

would have destroyed the whole loan. With all the knowledge I now possess I cannot say I regret not having done so. It would have been an act I should not have been proud of.

92. I notice in your petition, and also in your statement, you say a great deal about the difficulties connected with the raising of the loan, and also in regard to your connection with the Inscribed Stock Act. This might be brought forward as a ground for your receiving some consideration from the Government; but I do not see the bearing of your remarks on this special claim?—The Government had in a measure said to me you must do all you can to get the Agents to agree to the whole of the Five-million Loan being raised. The Agents were averse to more than half the amount being borrowed. I had full knowledge of the whole subject, and was the author of the scheme for conversion of stock; and through my having made an arrangement with the Bank of England we got the bank to negotiate the loan. But for their considering that that agreement imposed an obligation on them, they would not have brought out the loan. I bring this forward to show that my services were indispensable in the matter, and that had I said to the Government, on the eve of the negotiations, relieve me of the Agent-Generalship, or agree that you will pay me a commission, I should have been placing the Government in the position of either acceding to the request, though they might have thought it most indelicate at such a time, or risking the whole of the loan. Although Major Atkinson says so to-day, that they would have resented such an application and refused it, I hardly think such would have been the case, for the Government were in extreme difficulty. They telegraphed to me that price must be no object in the way, and I think that I could have compelled them to have made the appointment; but I do not think it would have been a course that I should have been proud of adopting.

93. But I do not see the bearing of these remarks on this particular claim?—As showing how necessary my services were in the then condition of the loan; and, though I was virtually holding office only until my successor was appointed, I made no terms.

94. I notice that the directors of the Agricultural Company, in reply to a letter from you, state that much of the support given to the company was due to the fact that you were to be a member of the board: did this refer to you in your individual capacity or as Agent-General; did the fact of your being Agent-General give importance to the company?—I cannot say exactly what the directors thought, but probably both these impressions were in their minds.

95. I notice also in your statement you say you had not attended to your own interests, and that your life had been spent much more in endeavours to serve others than in attempts to serve yourself. That seems to be a reflection, to some extent, on the colony: that you have not been sufficiently remunerated. Do you wish the Committee to take that interpretation out of it?—Most certainly. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the return which was laid on the table of the Legislative Council of the amount which I actually received. I have not seen the return myself, but Mr. Gavin tells me the entire amount I received was £27,193 16s. 1d. for all my salaries and expenses from the time I joined the Government in 1869 to the time of my retirement in 1881. That sum included my expenses for three trips to England and two trips back again, and two or three trips to Australia. I certainly made no money out of it.

---

FRIDAY, 11TH SEPTEMBER, 1885.

Sir FREDERICK WHITAKER, K.C.M.G., examined.

96. *The Chairman.*] Were you a member of the Ministry which succeeded Sir George Grey's?—Yes.

97. At that time Sir Julius Vogel was not only Agent-General but also Loan Agent?—I believe so.

98. On the 11th November was this telegram despatched by the Government of which you were a member?—Yes; I think so.

99. Do you remember at this distance of time what shape the consideration took in Cabinet as to the expediency of relieving Sir Julius Vogel of the Agent-Generalship?—I recollect the discussions upon it, and the conclusion we came to was that it was not desirable that the Agent-General in London should hold the position of director of the New Zealand Agricultural Company. This telegram I presume was sent as the result of that conclusion. I did not see the telegram at the time it was sent, but have no doubt it was sent in consequence of the position the Cabinet took up at that time.

100. Do you remember if the expediency of appointing Sir Julius Vogel Loan Agent was considered?—Yes; I recollect that. This telegram truly represents, I think, what was agreed upon by the Cabinet.

101. Was it intended that this appointment should apply to the Five-million Loan?—I have no recollection of anything being said about that. I do not think any particulars were gone into on the subject of that loan at that time.

102. Do you recollect Sir Julius Vogel making any claim in connection with his services as Loan Agent?—Yes.

103. Was that immediately or soon after the loan was raised?—Yes; I think it was soon after. I cannot speak certainly about dates, as it was some time ago.

104. Were these claims considered by the Government?—They were.

105. What was the conclusion arrived at?—They received consideration certainly more than once, perhaps several times. The conclusion came to was that Sir Julius Vogel had not any substantial claim.

106. That was the opinion of the Cabinet as a whole?—Yes.

107. Did anything lead you to take a different view of the question from the rest of the Cabinet?—No; I did not consider it separately at all. At that time I was Attorney-General, and