

The Legislature of New Zealand has passed an Act in 1927 which has been referred to by you, sir, a little while ago. It will be shown that the Administration appeared to make frantic efforts to get that legislation passed very hurriedly, and since it has been passed it has not been used in any way. The inference is that there is no need for it, and the Administration knew it, and it was used for political purposes. Under the Act the accused person must have a full opportunity to give an explanation. Now, the question of titles comes up. I have a number of orders here—not banishment orders—which take away the titles of the Natives. This is the form of order, and it reads, “By virtue of the powers me thereunto enabling I prohibit the use of the title ‘Fa’amau’ by you the person originally known by the name of Ulumoto.” Then the Administrator signs his name. This particular one I have here was dated the 26th July.

*The Chairman:* Under what authority does it purport to be made?

*Mr. Slipper:* I am informed that it is under the Samoan Offenders Ordinance, 1922; and section 6, subsection (1), reads, “The Administrator may from time to time, if he is satisfied that such a course is necessary for the peace, order, and good government of Samoa, or of any part thereof, by order signed by him directed to any Samoan, prohibit the use by such Samoan of any Samoan title or titles named in such order for such time as the Administrator may think necessary.” Subsection (2) of the same section reads, “Any Samoan who after any such order has been served on him uses any Samoan title in breach of such order shall be guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year.” It will be represented to the Commission that there was no necessity for these harsh measures, by reason of the fact that the Samoans esteem their titles very highly, and, moreover, this repressive legislation does nothing but stir up trouble in the island. It is because of these things and of the question of the Faipules that the country has been split into two parties, and the person ultimately responsible for that is the Administrator in adopting a wrong policy. It would be well to note that these banishments were made on a very large scale immediately after the Minister’s visit, and we allege the whole purpose is to break up any political efforts or aspiration of the people, and it will be shown that the Mau is a thoroughly legal and constitutional body to which any person has the right to belong and to discuss their politics the same as in any other country. I think that is sufficient to indicate to you what part I wish to refer to during the course of these proceedings.

*Mr. Baxter:* Your Honour, I propose to deal with the question of the interference by the Government in copra-trading by evidence. I have two witnesses here, sir; do you wish one to go out until he is called?

*The Chairman:* No, not as far as I am concerned.

*Mr. Baxter:* I call Mr. Brady.

CHARLES CRIPPEN BRADY sworn and examined.

*Mr. Baxter.]* You are the manager of the local branch of Burns, Philp (South Seas) Co., Ltd?—Yes. A company with its registered office in Suva, Fiji?—Yes.

Have you in any way associated yourself with the present political movement?—No.

Has the Government, either directly or through the New Zealand Reparation Estates, been interfering with the purchase of copra?—Yes.

In what way?—They have been purchasing copra from the Native villages in the districts of both Upolu and Savai’i.

Can you specify those districts, Mr. Brady?—To my knowledge, Mulifanua and Vaitele in Upolu, and Fagamalo in Savai’i.

In what way are they carrying this out, Mr. Brady? You say they are interfering with the purchase of copra: who is doing the buying at these points?

*The Chairman.]* When you speak of purchasing, do you mean straight-out purchasing of the copra, or do you mean an advance of money and undertaking shipment on behalf of the Natives?—A straight-out purchase, as far as I know.

*Judge MacCormick:* These two places are New Zealand plantations.

*The Chairman.]* You are not dealing with the copra from these plantations?—No; only with Native copra. I also omitted to mention Apia—Crown Estates head office in Apia.

*Mr. Baxter.]* Who is doing the buying in Mulifanua?

*The Chairman:* How can he know that? I expect that you will get that admitted by the Crown.

*Mr. Meredith:* The position is, sir, that there is no purchasing, purely an advance.

*The Chairman:* Yes, purely an advance and a transmitting to the market for sale on behalf of the Natives.

*Mr. Meredith:* With returns to the Natives afterwards.

*The Chairman.]* And a rendering of the account later on to the Natives as agent?—Well, Your Honour, I have two slips here purporting to be for copra received on which no reference is made to the copra being received on consignment.

*The Chairman.]* Surely that is purely negative—merely a receipt for the copra, and nothing to do with the terms on which the copra was received. That is a big logical jump, is it not? Whether the copra was received on consignment or as an out-and-out purchase, the receipt would be the same?—If I were selling copra I would like to know how it was received.

*The Chairman:* That is a mere mechanical receipt for copra.

*Mr. Baxter.]* Leaving aside whether it is an advance or a purchase, what is the price, say, at Mulifanua—what is the amount at Mulifanua being advanced by the Administration?—At Mulifanua. I understand, 2½ cents.