

159. How long?—That lasted about six months.
160. After that?—He was bookkeeper and cashier.
161. How long was he in your employment?—It would probably be six months or a little more.
162. During the time he was in your employment did he misappropriate money belonging to the firm?—Yes, he did.
163. Did you tax him with such misappropriation?—I did.
164. Did he deny it?—No, he did not deny it.
165. What excuse did he give?—He said that he was hard pressed for money; that he had temporarily used the money, and that he intended to repay it.
166. Was that offence overlooked?—It was charged to his account; it was overlooked.
167. It was debited against him?—Yes; it was debited against him in the books of the firm.
168. After that he continued in your employment?—Yes.
169. Did you find out further misappropriation?—Yes.
170. He had misappropriated money that he received belonging to the firm?—Yes.
171. Did he admit that to you?—Yes.
172. Was he dismissed?—Yes; he was dismissed.
173. Why was he not prosecuted?—Through the feeling entertained for his father and his brother, for whom both Mr. Wilkie and myself had great respect.
174. Did he ever repay that money?—A very small proportion; two or three pounds which came from his wife, who was in Wellington.
175. *Mr. Menteath.*] Was Jenkins dismissed from your employment?—He was.
176. How?—He was told that we could not put up with this thing again: that was the second definite instance.
177. Was it by letter?—No; verbally.
178. Was notice given to him?—There might have been a day or two's notice towards the end of the week.
179. What was the amount of the deficiency?—There were two sums that I could definitely prove.
180. The amount?—One was a little over a pound; the other was three guineas, I think, or something about that.
181. Were the particulars of these sums made known to Jenkins?—Yes.
182. By whom?—By myself, and Mr. Wilkie in my presence. I might say that, in the second instance, Mr. Wilkie was more interested than I was; for it was money belonging to the Acclimatisation Society, of which Mr. Wilkie was honorary secretary.
183. Do you recollect the date?—I could not recall the date exactly; I have no doubt I could give you all the particulars from the books of the firm in which they were charged to him.
184. Where is Mr. Wilkie?—He has been dead something like four or five years.
185. If Mr. Jenkins states that he had no notice from you of any defalcations; that he never heard so from you; that this is the first time he ever heard such allegations made—would you say that he was saying what is false?—I would, most decidedly. He wrote to me from Wellington. He knew I was much needing money after Mr. Wilkie died; he said he would see me right, no matter what happened. His wife also wrote to me. He knew very well that I could make part of this account a criminal case. His wife wrote to me sending £2 10s. I think it was, and begged that I would not take any action.
186. What kind of action, civil or criminal?—Either. He was pressed for money at this time.
187. You considered him good enough to give him credit for £15 or £20?—No, I did not; the way his account accumulated was little by little. I might state that, before he came into our employment, I lent him money at his urgent request. Then, when he was our commercial traveller, he generally contrived that his account should be overdrawn; this was added to his open account. On more than one occasion I paid his salary in advance. I told him that, rather than he should have done this, if he had asked for money I would have lent it to him.
188. When he left your employment, was he owing you money—how much?—From £18 to £20.
189. That includes about £15 you lent him?—Yes.
190. And the other, you say, he embezzled?—Yes.
191. When were you told you would be required to give evidence?—I think the first I heard of this was about three weeks ago.
192. When were you told you would have to give evidence here in this case?—That is only two or three days ago. I was asked about Mr. Jenkins, and what knowledge I had of him, about three weeks ago.
193. Where?—In Dunedin.
194. Were you served with a subpoena to attend here?—Yes.
195. In Dunedin also?—No, in Wellington.
196. Did not Mr. Jenkins leave your employment on his own account to enter into the employment of the Phoenix Company?—No; I think not.
197. What was the interval between leaving your employment and his entering that of the Phoenix Company?—I do not know. I know he was there after he left us; but I could not say how long.
198. Do you know that he joined the Phoenix Company on the Monday after he left you?—I do not know.
199. He left you on the Saturday and joined the Phoenix Company on the Monday?—I do not know; I heard soon after that he was there.