

That is all I want to know. I see by your pamphlet that you advocate self-government for the Samoans: is that right?—Yes.

That is so, is it not?—Yes.

And you think they are knowledgeable and competent to undertake the government of this country?—Yes.

Do you consider that that is consistent with the mandate of the League of Nations?—That I do not know.

And do not care?—I do not know.

You would suggest that the powers of self-government should be conferred upon the Samoans?—By having their own rules and laws.

By making their own rules and laws?—Yes.

Was that your purpose in joining the Citizens Committee?—No.

Are you alone in the Citizens Committee in your view that the Samoans are entitled to make their own laws and administer them?—I am not alone.

I think it is only fair to ask you if that is part of the object of the Citizens Committee?—No.

No part of the object of the Mau?—No, I do not think so.

Is it or is it not?—The Samoans say that that is their request.

That they should be entrusted with self-government in the sense you have expressed, and that is the object of the Mau?—That is the opinion of the Samoans.

Can you say whether or not, from your knowledge of the Mau movement, that its object is to obtain self-government for the Samoans?—That is the Samoans' wish.

You are not dealing with the desires of the European, but dealing with the objects of the Samoans who joined the Mau movement?—Yes.

I understand from what you say that you think that they are knowledgeable and competent to be entrusted with self-government?—I think they are, sir.

Now?—Yes.

GEORGE EGERTON LEIGH WESTBROOK further examined.

*The Chairman.*] You heard the evidence given by Mr. Williams, did you not?—Yes.

Mr. Williams said that it was not the object—or, rather, the purpose—of the Citizens Committee to advocate the removal of the present Administrator: is that true?—That is true.

Is the Citizens Committee now associated with the Mau?—Only to a certain extent we are held responsible.

You hold yourself responsible?—Mr. Nosworthy made us responsible.

And you are taking part now in the Mau movement: are you in constant communication with the Mau?—Yes, because there is a Royal Commission sitting.

I understand, for the purpose of the defence or prosecution of this matter, that it may be necessary for you to communicate with leaders of the Mau movement: is it not a fact that before the announcement the Citizens Committee was in consultation with the leaders of the Mau movement?—We really did not have any meetings with them after we were cut off from them by Mr. Nosworthy.

Do you dissociate yourself, then, from the Mau movement?—I am with it so far as my own ideals are concerned.

You have not dissociated yourself from the movement?—It would be impossible.

You are in agreement with it, then?—No.

So far as your ideals are concerned they are in accord with the Mau movement?—Only in certain things. I am not in accordance with what is going on now.

Tell me the particular matters in which you wish to dissociate yourself from the Mau movement? I did not think the time was ripe for self-government by the Samoans; but still, where there are questions of taxation involved there should be a question of representation.

Have you dissociated yourself from the Mau movement so far as it seeks to obtain self-government? You are of opinion that the Samoans are not capable of self-government?—Yes; but they should have representation.

*Mr. Baxter:* The other witnesses whom I wish to call will be Samoans, with the exception of Mr. Slipper.

*The Chairman:* I am very much against counsel being called as witnesses. The usual course in matters of this kind is for counsel to either submit a written statement or make a statement. The better course would be to make a short statement and submit it to Mr. Meredith, and no doubt that would be accepted as evidence.

*Mr. Slipper:* I desire to call attention to the grave reflections that have been made concerning me.

*The Chairman:* What are they, Mr. Slipper?

*Mr. Slipper:* I refer to the remarks concerning myself, that I apparently wanted to curry favour with the Natives, and that my attitude was helping the agitation because I knew that such an appeal would not be upheld, and that the delay would give the Natives confidence in me. The cases of Fautaga and Tagaloa were first heard on the 8th July, 1927. They were identical in facts and nature, and were taken together. They were adjourned to the 11th July, and further adjourned to the 14th July, when both defendants were convicted. At the hearing I made application to appeal, and was about to give grounds when His Honour the Chief Judge interrupted me with a remark to this effect: "I certainly think that this is a case for appeal. Indeed, I do not think it is necessary to hear the Crown Solicitor on the matter." Leave to appeal was granted. I then asked for bail under the Act pending the hearing of the appeal, but His Honour refused to grant bail. On the 30th July I communicated with New Zealand counsel.