allowance for any omissions or errors on my part. Now, the other question that is raised in this petition is as to the non-appointment of Sir Julius as Agent under "The New Zealand Consolidated Stock Act, 1877," after his appointment, with three of the other Agents, had been cancelled for a specific purpose—viz., the limiting of the powers granted. I cannot do better than read to the Committee the evidence given on this branch of the subject,—

I now come to my claim for deprivation of office as Agent under "The New Zealand Consolidated Stock Act, 1877." On the 17th day of April, 1879, I was appointed an additional Agent under the Act as long as I continued Agent-General.

On the 31st January, 1880, a fresh appointment was made without the proviso of my continuing Agent-General; and, as to this appointment, Sir John Hall wrote me, in a letter marked private (but which, after consulting numerous friends, it is considered I am at liberty, under the circumstances, to use), the following extract, under date the 26th February, 1880, that is to say, the month following the appointment:—

"By the present post you will receive answers to the official letters respecting the floating of the loan and the proposed inscription of stock. So far as they affect yourself, I am afraid they will disappoint you; but, with a full appreciation of your services, and with every wish to do you justice, we have not found it possible to accede to that for which you believe you have a fair claim.

"The argument that on all former occasions the services rendered by the Agent-General when acting as Loan Agent have been considered to be included in the duties of his office appears to us insurmountable. We are not unmindful of the value of the arrangements which you effected with the Bank of England in 1875, nor of the services which, as Agent-General, you have rendered to New Zealand; but, on the other hand, it is sure to be said that those services have been followed by your appointment as one of the Agents for the inscription of stock—an appointment which will, with the exercise of little labour, return, in all probability, a considerable income, and assist materially your position in London, whilst leaving you free to engage in any other business. From this point of view it is sure to be argued that this is not an unreasonable recognition of your services."

Gentlemen, that was never carried out. Sir John Hall wrote, on February 28th, that he would gladly support the granting of the honorarium; at the same time saying that the Government could not regard Sir Julius as Loan Agent in connection with the Five-million loan.

The Chairman: You are not correct in saying that Sir John Hall wrote the first letter.

Mr. Vogel: I beg your pardon; I mean Sir John Hall's secretary, Mr. Fox. It was written that the Government would gladly support this grant of the honorarium, and, in a letter, Sir John Hall himself states that they were pleased that they were able to give something—that is, the Loan Agency—to remunerate Sir Julius Vogel for what he had done, and for the service he had rendered. It all remained a dead-letter, for the appointment was cancelled, and Sir Julius Vogel has never received any remuneration whatever in any shape or form. Hence this claim. As I have already said, I am perfectly sure that had Sir Julius Vogel been a wealthy man this claim would never have been made. In his great love for New Zealand, he would, I am sure, readily have abandoned it; but he is now unable to help himself, and the claim he is preferring is one which he thinks he is in all equity and justice entitled to, and which the Government, although they considered themselves unable to agree to put it in the form of an honorarium, then approved of, but which no attempt was ever made to carry out or give effect to. Sir Julius, in his evidence, goes on to say:—

I should like to point out here that this letter of Sir John Hall's was dated two days before the letter of Mr. Fox, in which he told me semi-officially that the Government, although they did not think the House would grant the honorarium, would be glad to support it.

I was given to understand, after Sir F. D. Bell's arrival Home, that the powers conferred by the Governor in Council under the instrument of appointment were too extensive; but he conferred with me, in common with the other Agents, as to the remuneration the Agents should receive under a new appointment.

On the 17th June, 1881, the appointment was revoked, as I understood, solely on the ground that less extensive powers should be given in future.

On the 5th November fresh appointments were made of Sir F. D. Bell and Sir Penrose Julyan, with the same powers as before, but I was not included.

I submit I have received a cruel wrong by this cancellation of my appointment and failure to reappoint me.

If you consider the letter Sir J. Hall wrote me, and what he says of the position in London which the appointment carried with it, you will, I think, be able to see that a money payment alone would not be sufficient to compensate me.

The cancelment of my appointment and failure to reappoint me was a marked slur in the eyes of every one who knew what an important part I had taken in procuring the passage of the Colonial Stocks Bill, and in making the arrangements with the Bank of England. It was an insult to me in the face of the world. The sense of wrong and the suffering occasioned to me by the feeling that the colony, to serve which I had passed the best years of my life, could put on me such an unmerited slight defies description.

At probably the nearly approaching close of a life which has been passed much more in endeavours to serve others than in attempts to serve myself, I ask the Parliament of New Zealand to say if I have deserved the treatment I have received in my deprivation of this office.

I do not wish to attach blame to anyone. I am aware that the Government were placed in a difficult position because the Agent-General refused to act as an Agent with me unless my claim against the Government was withdrawn. I wish to say nothing against the Agent-General: he has a right to his opinions. But I ask the Committee and the House to say, Is it defensible that a man should be deprived of an office to which he has rights of a direct and implied character because he will not forego the claim which every person possesses of placing his grievances before Parliament? I had already told the Agent-General that it was to Parliament I wished to appeal.

No doubt Sir Julius Vogel spoke then with much feeling, and, at the same time, perhaps, there cannot be anything gainsaid in the remarks he made. As far as any personal feeling that existed between Sir Julius Vogel and Sir Francis Dillon Bell, it has long ago disappeared, and it has never been present in anything connected with this matter. Sir, that comprehends the second position in this case. Sir Julius received the appointment of Loan Agent whilst he continued Agent-General. That appointment was then cancelled, and reissued to him without the proviso of his being at the same time Agent-General. It was then cancelled for the avowed purpose of curtailing the powers. A fresh appointment was made with the same powers as before, only with this difference: that he was not included. Of course there is, apart from the moral justice of this part of the claim, a difficult legal point in this matter. It may be said—and I am not prepared to say that it is not so—that from a legal point of view Sir Julius has no claim against the Government for breach of contract; but it must be remembered that the Government is a peculiar body, if we may so call it. Ministers may, in a good many ways, do things which no other body, corporation, or private