

not think it introduces any new principle as to investigation of title. It does away with rehearings—the present method of rehearing; more simple and cheaper way. I went through the Bill a good many times.

392. Did you think clause 71 a proper clause—sending perjured witness to gaol?—I think that if that clause were introduced it would stop nine-tenths of the perjury committed there. The Cabinet decided on that Bill.

393. What done in 1892?—It was introduced, but did not get to second reading. We had too many heavy Bills. I was laid up two weeks. I was away last part of the session. I do not think I have given specimens of my signature, “Cadman and Smith,” to the bank. I may have done so.

394. For what purpose was new account opened in March, 1891?—I do not know; it was some arrangement of Mr. Smith.

395. Will you mention any occasion when I mentioned my name and Wi Pere as members?—I should say, a dozen times. I should say, three times in my office. You were seven or eight times in my office. I cannot give you any date when you mentioned it. I should say you mentioned it many times—that you and Wi Pere should be on the Board, and another. I never intended to get the Board up. I never communicated with any one about it. It may have been talked of to other Ministers by me, but not outside. Native Minister has power to buy Native land; but he would usually consult with other Ministers. Mr. Carroll is not a member of the Cabinet. He is a member of the Executive. I did not recommend it. Mr. Smith takes great interest in anything affecting his district; his perseverance is well known. I sign anything to give effect to sales of the Umutaoroa land. Maoris have not been in favour of any measures introduced for Native-land matters. I do not think the Natives have shown their desires. I do not think the papers sent before the Committee can be treated as expression of opinion of all the Natives. I do not think it likely that any measures will be introduced to give effect to what they say they want.

396. Is there any substantial difference between our report and Mr. Mackay's?—Perhaps not; but Mr. Mackay expressed himself as opposed to your report and your mode of extracting evidence. I believe he attended every meeting of the Commission.

397. Mr. Crombie says you read part of Mr. Smith's letter?—Yes. I did not know anything about Mr. Kennedy. He came to get me to sign notice of appointment for the *Gazette*.

398. Do you believe, that if it had been known by your colleagues they would have permitted it?—I do not think they would have objected.

398A. Do you believe, if it had been known by the House of Representatives?—Some, no doubt, would have objected, but I do not think the House would generally.

399. *Re-examined by Sir R. Stout.*] I do not know what the Natives' title was. No two lots of Natives agree about the matter. I do not think Smith remained in Wellington after the House adjourned—30th January, House broke up. [Mr. Baker's letter about special settlements' valuation, 12th August, 1885.]

NOTE.—Several of the expressions in these notes are incomplete or obscure, but they have been printed exactly as laid upon the table of the House.

ISSUES FOR THE JURY.

1. Are the publications, or either of them, defamatory of the plaintiff?—Yes.
 2. If so, is the defamatory matter fair and *bona fide* comment on the acts and conduct of the plaintiff?—No.
 3. Is the defamatory matter so far as not *bona fide* comment true?—No.
 4. If the defamatory matter is neither *bona fide* comment nor true, what damages, if any, is the plaintiff entitled to recover?—£1 sterling.
- Verdict for £1 damages, without costs.

CADMAN V. REES.

EXHIBITS PRODUCED ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF.

Friday, 16th June.

A. Native Land Court Acts Amendment Bill, 1891.

Monday, 19th June.

(1.) Letter of 29th June, 1892. Smith, for Tamaki Timber Company, to Commissioner of Taxes.

Tuesday, 20th June.

B. Letter from defendant to Sainsbury and Logan, dated 11th April, 1893.

Wednesday, 21st June.

C. Letter from C. D. Kennedy to Commissioner of Taxes, dated 19th April, 1893, and certain telegrams attached.

D. Deed of partnership between Irvine, Cadman, and Smith, dated 7th February, 1885.

Thursday, 22nd June.

E. Memorandum for Cabinet by Mr. Cadman, 8th February, 1892.

F. Draft letter from Mr. Cadman to the Premier.

G. Letter from the Premier in reply, dated 13th April, 1892.

H. Letter from Mr. W. L. Rees to Mr. Cadman, dated 6th June, 1891.

I. Letter from Thomas Mackay to Mr. Cadman, dated 8th June, 1891.

J. Letter same to same, dated 9th June, 1891.

4—H. 14.