

and lapsed on the 23rd July after the Judges' order. On the 12th June, 1908, there was a sale from the executors to Hermann Lewis for £14,000. On the same date Hermann Lewis gave a mortgage for it, the consideration being £14,000. He never paid a penny. Now, you might say, "Where does Dr. Findlay come in?" On the date when this sale to Hermann Lewis took place with a mortgage back, there was a caveat lodged on the property, and not removed until the 23rd July, and in the interim this transaction took place. This was a most grave irregularity, that must be looked into.

*The Chairman:* Why was the caveat withdrawn?

*Mr. Jones:* The Judges ordered it. They said, "Kick the caveat out." A mortgage from Hermann Lewis to J. G. Findlay and F. G. Dalziel was lodged on the 2nd May, 1910. There was a subsequent mortgage to T. G. Macarthy of £25,271, subject to a mortgage of £14,000 to Flower's executors and £1,000 to Findlay and Dalziel.

*The Chairman:* Who gave the mortgage to Macarthy?

*Mr. Jones:* Hermann Lewis—for £25,271 8s. 2d.

*Mr. Okey:* What was the condition of Findlay's mortgage?

*Mr. Jones:* Payable on demand; power of sale immediately on default, without notice. T. G. Macarthy's, payable 13th February, 1910; interest 9 per cent., reducible to 7 per cent. The District Land Registrar, in reply to inquiry, says that this caveat was withdrawn by him, and he declines to give his reasons for so withdrawing it. On the 2nd May, the date these mortgages were registered, Mr. Bamford, the Registrar-General, went from Wellington to New Plymouth, and removed the caveat (not mine, but the one by the Native Land Court), and the first transaction on the date was Findlay and Dalziel's. And yet this gentleman says he has no interest in the property. I can only say that there is the document. With regard to what you may feel inclined to do in my case: I can come to either the Courts or Parliament. The Courts have kicked me out. When the Upper Chamber was good enough to give me a recommendation I did not get it. Supposing this Committee gives me some recommendation, the Government has the same power to ignore it and kick it out, as was done previously. It is only right, I submit, that some evidence should be taken to release me from this position.

*Mr. Macdonald:* What is the date of the Stout-Palmer Commission?

*Mr. Jones:* The 4th March, 1909.

*Mr. Macdonald:* That was an inquiry to see what was to be done with certain Native lands?

*Mr. Jones:* That was not for my benefit at all. That was another inquiry.

*The Chairman:* This Commission was given on behalf of the Natives. That was the object of it.

*Mr. Macdonald:* That is right.

*Mr. Jones:* That is not my contention. It was given to Sir Robert Stout, as indicated in the letter, after Dalziel came to Treadwell and said, "Jones has complained about the terms, and Rigg has complained to the Premier. Dr. Findlay will send it to Sir Robert Stout."

*The Chairman:* It seems to me that your complaint is that you had no chance of giving evidence before the inquiry, and that Sir Robert Stout had already adjudicated on the case. I understand that that is the position you take up.

*Mr. Jones:* Yes. And on the 13th May last, in one of the local papers, it is set out that it was decided to set up a Royal Commission of two Judges for the purpose of inquiring into Jones's case. I am not speaking disrespectfully of the Judges, but how is it humanly possible that a man can give a decision one way to-day, and in a few months give a contrary decision. What would you feel if Judges decided your case, and they were put again in some other form to keep on at it? I am quite sure that you would not submit to that without protest. I do not know that I can say any more. If I can assist you in any way by the production of any documents I shall be most happy to do so, and, whatever your recommendation may be, I hope it will be a just one.

*The Chairman:* Would any member like to ask any questions?

*Mr. Newman:* I understand that two Judges were appointed, Sir Robert Stout being one. Did you receive any notice?

*Mr. Jones:* None. That is my complaint.

*Mr. Newman:* You received no notice?

*Mr. Jones:* No. Yet I am on the 'phone and the telegraph, and mails are delivered twice a week.

*Mr. Newman:* Why was this Commission appointed?

*Mr. Jones:* I understand it was because I had complained of the enormous terms demanded from me. Dr. Findlay said, "As Jones has complained, and the Premier has heard of it through Rigg, I will send the matter to Sir Robert Stout."

*Mr. Newman:* Did your solicitor get notice?

*Mr. Jones:* No, not a living soul connected with me.

*The Chairman:* You will get a copy of this evidence for your correction. Meantime I do not know what the Committee will do, but there are a large number of names mentioned by you, especially those of Dr. Findlay and Sir Joseph Ward, and the Committee may consider it necessary to hear them in the case.

*Mr. Jones:* I should like to be present.

*The Chairman:* You will be given fair play. That is a matter for the Committee.

*Mr. Jones:* I believe Sir Joseph Ward and Mr. Carroll were anxious to have this thing settled up.

*Mr. Jennings:* Might I say that, knowing the whole of the circumstances, and having been connected with the matter, I should like to give evidence when the Committee goes into the matter again.