

the Bills?—It is impossible for me to say now that you are not correct. It may have been that I was expecting to have to draft the Waterworks Bill. I am certain of this, however, that Mr. Stevenson drafted the Bill, and that I have never asked for, nor would have taken, money in respect to it. Whether it was in my name that I might have to draft the Bill, I do not know. After a lapse of fifteen months I would not undertake to say. In any case I do not think it is consistent with dignity for a member to go “lobbying” members in respect to a Bill like this, and that is why I object to do it in this case.

101. *The Chairman.*] It is done every day.—No doubt; but I should not have liked to do it, more particularly seeing that I am not member for Auckland.

102. Members are in the habit of doing it. Mr. Travers brings in a Bill to amend the Corporations Act to suit the wishes of Wellington; I bring in a Bill on behalf of Wanganui, and so on.—In those cases the member represented the constituency affected.

103. *Hon. Mr. Stafford.*] When Mr. Stevenson drafted this Bill, did you advise him on points of construction?—No; it was not necessary. It was simply a Bill of two clauses, and of a very simple character.

104. In your previous evidence you speak of advice given to Mr. Stevenson?—Yes; that was in respect of the Municipal Corporations Act, and, as I explained fully yesterday, was in reference to the effect certain clauses would have on the position of the ratepayers of Auckland.

105. You charged for that?—No.

106. It is an item in the account?—I admit that; but I am particularly anxious in this whole case to disown all responsibility for the items in that account, and I think, if my evidence is worth anything, it unmistakably shows that I never authorized those items to be set down, and am not in any way responsible for them.

107. You appear to have had various conferences with the Government in order to remove objections to the passing of the Waterworks Act?—The Government never had any objection to its passage. Mr. Stevenson and I simply waited upon Sir Julius Vogel and asked the question, and he said he saw no objection to it. Had I seen the account, certainly I should have struck out all those charges, more especially those relating to the Waterworks Bill, with which I had nothing to do. I undertook to take charge of that Bill, but it was outside all business transactions.

Major CAMPBELL, Clerk of Parliaments, examined.

108. *Hon. Mr. Reynolds.*] This is a letter, Major Campbell, from Mr. Macfarlane, in which he states that Mr. Lusk was engaged to act for Captain Morris in his contest with Captain Read for a seat in the House for the East Coast, and that a few days afterwards it was discovered that Mr. Lusk could not properly act as Parliamentary agent, whereupon Mr. Lusk had to return to Captain Morris the papers which had been given him. Then he says that you were consulted by Mr. Lusk on the occasion referred to. Can you give the Committee any information about your being consulted?—I shall best reply to that I think by producing another letter. This letter [produced and read] (Appendix A) was sent to the Speaker by Mr. Lusk, and upon its receipt I wrote the following memorandum for the Speaker which was attached to the letter [Memorandum read.] (Appendix B.) The Speaker requested me to see Mr. Lusk and point out to him the passage from “May” which I had referred to in the memorandum. Mr. Lusk came to my office, and I did point out the passage to him, and he said he saw, after reading it, that to act as agent for Captain Morris would be incompatible with his position, and he should not do so. I understood that he employed some other practitioner in Wellington.

109. Did you show him the Standing Order?—No. I do not think that the Standing Order applies to such a case as that. It refers to “business before Parliament,” and I take it that does not include election petitions. The passage I cited from “May” dealt with the point at issue directly, and I thought it more applicable.

110. *The Chairman.*] You had no conversation with him in reference to promoting Bills?—I did not know of that matter at all.

111. *Hon. Mr. Stafford.*] If Mr. Lusk had consulted you in reference to the promotion of Bills, would you have referred him to that or to any other passage from “May”?—I should have referred him to the Standing Order.

112. Do you recollect calling his attention generally to the Standing Orders?—No; I did not do so.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

Wellington, 21st June, 1876.

To the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I HAVE the honor to inform you that I have received from Mr. George Bentham Morris, of Tauranga (by telegraph), an authority to act for him in all matters connected with his petition against the return of George E. Read as member for the Electoral District of East Coast in the House of Representatives, and to request that, in the absence of Captain Morris, you will recognize me as his representative in the above matter.

I have, &c.,

HUGH H. LUSK.

APPENDIX B.

MEMORANDUM for Mr. SPEAKER.

IN reference to a letter addressed to you by Mr. Lusk, informing you of his having received authority from Captain Morris to act for him in all matters connected with his petition against the return of