20. What does that refer to !-The day after we returned to Auckland we had a meeting of the friends of Gaudin, and the meeting went into committee so that I could explain and tell them about his administration. Then I wrote to Colonel Logan again on the 9th July as follows :-

"Colonel R. Logan, H.M. Administrator, Samoa.

"Auckland, 9th July.

"Dear Sir,—
"In your letter of the 27th April you state, 'It is my opinion that at the first public meeting when the theft of gold was brought up you went into committee to discuss the matter

"The following are the actual facts (see Auckland Star report, 7th January): When I was asked why Gaudin broke the gold regulations I told the meeting that I could not explain Gaudin's action without first explaining your peculiar administration of the finances of Samoa. At the time I was without legal advice, and had such an awe of the far-reaching powers of inexperienced military officers that I did not care to jeopardize my personal liberty by risking a possible prosecution for publicly criticizing military administration. On my explaining my position it was decided by the meeting to go into committee so that I could speak freely. As matters stand it would have been far better for Gaudin's interest if all that I told the meeting had been published.

as our going into committee seems to have created quite a wrong impression in your mind.

"I must take strong exception to your use of the word 'theft' in connection with the removal by Gaudin of his own gold. Such an expression only goes to show that you are relentless in your determination to brand Gaudin as a criminal, and that if there is justice to be got anywhere we need not expect any from you. However, I trust you may live to realize that in your excess of military zeal you have permitted (if, indeed, you did not cause) a monstrous wrong to be done to an innocent man. If you are never brought to realize it on earth, you will most assuredly have to answer for your extraordinary abuse of authority and vindictive cruelty before the Great Court-martial that none can escape.

"I remain, &c.,
"M. M. McCallum."

I have no reply to that.

21. Is there any reason whatever for Colonel Logan characterizing the removal of Mr. Gaudin's own company's gold as a theft !- No. I would like to point out that you [Sir John Findlay] have hardly put the Committee quite right about the time between our arrival in Apia and the trial. We arrived there at 12 o'clock, and we were bustled into a launch, and we got ashore about 1 o'clock. Although you said ninety minutes only elapsed between our arrival at Apia and the trial, we did not have twenty minutes to prepare the defence. The fact that the trial was coming on was kept a close secret in Samoa, and the military officers there did not know that the trial was coming on.

22. Mr. Fletcher. What is your business in Samoa !- I went down merely out of friendliness with Mr. Gaudin.

23. You are in business in Samoa?—I am chairman of directors of Wynyard and Co., of Auckland—the ironmongery firm.

24. Mr. Rhodes.] You have referred to the discrepancy in the evidence in the official report of the proceedings?—The incompleteness.

25. Was not the evidence taken down and read over to the witnesses !-No; in no single instance was any one's evidence read over to him, although the report says that R.P. 83 was complied with. That rule says that the evidence must be read over to the witnesses.

26. Mr. Payne.] That is an incorrect statement?—Yes, that is incorrect. That was done

palpably to make it appear that everything was carried out according to the regulations.

27. Mr. Rhodes.] There is a serious difference between their method and that which is usually adopted in a Court of justice?—Yes, and even in Courts-martial. It is incorrect; and a person had no opportunity to challenge any of his judges.

28. Did he enter any protest?—No, he did not know enough about it. As a matter of fact, he could have objected to one of those judges. I can prove that one of those judges had said he would shoot Gaudin. Under those circumstances we would not have had that judge there.

29. Mr. Dickson.] During the time that Mr. Gaudin was waiting to be sent back to Samoa did you do anything to get him out on bail?—He applied to be allowed out on parole, and I personally came down to Wellington because we could not get any information in Auckland. I interviewed the Minister, Hon. Mr. Herdman, and he told me that the letters had been brought down here to be censored, and I also saw Mr. Massey. They both said it would be all right.

30. After the time you got notice for him to go back to Samoa, did Mr. Massey wire the Governor to get him out, and he refused?—Yes, the Governor refused.

31. Mr. Harris.] You say that to the extent that the official record of the trial at Samoa is incomplete, and as being incomplete it is misleading?—It is not very misleading, but it was done in a slipshod way. I noticed that the boy was writing part of the time, and some of the time he was not writing at all. The Crown Prosecutor told him not to put some of it down. We were so absolutely convinced that the whole thing would "go up in smoke" that we did not bother. If I had had any idea that there would be any trouble, or that it was a matter of five years' imprisonment, we would have taken a reporter down.

32. You referred to one or two specific cases where the evidence has not been given in the report: do you know whether in those cases the stenographer was or was not told to put that down? Was any evidence distinctly left out?—It was.

33. You do not suggest that any evidence that was taken down was left out afterwards? -No, but that it was done in a loose way, and Hansen's evidence was not complete, while other evidence is given—every word. If you will read through the official report you will see that Hansen's evidence is given in the form of a story, while the other evidence is given by question and answer. The one is summarized and the other is not. Hansen's evidence is summarized, and is incomplete.