

492. What block or blocks to your knowledge had he acquired interest in?—There was no block mentioned.

493. Did you know what blocks were included, if not mentioned?—I did not know.

494. Did you know that Mangapapa and Mangoira were the blocks?—I did not know then.

495. Were you assisting Stockman to acquire these interests?—Yes; the land on the northern side of the river.

496. Did you ever see any written contract between Stockman and any Native?—No.

497. Between Stockman and anybody else?—I have seen a sort of statement of what Stockman was prepared to do. It was written to two Natives.

498. Did you ever see any contract between him and Messrs. Owen?—No, never.

499. Did you ever hear from Stockman that there was such a contract between Owen and Stockman?—Never.

500. Were you present when the application of Stockman came before the Chief Judge for a certificate?—I expect so. I was interpreter to the Chief Judge at that time.

501. Did Stockman produce any documents in support of his application?—I believe so; I suppose he did.

502. Can you remember what documents he produced?—No, I cannot, there were so many documents produced.

503. Then you had no communication with the Chief Judge since the sitting of the Court at New Plymouth?—In what way, in writing?

504. In connection with this petition, or any of the matters connected with the petition?—Certainly not. I met the Chief Justice in the street since then, and the matter was never mentioned.

505. When were you summoned to give evidence to-day?—Yesterday. I got a letter asking me to attend.

506. Was that the first request to attend?—Certainly it was.

507. Had you any communication from the Chairman of this Committee on Tuesday last?—I saw the Chairman on that day.

508. What time of the day did you see the Chairman?—In the morning.

509. Did the Chairman then request you to attend before the Committee?—No.

510. Did he tell you that I had requested him to summon you?—Yes.

511. Did you then explain to him the circumstances about the allegation?—Certainly not. I simply told him I was willing to attend without being subpoenaed at all.

512. *The Chairman.*] I would like to put a question to you, Mr. Thompson, with regard to the allegation which has been made. Did you say, in the presence of Mr. Jones, that the Chief Judge was "a bloody scoundrel"?—No. I was an officer of the Court, and it is not likely I would say such a thing.

513. Did he say that he told you to work for Walker and do what you could for him?—No, I never said such a thing.

514. *Major Jackson.*] Had you any communication with Mr. Gray, Mr. Owen, or Mr. Jones lately?—No; I have met Mr. Jones incidentally, but we had no talk about these matters.

Mr. J. E. Macdonald: I have read the evidence of Mr. R. S. Thompson, and say in reference to it: Mr. Thompson was engaged by the day to interpret in the Native Land Court. When not so occupied, he was at liberty to undertake any business not affecting the cases before the Court. My business under the Administration Act was not before the Court. With Mr. Thompson's evidence before me I cannot call to mind his having consulted me as to the propriety of his interfering in any business, but, had he done so, I should have expressed myself as above.

APPENDIX.

PETITION FROM ARTHUR OWEN.

To the Hon. the SPEAKER and MEMBERS of the HOUSE of REPRESENTATIVES of the Colony of New Zealand in Parliament assembled.

The petition of the undersigned Arthur Owen, of New Plymouth, in the Provincial District of Taranaki, in New Zealand, settler, humbly sheweth,—

1. THAT your petitioner, in the year 1882, commenced negotiations with certain aboriginal natives for the lease of certain lands on the north bank, Mokau, Provincial District of Auckland; that connected as a partner and agent with your petitioner was a half-caste person named George Stockman, who had informed your petitioner that he was a person of influence amongst the Natives.

2. That certain written and verbal agreements existed between your petitioner and George Stockman and the Natives; that certain sums of money were advanced by your petitioner to Stockman and to the Natives in connection with the negotiations.

3. That in 1883 an Act was passed prohibiting Native-land negotiations unless by a defined process of law; that in 1884 another Act was passed prohibiting any negotiations whatever in this territory. Both these Acts had had the effect of suspending any further negotiations by your petitioner with Stockman.

4. That in 1886 the Parliament passed the Native Lands Administration Act, which your petitioner believed would permit him to complete the negotiations.

5. That subsequently to the passing of the said Act in 1886 your petitioner again renewed