

*Right Hon. Sir J G Ward* The paper known as the *Egmont Post* was published up to the 17th July, 1903, on which date its name was changed to the *Stratford Evening Post*

109. *Mr Allen.*] When was this application made for it to be placed on the list—what year?—1905.

110. *Right Hon. Sir J G Ward.*] Then did you get no advertisements between 1903 and 1905?—I think it was in 1904 the paper was started.

111 Did you get no Government advertisements between 1904 and 1905?—We received the necessary advertisements.

112. But you were not on the list?—No.

113. Did you make any attempt to get on the list between 1904 and 1905?—I think I answered that question before.

114. You do not remember when the first application was made to get on the list?—No, I do not.

115. Was it when the papers were amalgamated?—It would be soon after I discovered it was not on the list.

116 You very soon discovered that, I suppose?—Yes, I discovered it immediately we failed to receive Government advertisements appearing in other papers, and I would write down to the officer of the Department and ask about it.

117 Was it early in 1904 or late in 1904?—Late in 1904 I think it was.

*The Chairman* We are really dealing with a charge that applies to an individual so far as 1905 is concerned.

*Mr Allen* But I am getting to 1905.

*The Chairman* If you are going back to 1905, I think a point like this is hardly involved in a charge of this kind.

118 *Mr Allen.*] He says they made application, and I want to get the date. When do I understand you to say the first application was made?—Late in 1904, I should say

119 Did you make no application to get on the list between the time the papers were amalgamated in 1903?—I should like the point settled as to whether the amalgamation took place in 1903 or 1904.

*Right Hon Sir J G Ward* Mr Chairman, may I put in a return showing the amounts paid the *Egmont Settler*, the *Egmont Post*, and the *Stratford Evening Post* from 1896 to the year 1910? The *Egmont Settler* ceased and the amalgamation took place on the 31st October, 1903

*The Chairman* You may put the return in at the close of the evidence of this witness.

120. *Mr Reed.*] Mr Whitlock, the position amounts to this: that Mr Symes insisted upon the condition that he should be supported by the paper before he would support the paper's application for Government advertisements, and the paper refused that condition and made the application direct, and the application was at once granted?—Yes.

*Mr Myers* There was no reply to that letter of Mr Symes.

121 *Mr Reed*] Well, they did not accept the condition. (To witness: First of all you had the letter in Wellington in your possession, you say?—Yes.

122 Now, when you returned what happened to that letter?—Well, I cannot remember, but I should imagine it would be handed in with the correspondence at the end of the month to the meeting of directors. The practice was to hand in all correspondence during the month to the directors' meeting at the end of the month.

123. From whom did you get that letter—who gave it to you to bring to Wellington?—I received the letter from Mr McCluggage in the first place by post.

124. What happened to the letter when you returned from Wellington?—I have just told you that in the usual course it would be attached to the other correspondence, and be handed in to the meeting of directors.

125. Can you say that in the usual course of business it would be done, because the letter does not deal with the paper?—It deals with matters concerning the paper, and very important matters too.

126. It is not addressed to the paper, and it would not be the ordinary course of business if it was filed with the paper's documents?—I could not say

127 Can you recollect to whom you gave that letter when you returned?—No, I cannot remember

128. When did you leave Stratford?—In 1906

129 Have you seen that letter since 1906?—No. I have not seen the letter since until I came down here.

130 And you do not remember in whose possession you placed that letter when you returned from Wellington?—No I think it was Mr Anderson who had the letter, he was the solicitor for the company

131 *Mr Buchanan.*] I presume, before you started for Wellington the question of taking the letter with you was discussed between yourself and the directors?—I think Mr Anderson was the only man I spoke to about coming to Wellington.

132. What was your object in taking the letter to Wellington?—I have already explained that—to show it to Mr Jennings, so as to give him a reason for getting him out of the House and to arrange for an interview without calling Mr Symes out.

133 Could you not have done that without showing the letter?—Yes.

134. *Mr. Skerrett.*] Do you know that on your return from Wellington the letter from Mr Symes to Mr McCluggage was submitted to a solicitor for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was an offence against the Corrupt Practices Act—have you any knowledge of that?—I have heard that since I came to Wellington this time, but not before.

135. You can give me no information of that except what you heard in Wellington: you do not know when it was and how it came about?—No.