

1911, that the Premier had returned from Rotorua to Wellington, I came down from Mokau, but had much difficulty in seeing the Premier. When I did see him I placed a letter in his hand informing him, amongst other things, that I would prefer he would not make appointments for me to come to Wellington and then not to see me. I requested him, as per previous arrangement, to purchase the land from the Natives and then deal with me. He said he could not do so, as Mr. Salmond had so advised him. I requested him to set up the inquiry recommended in 1908. He replied that Mr. Salmond had advised him there was no power to do so, and that Dr. Findlay agreed with the Solicitor-General. I informed the Prime Minister of my belief that he was wrongly advised. I requested him to get the opinion of some counsel outside the Government. He replied that he would not do so. Sir Joseph Ward did not mention to me that he had consented to the Order in Council being issued.

48. That your petitioner considers it necessary to say that Sir J. Ward gives the blank denial in the House of Representatives to my statement that he had informed me he would arrange the business for me or consider my rights to the leases upon his return from Rotorua if I would come down and see him. (*Hansard*, 1911, pp. 1232–33.) But I maintain what I then stated to Mr. Wright, M.P., as stated in *Hansard*, and will leave it to others to judge between us. I may say that I should have come specially to Wellington for the purpose had he not so advised me.

49. That with respect to the large sums of money spoken of as liabilities on this property your petitioner would state that he has received only a comparatively small sum personally, and that the amounts have mainly been created by exorbitant charges and illegal claims put up by the solicitor, Flower, his accomplice Travers, and those associated in the transaction. That a more recent instance is the Flower-Travers combination effecting a mortgage through the dummy purchaser, Herrman Lewis, to one Thomas George Macarthy, for the sum of £25,271 8s. 2d., the said Macarthy never having loaned a shilling on or in connection with the property, nor having any unsatisfied claim on any person in connection therewith. Another item of the liability is the sum of £1,000 said to be advanced by the ex-Attorney-General's firm of Findlay and Dalziel in order to pay themselves to carry on the law proceedings on behalf of Herrman Lewis. Mr. Dalziel states in the papers, or in evidence, that it is the etiquette of the profession in this country to advance money for such purposes.

50. That certain questions and comments put forward by Mr. Justice Parker in dealing with the case in London, as to Flower's connection with the property and its value, and the passing of the estate at merely the amount of the mortgage, under such circumstances were fully justified by the subsequent fact that some £40,000 over and above the claim and cost of freehold has been netted already in merely changing hands without any development or even examination of the property. That the New Zealand law was dwelt upon by the other side before Justice Parker, who replied that he knew the New Zealand law, and that it was never intended to destroy equity, or prevent trial of action, as was pressed for by the other side.

51. That, with further reference to the Stout-Palmer Commission, your petitioner would ask attention to the fact that Mr. Jennings, formerly M.P., who for some sessions had most unfairly attacked my claim in the House, and the only honourable member who did so, completely in effect admitted and repented of his error in the House on the 27th October, 1911, when he stated, "Again, there was Mr. Joshua Jones to be satisfied; and let me say here in connection with that gentleman and to my judgment he has been to some extent placed in a most awkward position, that he had a most exaggerated idea of the value of the land. He said he could get £150,000 for it, but I do think, in the face of what has been stated by Mr. Dalziel, that he had obtained the opinion of three King's Counsel in the Dominion, Mr. Bell, Mr. Hosking, and Mr. Skerrett, to the effect that if the judgment given by Chief Justice Stout and Mr. Judge Palmer had been submitted to legal scrutiny he (Mr. Jones) would not have lost some of his property. Mr. Jones is entitled to some consideration."

52. That with respect to another portion of the block, comprising some 2,000 acres, not included in the litigation, but secured to my negotiation by special statutes, your petitioner would say that these statutes became repealed in May, 1907, while I was in England. That upon my return Mr. Jennings, M.P., and myself brought the fact before Sir J. Ward, who said there had evidently been a mistake made in repealing private statutes before their purpose had been fulfilled, and he would remedy the matter that session, 1908, by a short Act or special provision in some general Act, but he did not do so. In 1909 I spoke to him about it. He replied that he regretted the oversight, but would certainly remedy it that session. He, however, did nothing in the matter. I wrote to the Native Minister and to the President of the Maori Land Board asking to be informed of any intended dealings with this piece of land, but no attention was paid to my representations. In February, 1912, I spoke to Sir James Carroll on the matter. He said he would look into the case, and that was all the satisfaction I received. I have heard that the land has in part or in whole been bought in fee-simple.

53. That Dr. Findlay, apparently in view of justifying his actions in connection with the Mokau lands in the interest of his firm of Findlay and Dalziel and the client Herrman Lewis, made statements in the Legislative Council on the 21st August, 1908, and the 17th August, 1910, and before the A to L Committee of the House in 1910, that were prejudicial, misleading, and untrue, and did further produce the solicitor Treadwell, who had acted for me in the case before the A to L Committee, 1910, to state what both he and Treadwell knew to be misleading and prejudicial to the inquiry. That particularly the statement of Dr. Findlay in the Legislative Council on the 17th August, 1910, that he supported a motion in the Cabinet for inquiry into the Mokau case, should be strictly investigated—my allegation being that the statement is only half the truth, and the facts concealed.

That your petitioner doth humbly pray that your honourable House may be pleased to direct inquiry into the subject-matter of his petition, and grant such relief that in its wisdom may seem meet. And your humble petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Wellington, 20th September, 1912.

JOSHUA JONES.