

5. *Hon. Mr. Gisborne.*] I understand, Mr. Lusk, that you made your arrangements with the Mayor of Auckland before the session began, and that it was to this effect: that £50 should be given you for drafting an amending Bill to the Municipal Act?—Yes.

6. I see that there is among these telegrams a copy of a letter (Appendix C) in your name. It is a kind of an account, which gives the items of the services you rendered in connection with this Municipal Bill and the Waterworks Bill. This was sent by Mr. Beale. How is it that Mr. Beale put the items in that form; how did he come to be aware of the particular services you rendered, seeing that you were in Wellington?—Mr. Beale was generally aware of what I was doing, because I was in the habit of writing to him, and informing him of various business matters which I had to transact on account of firms in Auckland.

7. Did he make out that account with or without your knowledge and authority?—Quite; except the implied authority of one partner to make out an account on behalf of another partner. No express authority was given.

8. When you got back to Auckland, did you inform the Mayor that the original arrangement was to be reverted to—that you were to receive £50 for having drafted the Bill?—I have stated as far as I can recollect what took place between the Mayor and myself. I would not like to say that anything was said as to reverting to anything. I said I supposed that the arrangements we made would be stood by.

9. Were you aware of any rule or Standing Order against your promoting a Bill in consideration of which you had received any pecuniary reward?—I was not aware of the rule when I came to Wellington. I had never seen or heard of the rule.

10. *Hon. Mr. Reynolds.*] I see this telegram contains a copy of a receipt given by you. It says, "To expenses at Wellington during the session *re* Amendment Acts," and is signed "H. H. Lusk." Is that correct?—I have no remembrance of the contents of the receipt, but it is exceedingly likely that the receipt was in those terms. I believe a cheque was sent to me by the Corporation, together with a receipt, which I signed. I did certainly sign a receipt for the £50, but what the terms of the receipt were I have not the least idea.

11. *Hon. Mr. Gisborne.*] Was it a separate receipt, or were there other items included in it?—I should think it was a separate receipt.

12. *Hon. Mr. Stafford.*] You have said that you were not aware that it was contrary to the Standing Orders for a member to receive any reward for promoting a Bill in the House. When did you become aware that it was contrary to the Standing Orders? Was it during the session?—Though I was not acquainted with the Standing Orders, I was aware, from my own sense of propriety, that I was not at liberty to receive money for promoting a Bill in the House for a consideration. If such is the meaning of the question, that is my answer. I did not promote any Bill for fee or reward. It was only the other day, when this question was raised, that I for the first time read the Standing Order, and it dawned upon my mind that it was possible that I might have come within the strict interpretation of the Standing Order, although I did not believe that I had. If I have done so, it was from entire ignorance, because I did not know there was such a rule.

13. I understood from your statement that you became aware of something of that sort in respect to the Waterworks Bill during the session, and telegraphed up that Mr. Stevenson might come down and take charge of the Bill, and do what was necessary in respect to it?—I did not become aware of that. What I became aware of was that it was quite improper, and a thing which I would not in anywise do, to look after the Bill in the sense in which a Parliamentary agent would look after it—to speak to this member and that member to induce them (by proper means, of course) to look at the Bill in the light in which those who promoted it looked at it. I should always decline to take such a part in reference to a Bill, and in this case I declined to undertake any responsibility more than that which attaches to every member who assists in carrying a Bill through the House.

14. You have said that Mr. Beale sent in that account without any express authority from you to do so?—Yes.

15. Why would he come to the conclusion that you had drafted the Bill, you being in Wellington and he in Auckland, if he had no information from you?—I can only imagine that he fancied that as I had been acting for the City Council in regard to the Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill, and as I had introduced the other Bill into the House, I had drafted the other Bill also. That is the only way in which I can account for it. No doubt I mentioned to him in my letters that I was carrying this Bill through the House, and he in his ignorance of Parliamentary practice—an ignorance which to a certain extent I shared in—supposed I had drafted the Bill and was to be paid for it. Had I drafted the Bill for the Council, I may say at once, with the knowledge I then had, I should not have hesitated to charge for it.

16. *The Chairman.*] You arranged that there was to be a lump sum paid you?—Yes.

17. Then how do you account for the fact of Mr. Beale having broken that up by charging particular items of work on particular days?—Because he was not aware of the special arrangement which had been made.

18. But how could he have known that you advised on the 16th, drafted twenty-five clauses on the 17th, and twenty-five more on some other day. How did he arrive at these particular facts?—It is difficult to understand, but I presume he must have gained his information from my letters. I used to inform him of everything I did in connection with professional matters.

19. But about the dates?—Curiously enough it happens that the dates given are incorrect. For instance, it is stated I drafted this Bill in Wellington. As a matter of fact I drafted it in Auckland and brought it down to Wellington. It was a mistake to suppose that. I must have informed him in one of my letters that Sir Julius Vogel had asked me to give him a draft of the Bill proposed by the Auckland City Council, and he thereupon seems to have taken it for granted that I drafted the Bill in Wellington.

20. There are four or five specified transactions, and the date is attached to each transaction?—I have observed that. It must have been gathered from my letters, although I have no hesitation in saying that the dates given are incorrect.