Although we knew the facts we did not put that before Lord Justice Parker, because it would come out in evidence, and he had not that fact before him when he gave this decision. Here is a thing I cannot understand: on the 1st June, 1911, referring to the decision of 1908, Sir Robert Stout said there was a right of appeal to the Privy Council, and yet they would not let me appeal to the Privy Council. Yet in 1908, when the Court refused to allow the appeal, Sir Robert Stout himself, who was President of the five Judges, said, "Can you give us an instance where an appeal has been allowed in a case which the Court has held to be frivolous?" He says in 1908, "You shall not have an appeal to the Privy Council." In 1911 what does he say? "There was an appeal—why did you not appeal?" and yet the Court would not allow my appeal. It is difficult to reconcile his two statements. One is made before a Court of five Judges, and the other is made when he was sitting as a Puisne Judge. I say that it was not even before Lord Justice Parker. We relied upon our evidence and our facts. My counsel, in addressing the Court on the 1st June last year, said, "I am sure the mortgagee was never considered. I have looked into the papers, and contend there can be no sale unless the mortgagee's conditions were fulfilled, as they were not in fact. They broke their mortgage." The Judge replies, "Even so, you can sue for that breach in England." Mr. Jellicoe said, "I have a right also to sue in New Zealand, and I ask for terms," which he did not get. There was no judgment given in England as to jurisdiction, but the advice given was better than the judgment, because it came from some of the best Judges in England. His Honour, in delivering reserved judgment, held that the Supreme Court had already decided that the property had passed to Herrman Lewis, and that there was no cause of action against the defendants in connection with the land. He said, "It was clear from the affidavits that Jones had undertaken not to delay registration of the documents, and it was also clear that money was due when the property was sold by the Registrar. The sale was made on the 10th August, 1907. There was a suit in England in 1907 about this same property, and it was dismissed for want of prosecution, but not on the ground that the Court had no jurisdiction to entertain it." That is in the decision of Sir Robert Stout of June last. The advice I got in England was that these people got the title in New Zealand, that the property was in New Zealand, and that I should have to come here to enter the action. I have always had great difficulty in getting this matter opened up. The members of the Upper Chamber in 1908—Parliament was just closing and they had scarcely any time—as shown by their report, urged the Government to set up a proper inquiry. They brought up their report on the 2nd of the month, I think, and the House separated on the 9th. In the following year the gentlemen in the Upper Chamber had not much to do, and I spoke to some of them. I then wrote this letter to the Prime Minister: "Zealandia Private Hotel, Clyde Quay, Wellington, 26th October, 1909.—The Right Hon. Sir Joseph Ward, K.C.M.G., P.C.—Sir,—Mokau lands: Referring to interview you granted me yesterday with Mr. Jennings and Mr. Okey, M.P.s, when you stated that you would direct full inquiry to be made into the above matter that was submitted to your notice, I take leave to suggest for your consideration the suitability of the case being completely investigated by the Public Petitions Committee of the Legislative Council that commenced the inquiry in 1908, and only relinquished the same in consequence of the Parliament being on the verge of dissolution. I submit that this course should be acceptable to the Government and all parties concerned, that Committee being independent of all interests, and the large costs invariably attending such inquiries would be saved.—I have, &c., JOSHUA JONES." On the 15th November, 1909, I received this letter from Sir Joseph Ward: "Joshua Jones, Esq., Zealandia Private Hotel, Clyde Quay, Wellington.—Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th October, in which you make the suggestion that your case might be completely investigated by the Public Petitions Committee of the Legislative Council. In reply I have to say that the representations you make relative to the matter are noted and will receive consideration.—Yours faithfully, J. G. WARD." [Exhibit OO.] He has been a long time considering. I have not got it yet. I do not want to say anything more, because I think he has been misled in the matter entirely. With the view of carrying out the object of depriving me of my leases the Government employed Mr. Skerrett to act on behalf of the Natives, and he recommended—based on the Stout-Palmer report—that the leases were either void or voidable. In a statement laid on the table of the House, G.–1, 1911, page 2, it says, "The Commission arrive at the conclusion that there were serious doubts as to the validity of the leases, and reported against the proposal that the lands should be disposed of in the manner suggested by the lessee." That is, that the Stout-Palmer report condemned the titles. Mr. Skerrett suggested that "the Native owners of these blocks were entitled to claim damages from the Assurance Fund of the Land Transfer Office, and that accordingly formal notice had, on the 19th April, 1910, been given to the Registrar-General of Lands on behalf of the Natives, claiming £80,000 damages." Now, gentlemen, that is Mr. Skerrett's opinion; but even lawyers fall out, and Mr. H. D. Bell gave an opinion that he did not believe that Mr. Skerrett could possibly have given such an opinion. Mr. Skerrett states that in evidence, but he goes on to criticize me a great deal. He says, "The existing leases reserved a very low rent, and are, generally speaking, disadvantageous to the Natives, apart from the circumstance that they keep the Natives out of possession of the land for some thirty years to come." Now, when these lands were leased to me these very Natives held it would be impossible to say how many hundreds of thousands of acres, but when I entered into the negotiations they owned millions of acres. The Native Land Restrictions Act of 1883 shows that very clearly. When I went there you would not have got any one else to go if you had paid them for it; but this is held out as an inducement to the Government to break the agreement with the Natives. The cry of low rent was to get the Natives to "pull the leg" of the Government.

17. I do not think that could have been the object?—It must have been. The Committee was set up to consider my petition, and these gentlemen were allowed to go there to ignore my