

studiously kept from Mr. Okey and myself. Had Mr. Okey received his letter on the 7th there would have been time for me to move the Governor to withhold his signature from the Order in Council until Parliament had considered the matter. Mr. Okey should be asked to produce this letter. He marked the date of receipt on it. Had I known in time before the 22nd March that the Order had been issued and was being made use of, I might have taken some action to prevent the deal being carried out. I was much in Wellington after the Order was sanctioned, but Mr. Carroll never said a word to me about it. I have no doubt that the whole thing was a plot. It is all very well for the Native Minister and another honourable gentleman to say in this room that lawyers and others have stated the report of the Stout-Palmer Commission to be of no value. It has been of value for evil. I have maintained all along that it was a very unrighteous production. It is on record that on the 25th October, 1909, accompanied by two members of Parliament, I requested the Premier to remove this document from the table of the House and set up an impartial open inquiry. I did not mean an inquiry by the Attorney-General's ex-partner. The Premier raised some doubt about the power to remove the report of a Royal Commission from the table, but said he would inquire. I knew otherwise, and pointed out to the Premier that the responsibility lay in allowing the paper to go on the table. I did not believe there was any such difficulty. So I laid the matter before Mr. Speaker, who replied that there were precedents for such removal, and that the Premier had only to ask leave of the Chair for removal of the paper. I do not believe the Premier took any steps in the matter, and this scandalous production is bound up in the blue-books as a mark against myself and my children. I have never been able to get this open inquiry. Why? I ask. It cannot surely be on the ground of economy. These Parliamentary Commissions cost far more than open inquiry. Although the Press are admitted at this Committee, the people of the Dominion will never realize what has been done while I am limited to the scope of what is required to be said here—not to what I wish and have a right to say. Parliament was deluded last session into placing in a Bill two sections originated by the Attorney-General in the Council for the suggested protection of the Premier against a certain pamphlet, the contents of which everybody knew all about. It never dawned upon Parliament that there was a Native-land transaction in which the author of the sections was interested that required to be hushed up.

7. *Mr. Greenslade.*] I do not think this is fair. Have you evidence of that, Mr. Jones?—Parliament passed these two clauses of the Bill under the impression that it was to subdue the Black pamphlet.

8. It is not fair to bring that in before this Committee. It has nothing to do with the case, as far as I can see?—My object is to show that Dr. Findlay wanted to conceal this transaction. He has a mortgage over this property.

*Hon. Mr. Ngata:* Mr. Jones is repeating a good deal of what he said before the A to L Committee.

*Mr. Greenslade:* It does not help you at all, Mr. Jones.

*Witness:* My object was to show the reason for their so treating me. I have never heard of a man in these colonies being treated in the way I have been. If you like I will strike that reference out.

*The Chairman:* Go right on, Mr. Jones.

*Witness:* If the Committee orders it to be erased I will not object.

*The Chairman:* I will ask the Committee to permit all that has been said to be taken down.

*Witness:* Very well. Dr. Findlay maintained that he had no interest, direct or indirect, in this matter or in the business of Findlay and Dalziel; yet he was a co-mortgagee on the Register over portion of this property, and draws an income annually from the business of his firm. The Committee has only to look at the large sums that have passed through the firm's books over this Mokau business to judge what interest he has. The Chairman intimated that the Stout-Palmer report had been "ruled out" as having no bearing on this case; yet all that has been done has been based on that report. I ask the Committee, for my sake, to rule it in again. That report is the only authority for claiming the leases to have been improperly obtained, and, for other reasons, void or voidable. No Court of law has said so; and the Court that said that I had no interest—contrary, remember, to what the English Court ruled—refused me the right to try the action or leave to appeal to the Privy Council. The English Court had the New Zealand law before it, and I was represented by a New Zealand barrister. Coming back to the Order in Council, when that was obtained the Government could have protected me by withholding it until the other side had arranged with me, or the Government could have proclaimed the land as Crown property. Even at this stage there is a way of redressing me without injustice to any one, but it would be useless, I consider, to suggest any remedy to a Government where at least one of its members is interested. The Government actually played into Lewis's hands by holding over the Order in Council from the 5th December until the 15th March to enable Lewis to hawk round for the money. Respecting the item £25,000 paid to Macarthy, this was only a medium of Flower's executors—Travers, Campbell—defrauding me. They are doubtless in the swim. Macarthy had ample security for Lewis's debt to him without Mokau, and the Land Transfer Register of February-March, 1911, shows that these securities were transferred to the Hawke's Bay men. That was what the £25,000 was for. The only £25,000 that was paid was to the Native owners. The £25,000 that has been spoken of so much as having been paid to Macarthy by Findlay's firm, they got value for it. The Chairman went so far, the day before yesterday, as to say that with respect to the Stout-Palmer Commission I might have a little indulgence. Now, all I ask upon this head is that you will be kind enough to listen to me about the terms, and these are very important. But before I go on to that there is a point I wish to mention. The question arose the other day about the survey, and I spoke to Sir James Carroll and Mr. Herries. I said there was an understanding betwixt myself and the Government that the Government should pay for the survey. In