

*Mr. Harrison.*

9th Oct., 1872.

than to bring the matter before the House; and he led you to believe that if you did not, he would. Is that correct?—That was the impression conveyed to my mind.

109. The impression was that the Speaker would bring the matter before the House, if you did not?—He told me that I had no option in the matter.

110. Did he lead you to believe that he would bring the matter before the House, if you did not?—Yes, that is the impression on my mind.

111. Did the Speaker advise you to consult any other of your friends?—No; he advised me to communicate formally to him what had been said.

112. Had you been advised by any other person to make a formal communication to the House?—No.

113. Did not Mr. Vogel advise you to that?—No; he simply advised me to see the Speaker on the subject. I believe he had communicated with the Speaker before I went there.

114. Had you any communication with the Hon. Mr. Reeves?—Not until after I had seen the Speaker.

115. Did you see Messrs. Vogel and Reeves on the evening of Monday?—I do not think so.

116. Do you remember a dinner given by Mr. Brogden to a number of gentlemen in the Club?—Yes.

117. Were you in Wellington at the time?—I was.

118. Were you invited?—No, I think not.

119. You were not at it?—No, I was not.

120. Did Mr. Tribe, at the time you communicated to him what had transpired, state to you generally the nature of the proposals he said had been made to him?—No, he did not. He only told me in a general way what had taken place, but he never communicated to me its exact nature.

121. Therefore you do not know upon what he founded his opinion on the subject?—No.

122. In your evidence you stated something about some money paid by Mr. Brogden to Mr. Tribe?—I stated that Mr. Tribe had rendered some services to Mr. Brogden on the West Coast, and that at an interview he had with Mr. Henderson, Mr. Brogden's chief engineer, he suggested that he should receive some payment for these services. On the matter being discussed, Mr. Henderson named a sum double that proposed by Mr. Tribe himself.

123. That is, Mr. Henderson considered the remuneration suggested to be below the mark?—Yes.

124. Did Mr. Tribe inform you that he looked upon that as an improper attempt to influence him?—No, not at all.

125. Do you consider that he was fairly entitled to remuneration for his services?—Yes, I think so.

126. Was it then communicated to you for the first time at the interview on Monday that an attempt of this kind had been made?—I think it was. I may state that I have not heard that Mr. Tribe actually received remuneration for these services.

127. You had sufficient knowledge of the services rendered to justify you in believing that he was entitled to remuneration. Do you think that the amount he asked for was enough?—I think so.

128. Therefore, you infer that it was improper on Mr. Brogden's part to estimate these labours at a higher rate?—No, that is not the case. The circumstance simply confirmed other suspicions that existed on my mind at the time.

129. Was it at your house that this passed; I mean the conversation between you and Mr. Tribe?—No, it was either in Bellamy's or at the Metropolitan Hotel.

130. With the exception of what took place on that occasion, has anything derogatory to your position been proposed to you by Mr. Holt?—Certainly not.

131. How long have you been engaged in connection with the newspaper press?—More or less for the last seventeen years.

132. How long, I mean, in New Zealand?—Since 1861.

133. Where were you first connected with newspapers in New Zealand?—In Dunedin.

134. Was that upon a newspaper which Mr. Vogel had the direction of?—Yes.

135. Have you not been more or less connected with Mr. Vogel for a considerable period?—Eight or nine years.

136. Has there ever been anything in your communications with Mr. Holt which led you to believe that he was not a man whose word was trustworthy?—No, certainly not.

137. I understand that the alleged agency has been denied by Mr. Holt, and that in this denial he is corroborated by Mr. Brogden. Do you still adhere to the opinion that he was acting as an agent?—Mr. Holt has stated that no such proposal was made; that is a very different thing from denying the agency.

138. In the face of that denial, which has, I believe, been published, do you still persist in the view you have taken?—I do not, since the explicit denial was made. I have already stated that I am perfectly certain that Mr. Holt himself was not aware of the full extent of the gravity of the matter introduced.

139. You did not point out to him that he was treading upon dangerous ground?—No, I did not.

140. *The Attorney-General.*] Mr. Harrison stated that he said nothing to Mr. Holt showing that he considered the proposal an improper one. Mr. Harrison has also stated that he said to Mr. Holt that the further consideration of the matter must be postponed until after the close of the Session. I would ask an explanation of what led him to postpone the matter till after the Session?—I stated to Mr. Holt that it was quite evident that I would not enter into any arrangement with the firm that was likely to interfere with my political action; it would therefore be as well to drop all negotiations until after the Session.

141. You state in your letter to the Speaker,—“It was specially intimated that, whilst I need not commit the *Wellington Independent* (of which paper I am the editor) to any direct support of the present Government, nor that I should vote in that direction in the House, I should do what I could to influence the Hon. Mr. Vogel not to bring down this Session a motion which might involve the defeat