

here, or in New Zealand, for any further time to delay the registration of the above-mentioned documents, the present extension to the 1st March, 1907, being final.'” These two documents were placed in the hands of Mr. Justice Parker in London, and it took His Lordship aback. He said, “Is that this case which has been before the Court so many years?” My counsel, Mr. Jellicoe, said, “Yes.” Mr. Justice Parker said, “Where is Mr. Jones?” and I stood up. Now, those two documents were placed in the hands of the Judge by counsel for the other side, who commented very strongly upon my having signed them. The Judge said, “That is a stronger reason why his action should proceed. He possibly has a good answer in going behind the two documents he signed, and that is a reason why I shall not stay the action as you ask me.”

3. What order was it that the Full Bench refused to let you litigate?—The 20th July, 1908. The President was Sir Robert Stout. That, of course, is used here by the Chief Justice of New Zealand in his report to condemn me. He was not sitting as Chief Justice when on the Royal Commission, but the Ethiopian could not change his skin sitting as a Royal Commissioner or as a Judge. I wish to put this in, and shall ask every member of the Committee to take the report of the Commission home and read it. This document of Sir Robert Stout brands me as a scoundrel, and I should not be allowed in the Parliament Buildings if a tithe of what he says is correct. I knew nothing of it until two months afterwards, when I saw it mentioned in an Auckland paper. When I saw that an inquiry had been held it was on the 12th May following the March in which this document was put in. I say this, firstly, Sir Robert Stout well knew that there is no power even in the King of England to do what he did. The King is prohibited by statute to inquire into the private business of any man without his consent. That inquiry was held under the pretext that it was an inquiry into Native lands unoccupied in New Zealand. Sir Robert Stout knew as well as I did that the property was not Native land, that it was under the Land Transfer Act, and that he had no power to inquire into that. In support of my contention, the opinion of Mr. Hosking, K.C., Mr. H. D. Bell, K.C., and Mr. Skerrett, K.C., has been taken on the validity of that document, and the Committee of 1911 held that the document was illegal and would not allow me to refer to it. Yet Sir James Carroll, the Acting Prime Minister, said in the House that the report having held my leases to be void, or voidable, mainly through malpractice on my part remember, the Government felt justified in issuing the Order in Council dated the 15th March, 1911, authorizing other people to come and buy the freehold from under my feet. My title was only leasehold, but that is the excuse for that document which has been kicked out of the House and held to be illegal. That is only one of many injustices I have received from the Government. Two gentlemen—Mr. Okey and Mr. Jennings—did me the honour to go with me to see Sir Joseph Ward. I said, “Look here, Sir Joseph: this Stout-Palmer report, firstly, is illegal; secondly, the alleged inquiry was held behind my back and I knew nothing of it; thirdly, the statements are untrue, and Sir Robert Stout, who was one of the five Judges in 1908 that ousted me from the decision given by Mr. Justice Parker, was not a proper person to again sit on a Royal Commission and deal with the case.”

*Mr. McCallum* protested against an attack being made on the Judiciary.

*Hon. the Chairman* said the Committee should distinguish between what was a personal attack on a Judge and a criticism of the public acts of a Judge. He was not prepared to hold that the public actions of a Judge were beyond attack or criticism. He had heard nothing in the nature of a personal attack on Sir Robert Stout.

*Witness*: I was prepared for that rebuke, and would be very glad to make every allowance for Sir Robert Stout if I thought he acted in ignorance; but if he wanted the truth he should have summoned me before the Commission. How could he arrive at any fair conclusion without examining the very man who could have told him everything that was true? I ask you, gentlemen, to place yourselves in my position. Why should I be branded as a villain by Sir Robert Stout? Does the honourable gentleman think I am so foolish as to imagine I am advancing my claim before fourteen members of this Committee by casting unnecessary aspersions? That document has been thrown up at me at times wherever I have been in the North Island. A Minister of the Crown, who was kindly disposed towards me—it was Mr. Herries, who was not then a Minister—said, “Mr. Jones, I do not know that I could afford you any assistance. Look at the Stout-Palmer report! I am not sure that you will even be allowed to go to Parliament in the face of that report.” I ask you, gentlemen, how can I come here without pointing out what that document is? I would gladly make allowance for Sir Robert Stout if I thought he acted in ignorance, but he did not. I never knew of the inquiry until two months afterwards, and yet he examined every witness set out in my petition who would gain by condemning me. Again, Sir Robert Stout knew as well as I did that in my Act of 1888 the last section provided that, subject to the certificate of the Trust Commissioner, these leases should be good value and effectual to all intents and purposes. Knowing that, how could Sir Robert Stout hold an inquiry into these lands? As Dr. Findlay put it, it was part and parcel of the Native land inquiry. It was nothing of the kind—they were not Native lands. No man respects the Judges more than I do, and I have not said what I have without grounds. The Stout-Ngata Commission, both by effluxion of time and completion of service, was disbanded. Mark that. This Stout-Palmer Commission was specially set up, and would not have been set up but for the Mokau case. In a letter to my solicitor—I will put it in—I say, “Wellington, 7th November, 1908.—Mr. Treadwell: Dear Sir,—Mokau lands petitions: You informed me yesterday that you had received a visit on the 5th from Mr. Dalziell, of the firm of Findlay and Dalziell, who informed you that in consequence of the Hon. J. Rigg, M.L.C., having written a letter during the present week to the Premier wherein he recited the report and resolution of the Legislative Council of 9th October last, dealing with my petition, and intimating that as the letter of the honourable gentleman did not disclose the ‘benefits’ supposed to accrue to me under a draft agreement mentioned, the Government had concluded to disregard the recommendation of the Legislative Council in so far as affording me any relief was