

121. I would ask you, though, to put yourself in my place. I was to take the Agency-General without salary, and there was no other loan business immediate; was it possible that the Five-million Loan would not be included?—I should think that very likely it was in your mind—not unlikely at all. I was not aware of the position of the Five-million Loan at the time, and it did not crop up when the question was discussed; but I should think very likely you had it in your mind.

122. Supposing that after I had ceased to be Agent-General, and before I was relieved of the agency for the inscription of stock, a large amount of stock was converted, do you not think I was entitled to be paid commission on that. I was not receiving pay as Agent-General?—After you had ceased to draw pay as Agent-General what did you do in reference to inscription of stock?

123. I took no active steps. The stock was inscribed after I ceased to be Agent-General in the usual manner. I took no particular action regarding it?—I should think it would be in reason, after you gave up the Agent-Generalship, that upon anything you did you should be paid. What that was I do not know.

124. I would point your attention to a letter you may not have seen before—a private letter of Sir John Hall's to me. I have been advised that I had a right to use it, and I have done so.

Page 4, date 26th February, 1880.) Do you think there can be any doubt, from that letter, that while I continued to be Agent as referred to in that letter, and had ceased to be paid as Agent-General, I was not entitled to be paid for the work?—I should think from Mr. Hall's letter, which I have never seen before, that he was under the impression, and would create the impression in you, that you were to be paid: that is the inference I draw from the letter.

125. I should like to state some facts, probably beyond your knowledge, that after I had ceased to be Agent-General, and Sir Dillon Bell came Home as Agent-General, he called a meeting of the Stock Agents, Mr. Sargeant, Sir Penrose Julyan, and myself, and told us that there was a great obstacle to future conversions, because of the claims which had been made by the Agents, and which he wished to have entirely withdrawn. I told Sir Dillon Bell that so far as withdrawing my claims I would undertake not to prosecute them legally, but that I would not yield the right to petition Government and Parliament. We then entered into the question of the remuneration which was to be paid to the Agents in future, and an understanding was arrived at as to what was to be the amount; I, of course, supposing that it referred to the appointment which Sir John Hall had told me would be a reward for my services after I left the Agent-Generalship. During the course of that interview Sir Dillon Bell said that he considered it would be absolutely necessary to revoke the powers already held by the Agents, those powers being too large. What took place afterwards was this: the appointments were revoked, as I was led to believe, for no other reason than that the powers were too extensive, and then an Act was passed, without explanation, making it necessary to appoint only two Agents instead of three, as the law required before. Then an appointment was made of two Agents, giving them precisely the same powers that the three had held before. The two Agents appointed were Sir Dillon Bell and Sir Penrose Julyan, and I was left out. I ask you, considering these facts and that letter of Sir John Hall's, was there not a breach of faith committed in not giving me one of those appointments?—I do not not recollect the circumstances, and did not know anything of what you mention as taking place in London; but I am certain I was no party at the time I was in the Cabinet to anything which might be called a breach of faith.

126. I do not think you were in office at the time?—Yes; I must have been; I was Attorney-General in 1880.

127. On the 17th June, 1880, the appointments were revoked solely on the ground that less extensive powers should be given in future?—I was in office then as Attorney-General.

128. On the 5th November fresh appointments were made?—I was in office then.

129. I was not included. I am not asking if you committed a breach of faith, as you were not cognizant of that letter?—No; I was not cognizant of the letter.

130. Do you think now that I was not entitled to be reappointed?—I do not recollect the grounds on which your reappointment was not made. They may have been good grounds, or they may not.

131. Major Atkinson said the other day that, having secured the power to appoint only two Agents instead of three, Sir Penrose Julyan's position in the city was such as made it desirable to appoint him as one of the Agents, and the Agent-General was necessarily the other?—I infer from this letter that the intention of Sir John Hall was at that time that you should be reappointed. Why it was not done I do not recollect. Are there no papers to show it? I am speaking entirely from recollection.

132. I would like to point out to you that not only did I get that letter from Sir John Hall, but Mr. Fox, who was Secretary to the Cabinet, wrote me a letter in which he commences, "This is a sort of semi-official, or not merely private, letter." Do you recollect that letter?—I do not recollect that at all. Of course if it was a semi-official letter I should not have seen it.

133. Do you not recollect the feeling of the Government?—All these letters would be written without my knowledge, unless there was some special question for the Cabinet. I do not recollect anything about them. To a certain extent I suppose anything that Sir John Hall said would be no doubt with the understanding that he was representing the feeling of the Cabinet at that time. He would not have said it unless he thought he was representing the view of the Government as well his own.

134. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider that the services of Loan Agent and Stock Agent should be included in those of Agent-General?—Yes; it was considered so.

135. Without any additional payment for their performance?—Yes. I understood the Agent-General's duties included all the agencies for the salary he received.

136. From your knowledge of financial affairs in 1879, do you consider the services of Sir Julius Vogel to have been of a particularly onerous nature?—Yes; I think they must have been.