

Mr. Sheehan.

1848. You say that Mr. Watt rose no objection?—Yes.

1849. Perfectly certain?—Yes; absolutely certain.

8th Dec., 1879.

1850. Are you certain that Mr. Watt did not carry protected measures for himself in reference to some engagements of yours in Auckland which he purchased?—No.

1851. At that time?—I tell you what Mr. Watt did, although it is wrong speaking of these things. He wanted to settle this matter for himself for £10,000, and to pay me £2,000 for myself; and because I refused to do it, it was made known to every man in Auckland to whom I owed money, and they were going to sue me for not taking the money. I do not believe Mr. Watt paid a single shilling for the purpose you state. He may have told people there that I could have the money to pay them if I chose.

1852. Never paid a shilling for what?—To put the pressure on me you were speaking of now, before the settlement took place.

1853. I am speaking about after the settlement?—I am not.

1854. Why did you not bring the action against me before?—Because I did not consider, till the papers turned up, that an action would succeed.

1855. We understood from Mr. Rees that all the documents were in your possession, and that he drew up the declaration in the action against me?—He came down from Auckland specially retained by me to peruse those titles. He had *carte blanche* to act for me.

1856. He told us that he had these documents, and drew the declaration under your instruction?—He had general instructions from me.

1857. I should like you to answer my question a little more definitely. Why did you not bring the action against me before? Why did you keep that document four years in your possession before bringing the action against me?—I had not the document four years in my possession. You must not ask me to say things which I have not stated. There were a large number of actions.

1858. The document may not have been four years in your possession, but it was considerably over three years?—It might have been. I did not issue writs in every action where actions ought to be brought.

1859. You say every one was consulted in regard to this settlement?—Yes; except yourself.

1860. Can you say why?—I suppose you would have been consulted if you were necessary.

1861. But you were acting for the Natives?—My policy with regard to you, Mr. Sutton, was very different. It was through the medium of the law Courts I purposed effecting settlements with you.

1862. You did not recognize Tamihana Mataroa's reserve?—I cannot say.

1863. Or Paramene's?—What I do say is this: that the whole matter was fully discussed, and everything which appears in the document was interpreted and explained a hundred times over; and every man signed with the fullest and most absolute publicity.

1864. And they were perfectly conversant with the arrangement?—Perfectly.

1865. But a few months afterwards, in consequence of your advice, the Natives claimed a very large sum of money?—Against you, certainly.

1866. Can you explain what became of the £17,500?—I decline. It is no business of yours, or the Committee's.

1867. Are you not aware that there is a petition before this Committee about it?—I am quite aware of it. I decline to answer the question. It will not throw light on this petition now to know what became of that money. When that petition comes forward that matter will be explained.

1868. Are you not aware that Rora claims a large sum of money for her share?—Her share would be about £500. She received £300.

1869. Why did she not receive the balance?—That is a matter for Rora and those persons acting on her behalf.

1870. But I thought you were acting for her?—I was up to that date.

1871. And that you had the money?—I had not the money.

1872. You still think, Mr. Sheehan, that you did not have possession of that document in 1873 or 1874, at the time of the Supreme Court case against me in Napier, in which Mr. Travers acted?—I do not think I had.

1873. Did Mr. Travers have it?—I cannot say.

1874. He was acting for you?—He used to advise and draw pleadings, but I cannot speak definitely without reference to my papers. When Rora and her friends came to me, first of all I asked if they had any evidence in writing, and they told me that they thought that there was some writing. They went to their home and came back and said that they could not find the paper. I dismissed the matter from my mind, as not one to be gone on with.

1875. Mr. Ormond.] When would that be?—When I went to Napier in 1873.

1876. Did you not apply to Mr. Coleman for the 350 acres?—I think not.

1877. Why not?—Because I think he left shortly after.

1878. But I mean during the time this document was in your possession?—If you can mention any circumstances that would refresh my memory as to when that document came into my possession I could answer you.

1879. If Mr. Hamlin, the Chairman, would let me have the Oamaru petition I think I can refresh your memory. Do you remember when the Oamaru case was tried. I could see by the petition. I think it was in 1874?—I think it was later than that.

1880. Or 1875? [Oamaru petition produced.]—There ought to have been a library copy of the evidence in the Oamaru case. There was a copy of the evidence from a shorthand report used by the Judges in the appeal case.

1881. Mr. Sutton [examining the Oamaru petition]: It was rather later. I see it was in June, 1876. The action commenced in August, 1874.

Mr. Sheehan: When did it go to trial?

1882. Mr. Sutton.] In the next December. It would be probably in June, 1875, when you went to Napier.—Just before.