

If such perjury is not to go unpunished, then it remains the solemn and bounden duty of good citizens to take appropriate steps to purge the fountain of justice from the foul and deadly streams of sworn lies and falsehoods poured into it in huge volumes by the witnesses at the trial just terminated.

The witnesses who committed wilful and corrupt perjury and whose prosecution I advise are—

- (1.) Richard McCallum, who swore he did not know who the directors of the McKenzie Company were, a fact known to every schoolboy in Blenheim—an obvious and glaring act of perjury; who swore his election expenses for the first ballot were only £116—disproved by Best, and by Parker's admission that he made £1 10s. by the use of McCallum's motor-car.
- (2.) Archibald McCallum, who swore that he went to the meeting of the No-license League in consequence of reading an advertisement in the newspaper, whereas he went in consequence of directions from his brother, as appears from the next paragraph; also in swearing he did not give money for the supply of beer at Mirza: this is proved by Dodson and Bull, and by Dodson's books, and can no doubt be strengthened by Jenkins's evidence. The latter can be put in the box and be asked to explain why, if the money for the beer was genuinely and *bona fide* provided by his mates, the navvies at Mirza, the order was wired through McCallum's secretary, Bull, who is not a brewery agent, nor a salesman for beer.
- (3.) George Sydney Kerr, secretary of the No-license League, who swore with reference to writing a letter to R. McCallum asking him to speak at the meeting of the No-license League on the night of Monday, the 11th December, "I do not remember getting an answer."

I have learned since the trial that not only did Kerr get a letter from McCallum, but that the said letter was written in such an undecipherable hand that after the Rev. Mr. Richards tried to read it to the meeting, and failed to interpret the Chinese hieroglyphics in which it was couched, Archibald McCallum (the witness who went to the meeting in consequence of reading an advertisement in a newspaper) read the remainder of the letter to the meeting. Considering that A. McCallum and R. McCallum are both on the telephone, no jury in the world—not even a jury of niggers—would believe that R. McCallum did not instruct A. McCallum with his own lips, either face to face or by telephone, to attend the meeting as his representative. The Rev. Mr. Richards is thoroughly disgusted with Kerr's perjury, and is to try to get McCallum's letter and hand it to me.

It is to be noted that Kerr is an employee of Edward Parker, who is the arch-conspirator in the case with McCallum. If the letter has been destroyed, then I do not hesitate to say it has been destroyed by Parker, who is, in my opinion, capable of any crime from pitch-and-toss to manslaughter. In all probability McCallum press-copied the letter in his letter-book, as a lawyer would invariably copy every letter he writes. But if it were not so and the letter had been made away with, and McCallum again commits perjury by swearing he has not got a copy of it, then the proof that there was such a letter can be clearly and conclusively demonstrated by the Rev. Mr. Richards and others who were present at the meeting of the No-license League when the letter was read on the 11th December.

- (4.) Edward Stone Parker, who swore he gave his motor-cars free to McCallum. At Hamilton, Parker said he hoped he would not be called as a witness—that if he were he would either have to commit perjury by swearing he gave his cars for nothing, or, if he swore McCallum owed him nothing, then he would lose the money McCallum owed him. Who committed perjury by swearing he did not make £4 out of the use of McCallum's car in one day, but only £1 10s. A jury will convict Parker on this, and I have no doubt his books will prove it. Who committed perjury by swearing Healy did not hire a car from him.
- (5.) William Henry Macey, who committed perjury by swearing he did not engage Morrison for payment. This offence will be proved by the conviction of Morrison as detailed in the next paragraph.
- (6.) Frank Morrison, who swore he was not engaged by Macey at £1 a day, and that he did not admit to Holdaway he had received payment for his services from Macey. This can be proved with the utmost ease by Morrison's own admissions to many persons—that is to say, his engagement for promise of payment—by Messrs. Wiffen, Healy, Loudon, O'Neill, McConway, Patchett, and Marfell. Morrison being convicted, his companion in crime, Macey, will go up at the same time. A witness is available who piloted Macey to Morrison's house at 9.30 on Sunday night. Does a man go on such a mission on such a night to engage a man for gratuitous service? The suggestion is ridiculous.
- (7.) E. H. Best, for swearing the entries of £5 on the 7th and 14th December were not genuine entries of a debit of £5 in each instance, and that the erasures and substitutions of "No" for "£5" were made months ago.

With regard to the judgment itself, I have to say it is not, in my opinion, as a counsel of thirty-four years' experience, justified by the evidence, but, on the contrary, is directly opposed to the evidence. It is a judgment which no special jury ever impanelled would have given a verdict in accordance with. That it is absolutely wrong may be proved in many ways. Probably the most significant way of showing that it is not what it should have been is to consider for a moment the way in which Mr. Skerrett, counsel for the respondent, addressed the Court. Mr. Skerrett spoke for an hour. Half of that time was taken up in putting forth visionary law-