

Mr. Harrison.

9th Oct., 1872.

terms have you been with him? Have you been on confidential terms?—I have only known Mr. Holt for a few months: since he came from Auckland, and before he entered into the service of Messrs. Brogden and Sons. I really forget when I was introduced to him. It is a few months since—about a month before the commencement of the present Session.

46. During that time have you been on confidential relations with him?—I have.

47. Was the communication you made to Mr. Vogel made inside the House or outside?—I am not quite sure whether it was made outside the House or in the lobbies of the building.

48. At what hour was it made?—I cannot say. It was made some time before the House met on the Tuesday.

49. *Sir J. C. Wilson.*] Between what hours would you say? Between twelve and half-past two, or when?—I really cannot say. It was between one and two, I think. It was some time previous to half-past two, I know. That is as near as I can specify the time.

50. *The Hon. Mr. Gillies.*] You had the previous evening mentioned the circumstance to Mr. Tribe?—I did mention what took place to Mr. Tribe.

51. Did you, prior to consulting with the Speaker in his room on Wednesday morning, mention the matter to any other person excepting Mr. Tribe and Mr. Vogel?—I will not be positive. I think the matter was not mentioned by myself, but by Mr. Vogel; and I think I was asked if certain things had taken place.

52. Am I to understand then, that, so far as you remember, no mention was made of the matter to any other person but Messrs. Tribe and Vogel until after you had consulted with the Speaker on Wednesday morning?—I have no remembrance of having made a voluntary statement to any other person, excepting it may have been in answer to a question put to me as to whether certain matters had taken place.

53. On the Tuesday you consulted Mr. Vogel on the subject. Was there any other person present at that time?—No.

54. No one present at all?—No one at all.

55. Did you then inform Mr. Vogel that you were under the pledge of secrecy?—I cannot say. I do not remember exactly, but I think I did.

56. Subsequently to your consulting with the Speaker, did you again consult with Mr. Vogel before writing the letter?—No, I did not.

57. Did you communicate with any other person on the subject before you wrote that letter to the Speaker?—With no one whatever.

58. Did any one see that letter, or any draft of it?—No one saw the letter.

59. *Mr. Travers, as Counsel for Mr. Holt.*] Do you know the objects for which your professional services were sought?—Yes.

60. What were they?—In furtherance of the objects of the Company in their endeavour to form water supplies for the gold fields, and generally for the furtherance of such undertakings connected with the mining interest which might be undertaken by the firm, or which the firm might contemplate the construction of, in New Zealand.

61. What were the character of the services you were to render?—Simply to explain and describe the nature and object of these undertakings, and generally to assist in furthering the views of the Company with regard to these undertakings.

62. You were, generally speaking, well acquainted with the nature of these undertakings?—I had a general acquaintance with them.

63. Did you approve of them?—I did.

64. Then you were simply asked to advocate matters quite in consonance with your own views?—Yes.

65. Did you not in your conversation say that you did not know whether these undertakings would meet with the support of the party with whom you were working?—No, that was not said.

66. Did you not say, that if the object of these undertakings conformed with the views of your party you would advocate them in the House?—No, I did not say so. I said that I would not advocate them in the *Wellington Independent*. I said also that I was to have perfect freedom of action in the House, and that I was to be free to take what course I thought proper.

67. When you said that, were you urged to take any other course?—No.

68. Then am I to understand the matter thus: The subjects you were to advocate were subjects you yourself approved of, and had no hesitation in advocating?—Yes.

69. Even as a Member of the House, and irrespective altogether of parties?—Yes, irrespective of parties.

70. As a matter of fact, have you not in the columns of the *Independent* advocated the same things already?—I have.

71. I see in your evidence already taken a reply to an honorable Member's question, Whether anything was said about the proposal, at dinner at your house,—you say, "No, nothing was said about it there"?—No; the subject was not mentioned at dinner.

72. Was anything said about it after dinner?—No; Mr. Holt and I had no conversation on matters relating to business during the afternoon.

73. Your conversation, then, was general, probably respecting political matters?—Yes.

74. You asked Mr. Holt to dine with you. When did you do so?—I had invited him before the interview took place in the afternoon.

75. Am I to understand that up to the time of your communication with Mr. Tribe you had seen nothing improper, insulting, or derogatory in what Mr. Holt had said?—The notes you have got of my evidence are not quite correct. What I stated was, that it was not until after I had seen Mr. Tribe that I discovered there had been an attempt made to influence me as a Member of the House.

76. Am I to understand that it was not until after you had seen Mr. Tribe that the proposal struck you as being an improper one?—I do not say that; when I found the conversation assuming a dangerous character, I said that it better be dropped until after the end of the Session.