

applied for an appeal to the Supreme Court of New Zealand, but the Judge, fortunately, did not allow this to interfere with the execution of the sentence. This appeal is really only a scheme on the part of a lawyer (Mr. Slipper) who is a new arrival here, and does not understand Native problems, but apparently wants to curry favour with the Natives. His attitude is helping the agitation, for he knows that such an appeal will not be upheld, but that the delay will give the Natives confidence in him." Evidence will be called on that matter, sir, to show that Mr. Slipper decided nothing in that matter without first calling me into consultation. The appeal was not recommended by either of us. After His Honour the Chief Judge had given his decision the matter was referred to us by the committee, and neither of us was prepared to advise an appeal. Advice was sought from other counsel in New Zealand—Sir John Findlay. On his advice the appeal was taken, and not on Mr. Slipper's. That statement is untrue. This, of course, will be denied. There are several charges of sedition. We will leave that to cross-examination. Later, on page 165, about half-way down: "It may only be a coincidence, but I blame Mr. Gurr, one of the committee and a well-known intriguer with the Natives, for setting up an organization here in this agitation similar to that which caused trouble in American Samoa six years ago, when he was a resident of that Territory." Apart from the facts that is a contrast to the statement by His Excellency the Administrator at the beginning, where he said that it was Mr. Nelson who was concerned entirely. It will be denied by Mr. Gurr, and other evidence given by the members of the committee. Towards the end of the report you will see a list of five subheadings. They will, of course, be dealt with, but I particularly wish to mention 3 and 4. The *Samoa Guardian* will be entirely justified. For that we can only set up a negative defence. "The actions of a new lawyer here (Mr. Slipper), who is reported to be advising the Natives to disregard orders given by the Government." We will certainly give that a complete denial. I have no doubt that my friend will set up a defence of denial. The other report below it deals very much with the same matters which I have mentioned before, and I do not propose to delay the time of the Commission by detailed reference to it. There is also in this State paper two reports of the Inspector of Police, in which he refers to the nature of the persons present at the public meeting, and in which he conveyed the idea that the majority of the people were convicted criminals, taxi-drivers, and wharf labourers. The type of persons present will be referred to, also the suggestion of an organized scheme for the purpose of obtaining applause. Those reports appear in Appendix I. There is no need for me to refer to any other matters, sir.

ARTHUR WILLIAMS further examined.

*Mr. Baxter.*] You will remember Mr. Nelson's return in August, 1926, to Samoa?—Yes.

I believe that was after he had been to Wellington?—Yes.

*The Chairman:* My recollection of the evidence is that he returned from Sydney to Samoa on the 21st September, 1926.

*Mr. Baxter.*] Now, he returned to Samoa towards the end of September after having been to Wellington?—Yes.

Did he refer to any interviews he had in Wellington?—Yes, he said he had an interview with the Minister of External Affairs.

*The Chairman:* You cannot give that detail. You can only lead up to it.

*Mr. Baxter.*] He told you he had been to Wellington and had had an interview?—Yes.

And as the result of what he told you was anything done by you, or by him, or any other person?—He said the Minister of External Affairs intended coming down on the October "Tofua."

Whom did he say that to?—He announced it publicly when he returned.

Did you do anything or were you concerned in anything that was done as a result of this?—It was decided by the elected members to call a public meeting. As the Minister of External Affairs was coming here, the public felt they would like to interview him and put some of their grievances to him.

Was that public meeting called?—Yes, called in the Market Hall.

*The Chairman.*] Who called it?—The elected members.

*Mr. Baxter.*] Were the elected members the same then as they are now—Mr. Nelson, Mr. Westbrook, and yourself?—Yes.

Do you remember what the date was?—In October, 1926.

Were many of the public there?—Yes, a large number appeared.

What race?—Europeans and Natives both.

The meeting had been announced by the elected members—in what manner?—It was advertised in the papers.

In that advertisement was any mention made of what the business would be?—I think we mentioned the idea of the meeting.

That was the advertisement that appeared in the *Samoa Times*?—Yes.

You say that Natives and Europeans were at the meeting: do you know how the Natives came to be there?—It was a public meeting, and it was considered any one had a right to come, Samoans or any one else. They are part of the community.

Was anything said to you by Natives or any one else about their being there?—It was a public meeting; some Natives asked if they might come along.

Do you know why they came along, or have you got any idea?—Because they had some grievances to put up.

Did you at that time know they had grievances?—I knew they had grievances.

Did you at that time know the nature of those grievances?—Yes.

Who presided at the meeting?—The Hon. Mr. Nelson.