last witness. I have heard his evidence. My brother told me I was employed on the census, but I do not remember doing anything, nor receiving anything for it. I took very little interest in the matter. I remember signing an authority in connection with it; he said if he could not get the work done within a certain time I was to help him. I believe the signatures to the claim and the authority are mine. I think they were made at one time, at Pakuranga. I could not say certainly whether the voucher was filled up or not before I signed. I never had such a claim, but I considered that if he did my work he had my claim.

8. *Mr. Campbell.*] I believe I would have assisted my brother, if he had wanted me to: but I should not like to say that for a certainty. I do not remember ever having made a statutory declaration that I had done this work, or anything in the form given in the schedule to "The Census Act, 1877."

LAWRENCE FITZPATRICK, sworn and examined.

I am brother to the last two witnesses. I have heard the evidence given by them. I believe I was appointed in connection with the census, and I agreed to assist my brother if required. I never was required, and did no work on it. I signed either two documents, or one in two places. I believe both the signatures (on front and back of the voucher) are mine; but I had no claim of £22, for I did no work. I do not remember signing any other document but the voucher; both signatures were made at the same time. To the best of my belief the statement of claim was not filled in when I signed, but it was a blank printed form. I never had anything to do with Mr. King in the matter.

ALBERT BOARD sworn and examined.

I am a commission agent, living at Ellerslie. I was employed by Mr. King on the census of 1886 for Remuera District. It was arranged that I was to find my own horse, and get £1 a day when riding, and 10s. a day when on foot. I believe I made out an account for it. I am not

positive what the amount was; I got £38. I believe the total was £42, out of which I had to pay £2 to Mr. Whewell, Mr. King's partner for assisting me in looking over the papers, and the other £2 was, I think, interest which I paid to Mr. King for money advanced by him to me whilst I was collecting the census. I do not recollect how much he advanced me. I got the £38 through an agent. I do not remember who it was. The voucher shows that it was Mr. Edmiston; most likely I gave him his charge for discount out of the £38. Messrs. King and Whewell had an office in the Insurance Buildings. I think they were accountants. I asked Mr. Whewell to assist me.

9. *Mr. Campbell.*] I do not recollect getting a cheque from Edmiston for £41. On seeing the entry in King and Whewell's book I think it is very probably correct. I believe I did hand them a cheque, and Mr. Whewell deducted what I owed him. If Mr. King says he gave me a cheque for £4 on the 26th March, it is most likely correct. I say the same of a cheque for £5, on 24th April [butt of cheque produced]. I say the same of cheque for £6 15s. on the 10th May [butt produced]. We settled up when I gave Edmiston's cheque to King and Whewell. I have no reason to doubt that I received a cheque for balance due, £24 15s., if Mr. King's book shows it: that would allow only 10s. for Whewell's charge, which I certainly thought was £2; but that does not show any interest paid to King. I am still positive of the sums of £2—one to Mr. Whewell for assistance and the other to Mr. King for interest. I cannot remember how or in what manner it was paid. I cannot swear certainly to anything but my own handwriting. I discounted a voucher for my work in 1891; the voucher (8754) was for £12. I do not remember what the discount was.

TUESDAY, 17TH JANUARY, 1893.

JOHN BROWN sworn and examined.

I am a surveyor's assistant, at present residing at the Bay of Islands. I was employed by Mr. King in 1886 in collecting census returns for the two districts of Epsom and One Tree Hill. The terms were that I was to receive £1 a day if I found my own horse, or if walking, 10s. a day. I did the work, and I believe I got £32 for it, but I cannot be positive as to the amount. I believe I got a cheque from Wellington—whatever I got was the full amount of my account. I was not certain of the amount when I wrote to Mr. Seaman the letter of 27th July, 1892. I am not certain now, but I am satisfied that the amount stated on the voucher is correct. I had no other transactions or understanding with Mr. King, nor were there any special conditions of my taking the appointment, except that I was to do the work. I never considered I had any cause of complaint. In 1891 I received £25 from Mr. Seaman for the same work. Mr. Seaman told me the Government would not sanction the same expense as was incurred on the previous occasion. I contracted to do the work for £25. I do not consider I was overpaid in 1886, but underpaid in 1891. I took it because I was doing nothing else at the time. I do not remember signing any form or declaration other than the voucher. I produced no vouchers or receipts for horse-hire to Mr. King; he took my word for it. I think he knew I had no horse of my own. His check on such accounts would consist in his knowledge of the number of days it would take to do the work.

1. *Mr. Russell.*] I paid for horse-hire the days I claimed for. On seeing the voucher I am now quite satisfied that I got the £34.

WALTER GRAHAM sworn and examined.

I am a newsagent, residing in Auckland. I was employed by Mr. King in taking the census of 1886 for a part of the North of Auckland district. I made no agreement about terms until after the work was done. There was no understanding of any kind between me and Mr. King, and no condition except that I was to do the work at a fair price. I did the work, and was paid for it. I do not remember the precise amount, but I think it was about £16. I received the money by cheque from Wellington. I think I signed the receipt myself. On looking at the voucher I find that I signed an authority to Mr. Gallagher to draw the money, and he signed the receipt. I do not remember the circumstances, but I have no reason to call it in question in any way. I must have got the money from Mr. King. I wanted the money, and Mr. King undertook to get some one to advance it to me on discount. I was under the impression until I saw the voucher that this occurrence took place in 1881, when I was also employed by Mr. King; but it must have been in 1886.

2. *Mr. Campbell.*] I presume the £2 10s. was deducted for Mr. Gallagher's interest. Whatever was done was in compliance with my own wish.

Mr. W. R. E. BROWN's examination resumed.

3. *Mr. Campbell.*] I believe Mr. King acted in 1878 in census-collecting and as superintendent enumerator of agricultural statistics. If so, I offered him the appointment under instructions. I had no reason to complain of the quality of his work. In 1881 Mr. King was again appointed to similar offices: it would be on my formal recommendation; but I think in both cases the initiative came from the Ministry. I raised no objection. In 1881 his work appeared to be correctly done; but there was a good deal of friction about the cost of the work. I believe that was the case in 1881; but, speaking from memory, I cannot be positive about that. Mr. King was again appointed in 1886. To the best of my recollection I objected to his appointment on the ground of expense. In that year there was nothing to lead me to doubt the correctness of his work. I do not remember ever, in any of the years mentioned, expressing to Mr. King any dissatisfaction with his work. I should have done so had I thought there was cause for it. In 1891 Mr. Seaman was appointed census-enumerator. Mr. King was appointed as clerk under Mr. Seaman. This was done through political pressure used by some member or members for the district to induce the new Government to get him appointed. It was done by special instructions of the Government. I do not know of

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?

WEDNESDAY, 18TH JANUARY, 1893.

THOMAS SEAMAN sworn and examined.

I reside at Ponsonby. I am aware of the statements made by Mr. Mitchelson in the House of Representatives, reported in *Hansard* (October, 1892, p. 719). The greater part of the information was supplied to Mr. Mitchelson by me. In consequence of the return to the House of Representatives of the 7th July, 1892, I was asked by Mr. Mitchelson if I could give any account of the great difference shown by that return in the cost of the returns for different years. Previous to this several persons had applied to me for employment who had been previously employed by Mr. King in connection with the returns. On comparing the statements of some of them with the list of payments sent me from Wellington, I found that they appeared to have received less than the amounts shown on the vouchers. In consequence of this, when I was asked to explain the differences of cost, I sent notes or memoranda to some of the sub-enumerators asking for information. These notes and the replies I received have been produced, and some of the witnesses have been asked about them. I also had interviews with some of them. It was the information so obtained that I supplied to Mr. Mitchelson. Mr. King was employed by me on the industrial statistics from the 20th April to the 3rd July, 1892. He was then dismissed, having handed in the work as completed: it was completed with very few exceptions. He was paid up to that date. He was not told that any fault was found with him.

1. *Mr. Campbell.*] I did not move Mr. Mitchelson to ask for that return, nor do I know who did. For some years past the collection of census and agricultural returns has been done either by myself or Mr. King. Mr. James Glenny was mistaken in his evidence when he said he had several interviews with me. There was only one, and that was at my office. I only saw two of the whole number. I did not apply to Mr. King for any explanation. With regard to Mr. Brown's evidence about the number of constables employed in 1890, there were thirty-five collectors instead of twenty-eight, and I had nine counties. In 1891 I had eighty-two collectors and only three constables. The instructions have always been to employ constables where practicable. When I employed Mr. Robert Shaw in 1891, his age was sixty-nine, and I knew that his son would help him. In the same year I employed Colonel Rookes, aged seventy-one. He appeared thoroughly efficient, and I was asked by Sir George Grey to employ him.

JOHN KING sworn and examined.

I was census enumerator and superintendent for collection of agricultural statistics in the years 1878, 1881, and 1886. I held the appointment for agricultural statistics annually from 1878 to 1887. I had no complaints from the department with regard to my work all that time. In 1886 the price of labour was much higher than in 1891, and I believe in giving fair remuneration for good work; and I am satisfied that the expenses were reasonable and not excessive. I should think Auckland City lost about 5,000 population during that interval. I was always opposed to the employment of constables [reasons given]. With respect to the industrial statistics, I took the figures as they were given to me, the owners in some cases stating that a loss was incurred. I pointed the apparent anomaly out to them. The work was not completed when I was dismissed.

The increased cost of the agricultural statistics in 1892 is accounted for by the great increase of holdings since 1890, and only five constables were employed as against thirteen in 1890.

With reference to the returns of 1886, in no case were the vouchers signed in blank; also, the authority on the back.

Smith got the whole sum less 9s., which was paid to King, Walker and Co., who discounted the account after the work was completed. Smith received the cheque for £17 11s., as shown by butt of cheque produced, and bank-book of King and Whewell. We neither expected nor got anything out of that cheque.

John Brown got his cheque for £34 direct from the Treasury to his address at Onehunga. I had nothing whatever to do with the cheque. I neither claimed nor received anything from Mr. Brown.

Albert Board had some money transactions with King and Whewell, who made advances to him. They consisted of sums of £4, £5, and £6 15s. before the work was finished. I produce two butts of cheques [the third frayed to pieces]. Board brought us a cheque of Edmiston's for £41, as shown by our day-book of the 10th May, 1886. The £1 was Edmiston's discount. King and Whewell charged 10s. for the advances, and Board received a cheque for the balance, £24 15s. I never received anything from Mr. Board, or had any other dealings with him than what I have stated.

In Glenny's case, I did not receive the cheque. I did not receive a penny from Mr. Glenny. His statement about refunding me £3 10s. is quite untrue. The firm of King and Whewell received nothing from him.

I have had no communication with Mr. Glenny since the allegations against me first appeared. Mr. Broad spoke to me after he got Mr. Seaman's letter, and I told him he had nothing to hide and nothing to fear, and I have refused to discuss the question with him. I never approached him, but he came to me. Smith wanted to speak to me, but I declined to discuss the matter in any way with him. Brown never spoke to me about it, nor I to him.

In Heighway's case the body of the claim was filled up by myself, the signature is Heighway's, and it was affixed after the claim was filled up. The amount, £18 10s., was put in before he signed it. The address is not in my writing, and it does not appear to be in his. The authority indorsed on the back is signed by him, and the words "Eighteen pounds ten shillings" are in his handwriting. I speak from a full knowledge of his writing. The rest of the writing is Edmiston's. Edmiston had told me that if any of the sub-enumerators required money he would be very glad to discount their vouchers. In every case when I did any business with him I generally accompanied

the payee to his office to complete the voucher by getting the authority made out. I am quite clear that Mr. Heighway accompanied me, but I am not quite clear whether we found Edmiston at his office when we went over. On the 27th May, 1886, King and Whewell got from Edmiston his cheque for £18 on account of Heighway, but the latter does not appear to have come for the money until the 31st of the same month, as shown by the butt of cheque produced. Mr. Heighway then got the cheque of King and Whewell for £17 11s., being the £18 less 9s. deducted. I believe that deduction was for the completion of some detail of Heighway's work by some other officer. The cheque was cashed on the same day, as shown by our bank-book (National Bank). I gave that cheque myself to Mr. Heighway, and he took it away with him. I never accompanied Mr. Heighway to the Bank; his statement is wholly mistaken. I did not in a single instance participate in any discount charged by Edmiston. In Heighway's case his charge was 10s. Heighway had to sign besides the voucher a declaration as to the work done. Every sub-enumerator without exception had to sign that. He never signed anything in blank. Mr. Heighway's statement that he only got £12 is absolutely untrue. I never paid him a penny in cash. It is quite untrue that I ever asked him to buy promissory notes, or that I questioned him about his investments.

I arranged with E. Fitzpatrick that he and his two brothers should take the Howick Riding. I left the distribution to himself. The three names went in the ordinary course to Wellington, and they were supplied with the necessary forms for the three districts. The work was completed, and each of them sent in the necessary papers. To the best of my recollection E. Fitzpatrick made the usual declaration himself, before myself, and his brothers before a local Justice of the Peace. E. Fitzpatrick came in and completed his own voucher, and then took away the other two for his brothers to get them completed before I signed them. The work was perfectly done. There was no excessive claim in either case. I believe E. Fitzpatrick got an advance from the National Bank. I believe I did not go with him to get it. I did not get a penny of the £78 either directly or indirectly. I never saw either of the brothers until they attended here as witnesses.

I went with Burnside to Abbott. I do not know what discount Abbott received. I did not get a penny. After he got his cheque Burnside repaid £5 which King and Whewell had advanced to him. Nothing was charged for that advance. A brace of pheasants was the only thing I got from Mr. Burnside.

W. J. Angove's voucher shows a sum of £42. I put his name to the claim myself to avoid sending the voucher to Warkworth. I have a recollection of his sending me £2 for Mrs. King; it had no connection with the census—it was in consequence of some bacon they had sent her turning out badly. My wife is a relative of Angove's. There was never any arrangement for £2 to be refunded. It might have been sent six or eight weeks after he got his cheque.

I think Walter Graham was mistaken in saying that Gallagher charged him £2 10s. discount. I feel sure that he would not have charged more than 15s. to £1. Graham told me yesterday that if his wife had been alive he could have ascertained the exact amount.

I never made any arrangement or suggestion directly or indirectly that any of the sub-enumerators were to refund any money, or to give me any kind of consideration for the appointment, nor was any money received by me from any of them which could be looked upon in the nature of a refund. I never in a single instance got a schedule of industries signed in blank to be filled in by me afterwards.

I am one of the agents for the Government Life Insurance Department. In 1892 I had thirty persons employed under me as sub-collectors. Out of that number I succeeded in getting eight to insure, before I had engaged them for the employment. It is not true that I made insurance a condition of the employment. In most cases the premiums were paid at the district manager's office. I do not remember receiving any premiums: if I did I should have to account for them. The statement that I pocketed any premiums is absolutely untrue.

I have never used any pressure to induce any one to insure, except the ordinary arguments and persuasions used by agents. I asked Pascoe to insure, and he willingly did so, and he paid the premium at the office.

MONDAY, 23RD JANUARY, 1893.

SAMUEL PASCOE sworn and examined.

When Mr. King gave me the appointment referred to in my previous evidence he asked me to insure my life in the Government office, and I did so. He was agent for that office. I insured for £200, and paid a premium, £2 19s. 10d. I paid that sum at the time; it was not deducted from my subsequent payment. Mr. King did not make it in any way a condition of my appointment. He did not lead me to understand by word or manner that the appointment would depend on my insuring. I have not complained to any one about it. I did not mention the matter to Mr. Buckland. I may have said I thought it strange that I should be asked to insure. I did think it strange at the time. I did want to insure my life, but I was doubtful if I could keep the premiums up. I did not at the time think it was improper, but I thought Mr. King might have waited until the work was done.

Mr. Campbell.] I was not insured in any other office. I paid the premium into the Government office, not to Mr. King.

JOHN KING's examination resumed.

In the matter of B. S. O'Donnell, deceased, he died about four years ago. He was living with Burnside in the country in 1886. After I certified his voucher I had nothing to do with the matter. I neither received nor claimed anything out of the £45. Mr. Edmiston is now down South. In 1886 I had eighty-five to eighty-seven sub-collectors. I have not yet sent in any claim for my work in 1892. I have asked for this inquiry. [Telegram, 21st November, 1892, also letter to Premier, 13th October, 1892.]

By the Court.] Our firm, King and Whewell, carried on business as commission agents. We used also to lend money. I had no interest of any kind in the discount or profit obtained by any other money-lender or any of these vouchers.

With regard to life insurance, I have not in any case been influenced in giving appointments by the circumstance of the applicant insuring his life or not. I selected persons of local knowledge where practicable.

With regard to Angove, I should have said that they used frequently to send Mrs. King presents of fruit and other things.

I wish to add that I consider the remuneration given for collecting census and agricultural statistics wholly inadequate. An enumerator only gets £75 for nearly twelve month's work for a large district.

EXHIBIT A.

RETURN to an ORDER of the HOUSE of REPRESENTATIVES, dated the 7th July, 1892.

Ordered.—"That a return be laid before this House—(1.) Showing the cost of collecting the census and agricultural statistics in the Counties of Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, and adjacent islands, with Great Barrier and Little Barrier, during the year 1886; and the cost of collecting the census and agricultural statistics in the Counties of Otamatea, Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, and adjacent islands, with Great Barrier and Little Barrier, for the year 1891, showing the names of the principal enumerators on each occasion. (2.) Showing the cost of collecting the agricultural statistics in the Counties of Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, Coromandel, Thames, and Piako, during the years 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885; and for the Counties of Otamatea, Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, Coromandel, Thames, Ohinemuri, and Piako, for the years 1887, 1888, 1889, and 1890; and for the Counties of Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, and Manukau, during the year 1892, showing the names of the principal enumerators on each occasion."—(Hon. Mr. MITCHELSON.)

(1.)

(a.) Cost of collecting Census and Agricultural Statistics in Counties Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, adjacent islands, and Barriers, during year 1886:—

	£	s.	d.
Enumerator ...	72	5	10
Sub-enumerators ...	1,745	3	6
Miscellaneous ...	169	14	6
Total ...	£1,987	3	10

Enumerator, John King.

(b.) Cost of collecting Census and Agricultural Statistics in Counties Otamatea, Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, adjacent islands, and Barriers, during year 1891:—

	£	s.	d.
Enumerator ...	74	1	6
Sub-enumerators ...	1,100	10	0
Miscellaneous ...	154	18	2
Total ...	£1,329	9	8

Enumerator, Thomas Seaman.

(2.)

Cost of collecting Agricultural Statistics in Counties Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, Coromandel, Thames, Piako.

	£	s.	d.	
1882 ...	316	12	6	Superintendent-Collector, Thomas Seaman.
1883 ...	277	12	6	" "
1884 ...	242	16	6	" "
1885 ...	238	7	6	" "

Cost of collecting Agricultural Statistics in Counties Otamatea, Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, Coromandel, Thames, Ohinemuri, Piako.

	£	s.	d.	
1887 ...	543	7	0	Superintendent-Collector, John King.
1888 ...	305	3	0	" Thomas Seaman.
1889 ...	317	19	6	" "
1890 ...	307	7	6	" "

Cost of collecting Agricultural Statistics in Counties Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau.

	£	s.	d.	
1892 ...	311	15	0	Superintendent-Collector, John King.

* Including £20 Superintendent-Collector's fee, not yet claimed.

EXHIBIT B.

CIRCULAR NOTE: SEAMAN to SUB-ENUMERATORS.

DEAR SIR,—

Victoria Arcade, Auckland, 20th July, 1892.

A return *re* Census &c., has been laid on the table of the House of Representatives, to explain which I am asked to furnish some information. To assist me in doing this, will you please inform me what district you collected for in 1886, and the amount you received for the service, and also state the district and amount in 1891.

Yours faithfully,

THOMAS SEAMAN.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (2,250 copies), £9 5s.

By Authority: SAMUEL COSTALL, Government Printer, Wellington.—1893.

Price 6d.]

