

77. Did you state to Mr. Holt that you considered the conversation was of a character in some degree dangerous or improper?—I did not.

78. It was after that that he dined with you?—Yes.

79. Am I to understand, then, that you never communicated to Mr. Holt that you placed such a construction upon his conversation?—I did not.

80. Did you never ask him for any explanations?—No. No further communication passed between us after Monday night.

81. Do you remember the exact terms in which you communicated with Mr. Tribe regarding this interview? When did you first see Mr. Tribe in reference to this conversation?—Some time the same evening. I cannot, however, fix the precise time. It was after I parted with Mr. Holt. I told Mr. Tribe what had taken place between myself and Mr. Holt.

82. Did you then, on communication with Mr. Tribe, put such a construction upon it as would lead him to suppose that overtures of an improper character had been made?—It is impossible for me to give the exact words. What I communicated to him was to the effect that Brogden was desirous of receiving political support. I spoke more particularly of what had been said by Mr. Holt with regard to the advisability of persuading Mr. Vogel not to bring forward a want-of-confidence motion during the present Session.

83. You say you told Mr. Tribe that Mr. Brogden wished to obtain your political support in the House?—What I gave Mr. Tribe to understand was, that Mr. Brogden desired to keep the present Government in office.

84. As far as the proposal to secure your services went, you consider that a perfectly proper thing?—Yes.

85. It was something entirely outside of that which led you to believe that you had been tampered with?—I object to the word "tampered." It was something outside of the proposal that induced me to take the view of the matter which I did.

86. You state that Mr. Holt wished you to use your influence to prevent Mr. Vogel turning out Mr. Stafford and his colleagues?—Yes.

87. Did Mr. Holt make any offer to you of remuneration of any kind for the influence you should bring to bear on Mr. Vogel?—No; none at all.

88. In what respect did you consider the proposal was one which involved improper suggestion to you?—That view was taken in connection with the surrounding circumstances.

89. The proposal was made for your services to further the undertakings referred to by you?—Yes.

90. You looked then at the one thing as being tacked on to the other?—Yes.

91. Are you aware that Mr. Holt has sent a letter to the Speaker, denying your accusations?—Yes, I have heard that he has done so.

92. In the face of that denial, do you still persist in your opinion that he attempted unduly to influence your conduct?—In all my communications with Mr. Holt, I regarded him simply as an agent for Messrs. Brogden and Sons, and not as Mr. Holt as an individual.

93. Assuming then that he was not acting as an agent for Messrs. Brogden and Sons, do you still persist in believing that an attempt was made unduly to influence your conduct as a Member of the House?—No; I would be very sorry indeed.

94. With the explanations before you, do you still persist in believing that an improper attempt was made to influence you as a Member of the House?—If the communication was made to me by Mr. Holt as a private individual, I can no longer consider that an attempt was made to influence me as such. I can simply regard it as a conversation with a private individual.

95. Am I to understand, then, that it was the circumstances of the supposed agency that you laid the great stress upon?—Exactly so.

96. What special reason had you for supposing Mr. Holt acted as the agent of Messrs. Brogden and Sons?—I had no other reason than the general tenor of the conversation. He (Mr. Holt) generally made use of the terms "we," "us," and "the firm," which led me to believe that he was acting in his business capacity.

97. Had Mr. Brogden himself ever had any conversation with you upon this matter?—None at all, further than he has had a conversation with me with regard to works of this kind in actual progress or to be undertaken.

98. Did he ever propose to you to use your professional services in this matter?—No, never.

99. Then am I to presume that the conversations you have held with Mr. Brogden were simply those of a person interested, or presumably interested, in these matters?—Certainly.

100. Then am I to understand that Mr. Brogden never made any overtures to you for your professional services?—No, none at all.

101. In your experience has it not very often occurred that in conversations of this character the words "we" and "the firm" are used when it is not intended to convey the impression of an actual agency?—I think it is very possible.

102. In editing a paper, is the paper not often spoken of as "we"?—Oh! yes, it is.

103. The delivery boy, for instance, might use the word "we," and still you would not infer an agency?—The meeting on this occasion took place by special appointment in Messrs. Brogden's office.

104. Was not the office the most convenient place—perhaps more convenient than any other place in town?—Oh, yes.

105. Did not you yourself mention that you would call at the office and discuss the matter?—No; it was Mr. Holt wanted to go there. He wanted me to go to it there and then, and when I told him I had other engagements, he asked me to come in the afternoon.

106. And you went to the office in the afternoon?—Yes.

107. When you went to consult the Speaker, in his room, did you tell him, in the first instance, that the conversation was confidential?—I did.

108. When you communicated what had transpired, the Speaker said that you had no other option

Mr. Harrison.

9th Oct., 1872.