87 *Mr Skerrett* (to witness).] We will pass on from that letter That is the last of the letters written in connection with this particular matter of Mr Lysaght's. Did you, in point of fact, include Mr F V Lysaght's name in the petition?—In the second petition?

88. Yes?—Yes.

89. Do you know that Mr Brian Lysaght's name was not included?—Yes. I never sent him the petition. I sent it to Mr F V Lysaght.

90. Was Mr F V Lysaght a constituent of yours?—No.

91 Was Mr Brian Lysaght a constituent of yours?—No. Mr F V Lysaght was living in Canterbury, and is so now I think.

92. I want you to refer to the letter which passed between Mr Haddow and yourself?—Yes; it is dated 3rd May, 1906.

93 Now, at what epoch did this correspondence take place—before or after Parliament had recommended that the refund should be granted to Messrs. Hutchison and Haddow?—Oh! months after; very nearly a year afterwards.

94. Now, do you know what you did, in point of fact, towards the collection of those moneys? —Well, I did nothing until I received this letter from Messrs. Hutchison and Haddow, and no one was more surprised than myself that Mr Hutchison, of all men, should ask me to collect his money for him. I thought, ' Well, it is a pretty difficult task when Mr Hutchison cannot collect his own money—it is a pretty big order for me to take on ''

95. But what did you do?—I replied——

96. The Committee have read your reply, but what did you do so far as the Government was concerned?—I wrote asking for it.

97 Do you remember whether you wrote more than once or only once?—I could not say. It may have been more than once or only once. I wrote asking for particulars of how the matter stood.

98. Do you remember whether you wrote as agent for Mr Hutchison or not?—Certainly I should write as agent for Messrs. Hutchison and Haddow It was Mr Hutchison really, because he was the petitioner

99. Your letter, as far as you can recollect, was written to the Government informing them that you were writing on behalf of Messrs. Hutchison and Haddow?—Yes, it would be.

100. I presume we can see those letters?—

The Chairman Yes. We are really having secondary evidence of a written document. It is hardly relevant.

Mr Skerrett The document is not in my possession, it is the property of the Government.

The Chairman If you ask for it to be produced I will have some one subpœnaed to produce it. Does Mr Myers object to your giving secondary evidence?

Mr Myers I would sooner have the documents, because they may or may not be on the file.

Witness. The previous payments were made by the Lands Department, and I should rather think I would write to the Minister for Lands. It would be either the Colonial Treasurer or the Minister for Lands.

Mr Skerrett: May I ask that Mr Symes's letters should be produced?

The Chairman To whom do you say we should give notice to produce?

Mr Skerrett I presume, the Lands Department.

The Chairman Does the witness not know to whom he addressed the letters?

Witness. No, it is impossible for one to remember now—it is so many years ago. I could not say whether to the Lands Department or to whom they were addressed.

Mr Skerrett I will apply officially. It is the file connected with the west coast settlement reserves on which those letters would appear

101 *Mr Skerrett* (to witness).] Very well, I want to make it quite clear that in any communication you wrote to the Government with respect to Hutchison and Haddow's claim you wrote as agent, avowedly, for Hutchison and Haddow?—That is so.

102. Do you remember whether you interviewed any Minister or Ministers on the subject?—No, I never interviewed one: that I am positive about.

103. The matter was treated by you purely as a business transaction?—Yes, purely as a business transaction.

104. And your communications to the Government and the Department would be purely business letters?—Purely business transactions.

105. Now, you have produced all the letters which you have been able to find in connection with these matters?—Yes, every letter that I can find.

106. I have shown them to my friend Mr Myers, and I desire to refer to one or two of them. Here is a letter from Mrs. Grant, née Copeland, 7th November, 1906, as follows: "Mr W Symes, M.H.R.—DEAR SIR,—*Re* west coast leases award: Mr Davidson and Mr. Law advised me to apply to Captain Johnston for my award. Captain Johnston referred me to apply to you for particulars. My name is not on his list. Do not remember the amount paid, but paid my share of the expenses at different times as asked for it. I have only one small receipt. Thanking you for the trouble I must put you to." Then, on the 11th December she writes, "My claim was sent to you with my other papers. Am at a loss how to word it again. Very sorry to give you so much trouble, but would it be asking too much kindness for you to send me a letter that I could copy With kind regards and best wishes." Was Mrs. Grant a constituent of yours?—No.

107 That naturally was the general character of the correspondence—that is the sole object of them?—Yes.