

365. Did you appear before the Commission?—Yes.  
 366. Were you represented by counsel?—No.  
 367. Did you attend the Commission right through its sitting?—No.  
 368. Did you withdraw from the Commission?—I did.  
 369. On what date did you withdraw?—About three or four days after the Commission sat.  
 370. Did the Commission have further sittings after you withdrew?—Yes.  
 371. And Mr. Bloxam, Mr. Hargreaves, Mr. Martin, Mr. Latter, Mr. Harper, and Mr. Eyes were examined?—As far as I know; I was not present after the 6th September, 1888. I was only present up to the 6th September.  
 372. Did any one appear on your behalf on the reopening of the Commission?—No.  
 373. Have your charges been heard before a Committee of the House of Representatives as well?—Yes.  
 374. When?—From time to time since June, 1887.  
 375. And evidence taken before the Committee?—Yes, and reports made to the House.  
 376. Was the petition before the Public Petitions Committee A to L, last year?—Yes.  
 377. Was evidence taken before that Committee on this last occasion?—Yes.  
 378. And a report was made to the House?—Yes. [Report of Committee put in and marked as "Exhibit 59," Public Petitions Committee A to L.]  
 379. In regard to Mr. Conolly's report, why did you withdraw from the Commission?—I was quite unable to obtain assistance of counsel or production of witnesses or documents.  
 380. That was the reason you withdrew on the 6th September, 1888. Were you compelled to withdraw from the Commission?—That is so—yes.  
 381. What damage do you consider you have suffered, and what costs and expense have you been put to on account of the misconduct, as you allege, of the public officials?—From December, 1884, up to the present time, I think I am speaking well within bounds when I say that it has cost myself and my friends £4,500 to prevent myself from being ruined by the bankruptcy proceedings against me from time to time.  
 382. Is any portion of that £4,500 for money paid away?—Yes; I am referring to affidavit sworn by me at Wellington on the 18th August, 1892, before Mr. Jackson Palmer, solicitor.  
 383. Are the amounts shown there the amounts that have been expended?—Yes. I would like it to be understood that I am speaking merely of one account—the account of Stewart, Holmes and Denniston. It might appear here that I had paid the whole of the £78; but I have not done so. They have received from me but £50 of that, and I still owe the balance of it.  
 384. Do you say these expenses were caused by the misconduct of the public officials?—They were caused by the wrongdoing in these matters of the Registrar and the Official Assignee, Mr. Latter. I still further say, had the Registrar done right in the accounts, that certainly my business would never have come under the control of the Official Assignee; for I have never been a bankrupt but in law; not in equity.  
 385. During all this time have you been striving to put these matters right?—I have; and used every endeavour.  
 386. During that time have you been obliged to support your wife and family?—That is so.  
 387. By reason of these actions, and your attempts to put them right, have you been able to go on with business matters?—No, I have not so been able to go on with them. I say distinctly that I have been absolutely crippled from doing anything since December, 1884, but endeavouring to get these matters fairly adjusted.

THURSDAY, 25TH MAY, 1893.

*Mr. Beswick* here stated that he would appear for Mr. Bloxam during the remaining part of the sitting, as Mr. Bloxam may have occasion to be absent through press of business.

ALEXANDER MILLAR EYES, being duly sworn, was called by Mr. Beswick.

1. *Mr. Beswick.*] For some years you were clerk for the Official Assignee in the Canterbury District?—Yes.  
 2. How many years?—From 1884 to 1889.  
 3. Do you remember Mr. Ell being adjudicated a bankrupt in 1885?—Yes.  
 4. Was that bankruptcy annulled shortly afterwards?—Yes, that was so.  
 5. Do you recollect whether he filed a statement of assets and liabilities in that bankruptcy?—I do not recollect whether he did in that bankruptcy.  
 6. Was he adjudicated again on the 6th August, 1886?—Yes.  
 7. Do you recollect whether he filed his statement of assets and liabilities in that bankruptcy?—He did not file them at the time; there was a lot of bother about getting it, as far as I can recollect.  
 8. Did Mr. Ell frequently come into the Official Assignee's office for the purpose of getting information regarding his bankruptcy papers?—Lots of times.  
 9. Did he do so before the second bankruptcy or not? Between the first and second bankruptcy?—I cannot say for certain, but I should think so, if there was any information to get.  
 10. Did he come to the Official Assignee's office after the second bankruptcy for information?—Yes.  
 11. Many times?—A great number of times.  
 12. Was it with regard to papers in both bankruptcies?—With regard to papers in the second bankruptcy, at any rate.  
 13. Did he get the information he applied for?—He repeatedly got the information he applied for. He always copied the minutes after every meeting; he came in the next day invariably. I am now speaking of the second bankruptcy.