

Mr. Cornford.
21st Nov., 1879.

926. Now, I ask Mr. Cornford, whether it was not for the object of getting a statement from Rora that all the claims were satisfied, and that no outstanding claims existed against Mr. Sutton, that he took down the statement in writing and wanted her to sign it?—I had no such idea at the time.

927. I ask, on your oath, if that was your object?—I had no such object. I had pleaded a legal defence to the action at the time this was done. I believe if you will allow me to look at the paper [record of pleading referred to handed to witness], I can show. I was satisfied with that paper contained in the demurrer-book.

928. Then, Mr. Chairman, although Rora's answers could have been used in evidence against her, especially if she had signed them, Mr. Cornford had no such object in his mind when he questioned her and got her answers?—You said, to plead as a defence to the action. I asked her to sign it to refresh her memory. She had no objection to sign it.

929. Then, was that the object—to use it at the trial?—I will say at once that I had no definite object in my mind when I put those questions to her. I had no preconceived plan in my mind to make use of her answers.

930. Then is the Committee, Mr. Chairman, to understand that, when Mr. Cornford got these questions and declaration interpreted, he had no definite plan in his mind?—No.

931. Or that they were to be used at all?—I do not see any use in them myself. The document was valueless as far as I am concerned, except to show me what she said.

932. Will you answer my question?—I attached no importance to the conversation at the time—I mean to the answers that she made. I did not see that they had any special value. I had no object to serve in using these answers. If I had wished to make a settlement of the action, I would have gone about it in a very different manner.

933. *The Chairman.* Although you questioned Rora, it was not with the intention of withdrawing the case?—Certainly not.

934. If a statement of that kind—that is, that the object was to have the case withdrawn—were made to this Committee, it would be false?—Yes, it would be false.

935. *Mr. Rees.* Mr. Cornford did not get this document to use, if necessary, at the trial?—I she told a different story I would certainly have used the document then.

936. I ask this question, Mr. Chairman: Whether this statement was or was not to be signed with the object of being used against her, if necessary, at the trial?—If she made a different statement at the trial I would have used it.

937. That is, if she made a different statement in Court, you would have produced the document?—The document had no value for the purpose of pleading a defence.

938. Because she did not sign it?—No; even if she signed it.

939. Or even if she had a claim outstanding against Mr. Sutton?—Yes.

940. I would ask, Mr. Cornford, if anybody has stated or hinted to the Committee that this person, Rora, has sworn that she has not authorized me to act in her behalf—if any person has stated or sworn that, or that my authority has been recalled, is the statement true?—Not to my knowledge. I know nothing at all about it. I never heard her say so.

941. *The Chairman.* Rora has made no statement to that effect in your office?—No; she has never had any occasion to do so.

942. *Mr. Rees.* Is Mr. Cornford aware, from Mr. Sutton, that a paper-writing exists in Mr. Sutton's handwriting, promising 350 acres to Paora Nēnoi?—At what time?

943. At any time prior to this examination?—Yes.

944. Are you aware that Mr. Sutton signed such a paper?—Mr. Sutton told me a long time ago of the existence of such a document.

945. Signed by himself?—I understood so.

946. Supposing any one states this to the Committee [quoting from page 33 of Mr. Rees's evidence, beginning, "That Rora has sworn," &c.], is that correct?—As far as my knowledge goes she has never done so.

947. *Mr. Sutton.* I would like to ask one question. Do you remember whether that paper was written by Mr. Hamlin while Rora made her statement at the table?—I think it was written after she made the statement, from my pencil minute. He turned the purport of my pencil minute into that, and then read it over to Rora.

948. Read it to Rora?—Yes.

949. *Sir G. Grey.* Did you ask Rora whether she came to you voluntarily, without being induced to do so?—No, I did not. She seemed to be a free agent.

950. Was her husband joined with her in the action?—Yes. But I was given to understand that Wi Rangirangi is not her legitimate husband.

951. But he was joined with her as plaintiff?—Yes.

952. Did you ask her whether he knew that she was with you?—No.

953. If you had offered her money or given her money to sign this paper, would that have been wrong, as a solicitor?—I should think that it would be extremely wrong.

954. Where is the paper? I would just ask Mr. Cornford to read that note at the side, as it is rather illegible.—The pencil note? [Pencil note as follows:—"July 5, 1877. She has heard all this; she says it is quite true, but she won't sign without money—e rima hereni."]

955. Could you interpret into Maori to us the document?—No, I could not.

956. How do you know Rora said it was true?—Because Mr. Hamlin read it through. I had to rely on an interpreter.

957. Would it not have been better to have an interpretation on this?—It did not occur to me.

958. Have you your original notes?—I have not.

959. *Colonel Trimble.* Have you any personal knowledge of the promise or bargain between Messrs. Sutton and Watt?—Not personal knowledge.

960. Had the pleadings been made before Rora called?—I think so. [Papers referred to.] The pleadings had been delivered nearly two months.

961. Will you state the day?—The 12th May, 1877.