

204. And your membership declaration says, "I, —, declare that I am a British subject and a Protestant; I reject as superstitious the Romish doctrine of the Mass; that I am not married to a Romanist, nor will I marry one"?—That is so.

205. And you got your adherents and subscribers to sign that declaration?—Yes. Ten thousand have signed it in the North Island.

206. All that, you will say, is calculated to imbue a spirit of harmony throughout the community?—We are harmonizing the Protestants in the defence of their liberties.

207. And you do not care if you offend the feelings of the Roman Catholics?—No, not at all. It is better to have it on the surface.

208. And you are endeavouring to fan the flame?—No.

209. It looks very like it. Are there any more pamphlets, by the way?—No, not at present.

210. You mentioned a name that I did not catch?—That was an advertisement that appeared in the Press entitled "Rome and Beer."

211. Let us get on to your direct charges against the Post Office. When did you first think that letters were miscarrying?—I have a letter handed to me on the Thursday or the Friday of the week in which the letters were sent out.

212. The circulars, do you mean?—Yes, the circulars.

213. I understand the first posting of circulars was done on Monday, the 2nd July, and another posting on Wednesday, the 4th?—Yes.

214. When did you first communicate with Mr. Williamson, the Chief Postmaster?—On Monday night.

215. The first night?—No, on the Monday week.

216. The Monday before your lecture?—Yes. I had information before, but I thought they were perhaps accidents. I had only one or two.

217. But did you not ring up Mr. Williamson on the Thursday, the 5th July?—No, it was on the Monday night, I think—I am quite without any written record of the matter—Monday, the 9th July.

218. I suggest you are mistaken?—It is possible I am mistaken in that date.

219. I am informed that on the 5th July you rang up Mr. Williamson and made some complaint?—I would accept the date if Mr. Williamson is sure of it, because I have not a record of it.

220. And that he asked you if there were to be any further postings, and that you said, "Yes, some more would be posted to-night or to-day"?—Yes.

221. Did he not ask you to postpone the posting until that evening so that he could make definite arrangements in his office to keep a check?—Yes, that is so.

*Mr. Ostler:* Is it the 5th July?

222. *Mr. Gray.*] Yes, that is so. Mr. Williamson informs me you rang him up on the evening of the 5th July, and stated that envelopes from the association to the number of about fifty had been delivered without contents to the addressees?—Yes; that is, I was informed then from one and another.

223. Did not Mr. Williamson, after making inquiries from you over the telephone, request you to furnish a list of addresses of the empty envelopes?—That is so.

224. Did you ever supply that list?—No.

225. Why not?—I had not the names: I had to get them from my secretary. Then I was advised to withhold the names if I was going to make any public charge.

226. You advertised in the Press?—Yes.

227. You were requested more than once by Mr. Williamson to let him have a list?—That is so.

228. Can you suggest how he was to make inquiries into the complaint if he had not the names?—I was not concerned about what he was doing. I was concerned about how we were to prove the charges.

229. How do you suppose that the Chief Postmaster was to inquire into your complaint and see whether an injustice had been done unless you furnished him with the names and addresses of the persons concerned?—He could not do it. I explained to him through the Press why I had not done it.

*Mr. Ostler:* It was my mistake: I did not write.

230. *Mr. Gray.*] That was referring to something else. I am speaking of a date long antecedent to the meeting—the preceding week. You will admit, Mr. Elliott, it was impossible for the Chief Postmaster to make those inquiries without the particulars he asked for?—Yes; and in saying that I say it would have been impossible to prove our charges if the information had been allowed to get into the hands of the Post Office.

231. Yes; but you did not then suggest there was any improper action on the part of the Post Office?—No; but subsequent information made us think there was. We were not suspicious at that time.

232. After you made the charges you were advised not to supply?—No; I was advised before then.

233. After these conversations with Mr. Williamson?—I only had one.

234. You were advised that if you were going to make charges against the Post Office you had better not give him the particulars. For that reason possibly he has not received the particulars until we heard them in Court yesterday?—Yes.

235. You came to the conclusion apparently that there was something under the surface you did not know anything about?—In what respect?

236. That these non-deliveries, &c., were not merely the result of carelessness, but were done dishonestly?—Yes.

237. Now, I would like to know exactly what you do suggest?—In regard to the letters—in particular about the envelopes delivered empty?