

Did you tell the Administrator that you were going to call a public meeting before you actually called it?—No; but it was advertised in the paper.

Yes, the public meeting was advertised in the paper, but did you tell the Administrator that you were going to call a meeting as well as the object of the meeting?—No, but I think the objects of the meeting were published in the paper.

Had you mentioned one word to the Administrator about the matter?—No.

This was the public notice, was it not: "The elected representatives of the Legislative Council of Western Samoa have formed themselves into a provisional committee to convene a public meeting for Friday, 15th October, at 8 p.m., in the Market Hall, to consider representations to be made to the Hon. W. Nosworthy, Minister of External Affairs for New Zealand, on his forthcoming visit. All are invited to attend." That was the notice, was it not?—Yes.

And you have told the Commission that you had not mentioned one word to the Administrator before that notice was published?—No.

Before the meeting was held did you mention to the Administrator what was the object of the meeting, or did you leave it to himself to see it in the newspaper?—I did not speak to him, and he should have seen it in the newspaper.

And you left it at that?—Yes.

And you left it at that after accepting his kindly words at your reception and after your remarks wishing him every success in his social and administrative duties in Samoa?—Yes.

As a fair man, Mr. Nelson, do you think it was right, after accepting those remarks from him at your reception, that you should not have told him what you were doing? I ask this question from you as a fair man, Mr. Nelson?—The matter was decided by the public meeting.

Did you not owe a duty of friendship to the Administrator?—I did not have to consider the friendship of the Administrator when the public meeting decided on it, and it was not necessary to get his confirmation or criticism about it. He did not tell me when he ruled against me.

Did you know the night of your reception that you were going to hold this meeting?—No.

When did you have the meeting in Sam Meredith's house?—I think it was between my coming and the night of the reception—I am not sure. However, I think it was within six days.

That was before the Administrator made this speech at your reception, was it not?—Yes.

The meeting at Mr. Meredith's house was before the night of your reception—that is clear?—I think so: I cannot exactly say. It could not be far away—it would be about that time.

I am going to put it to you that it was before: will you agree with that?—Yes.

The conduct so disclosed we think is properly subject to animadversion. If Mr. Nelson was actuated by public motives, why should he not have given some intimation of his proposed course of action with respect to the ventilation of the alleged grievances, and have discussed them with the Administrator? According to him he was then on friendly terms with the Administrator, and he regarded the Administrator as a man to whom representation of public opinion could be made without exciting personal animosity; yet, although he had decided before the reception to call the public meeting, he made no communication of any kind to the Administrator on the subject before the reception, or at any other time.

The meeting held at Mr. Samuel Meredith's house before this reception is not, in our opinion, without significance. Mr. Nelson attended a meeting at this house, which is situated on the outskirts of Apia, at which were present Mr. Williams, Mr. Westbrook, Mr. Meredith, Faumuina, Malietoa, Lago Lago, Tuimaleali'ifano, and Tofaeono. The latter chief, who was called as a witness by the petitioners, was a member of the Mau Committee, and had been required to resign his office in the Administration as District Plantation Inspector. This witness said that it was arranged at the meeting in question that a public meeting of Europeans and Samoans should be called. Mr. Nelson's evidence oscillated, as to what took place at this meeting, between describing it as a mere visit of courtesy and as a meeting at which the holding of a public meeting of Europeans and Samoans was discussed. He denied that the public meeting was the outcome of the talk at Mr. Meredith's house. We have no hesitation in accepting the evidence of Tofaeono on this point. We are satisfied that at this meeting it was in fact arranged that a public meeting consisting of Europeans and Samoans should be held. Mr. Nelson has said that, when giving evidence before the Joint Committee of Parliament, he had completely forgotten this meeting at Mr. Meredith's house. It was not mentioned either by Mr. Meredith or Mr. Williams in their respective evidences, but was elicited upon the cross-examination of Lago Lago and Tofaeono, complainant's witnesses. The importance of this meeting was twofold: firstly, it was held out by Mr. Nelson that the attendance of a large number of Samoans at the public meeting was purely accidental, and, secondly, for Europeans to mix themselves up with Samoans in the ventilation of purely Native grievances was very unusual and contrary to the prevailing European sentiment. We recall the fact that in the Native circular