

note of these words that evening. I denied that I was an agitator; also that I had been in the habit of going to members of Parliament about my own grievances. I wish to state emphatically that the question, "Was I at Mr. Witty's meeting?" was never asked me at that interview. I say this because I have a keen recollection of every word used by the doctor to me at the time, and I took notes that evening or very shortly afterwards—I think it was that evening. I was much hurt at the charges made, and it was in connection with other grievances that I had that I applied to the Minister. In my appeal I reported that these words had been used, that that was the statement made to me—that I was an "agitator," and that I "was in the habit of going to members of Parliament" about my grievances. I never have been to members of Parliament about my own grievances, and I said so. I did not admit going to members before, because I had the impression that I was being made a scapegoat over the whole matter. I considered that, in view of the general dissatisfaction that existed, we (the attendants) who waited upon the members were justified in the action we took. I did not say I was not there, because I was not asked. My experience of Dr. Levinge up to that time had been that if it were proved to him that I was there and took the senior part he would deal very severely with me—at least that it would prejudice me in his mind. With regard to the other alleged untruth: when I was asked about being in the bakehouse on Tuesday morning—the day that I was suspended—I was not quite sure for the moment whether it was the morning before or that morning, and I think I said, "It was Monday morning I was there." The doctor appeared very angry, and he certainly did bustle me to some extent; he gave me the impression that he was very angry. He then asked me what reason I had for going to the bakehouse. I afterwards recollected that it was that morning I had been there. He asked me why I was there that morning, and I said that I called there to borrow the baker's pencil to make two entries on the requisition-sheet which I had not put down. That requisition-sheet is capable of being produced. All the other entries have been made in ink except these two entries, which I had not put down previously. I went inside the bakehouse, borrowed the baker's pencil, and wrote the two entries on the wall. Watt, the messenger, was there. I then wrote the two items on the sheet. I was only there long enough to do so. I suppose that sheet is still available. With regard to my being there the previous week, I wish to say that when the doctor asked me I had no recollection whatever of having been there, and I think I said so two or three times. The doctor, in his evidence, says I afterwards denied having been there. I do not remember denying that I was there; but I had no recollection of having been there that week, and I have no recollection now. The only evidence, so far as I am aware, with regard to me in that matter is the evidence of a patient. I protest against the evidence of this patient being allowed to weigh in the matter, because he is well known to entertain some of the most foolish and ridiculous delusions entertained by any patient. I think it is hardly right that the evidence of that patient should weigh against that of a sane man. There was no reason why I should tell an untruth in connection with this matter; there was no motive for my doing so. The doctor asked me whether I saw the report of the baker's hours of duty, &c., in the *Lyttelton Times*, and whether I knew how it got there. I denied emphatically knowing anything about how it got there, and do so still. I had nothing whatever to do with it. The night on which this patient says he saw me with the baker, I was on duty the whole of the evening (Friday, 26th August). The records will show that I was on duty the whole of that day and the whole of that evening. How, then, could I have had a conversation with a member of the *Lyttelton Times* staff and have supplied that information? I make this statement with a view of refuting the charge. I did not leave the Asylum premises during the whole of Friday, when the report was got by the representative of the *Times*. There has been information supplied to this paper from quite different sources with reference to this agitation. I have a report here from the *Press* of the 23rd August, in which it is said that a member of its reporting staff saw Dr. Levinge and saw other employees, who supplied information. The doctor did not supply information. I have here, again, a cutting from the *Lyttelton Times*—a sub-leader—in which it is stated, "The information published in our columns was not obtained from the baker, either directly or indirectly." I know nothing of the baker's hours. The baker never told me anything of his hours, neither has any other baker. It would be impossible for me to know unless I had the information from the baker. Consequently, if the statement I have read is correct, I could not have supplied it. I think that the evidence adduced shows that I have not fomented the agitation at all. Any part I have taken in the agitation has been in company with others, who have avowed that they were with me—that I was not the only one connected with it, and that, in their opinion, I only took a legitimate share of the work in connection with it. I may say that it is a matter of knowledge to me that there is great dissatisfaction amongst the attendants, and in view of that I consider that we were entitled to have taken the steps we did in petitioning the Minister to have these grievances redressed. I have not been a party to taking any steps that I consider contrary to the rules, or contrary to what we, as workmen, should take. We considered the matter very urgent, and one requiring action of a determined character. I have never at any time caused, purposely or otherwise, the attendants to be dissatisfied, nor stirred up strife among the men and women who act as attendants. Any action that has been taken has been taken after consulting together. I have not acted on my own responsibility at any time, and I do not see why these charges should be brought up against me now. If these charges have existed for some time—the circumstances which are considered to justify my suspension—I do not see why they should not have justified my suspension earlier. It is now twelve months since I was interrogated in the office with regard to being an "agitator," and charged with being in the habit of going to members about my grievances. If these charges had sufficient foundation then or since, why has not action been taken? I do not see why the mere fact of my having been at the bakehouse on two occasions previous to the appearance of this report in the papers—I do not see why that should be fastened upon as a reason for suspending me. It appears to me that the grounds are most trivial. I wish to put in as evidence two testimonials