3. *Hon. the Chairman.*] There is no need to pursue that point further; we can all judge on the facts?—When the agreement was made between Sir Joseph Ward and Sir James Carroll and myself in the presence of Mr. Treadwell, in April, 1910, that they would purchase the property and then deal with me, Sir Joseph Ward went to Invercargill, saying that he had left word for Mr. Carroll to see him. At an interview that took place with Mr. Carroll afterwards he said, "You write a letter for me to give to Sir Joseph Ward, so that he can cable to London accepting the terms in connection with the harbour." I would like to put this in: After the decision of the Full Court here, in July, 1908, I waited on the Prime Minister with Mr. Jennings, and submitted the matter to him. He said, "You had better petition Parliament." A few days later, on the 26th August, 1908, in the House, Mr. Jennings asked the Premier "Whether in view of the facts—(*a*) That Mr. Justice Parker, in England, intimated that in his opinion the High Court of Justice in England had no jurisdiction to entertain a suit for the redemption of the Mokau leaseholds, the property of Mr. Joshua Jones; (*b*) that the Supreme Court of New Zealand has expressed a contrary opinion, refusing leave to appeal; and (*c*) that grave injustice is suffered by Mr. Jones in the connection—the Government will introduce legislation to give him relief? The Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward (Prime Minister) replied: The course suggested of legislation to settle a decision of the Courts of justice is one involving such grave issues that I regret no promise in the direction indicated can be made. The better course for Mr. Jones to follow would be to petition Parliament, so that his evidence may be taken and his case reported upon by the representatives of the people." [*Hansard*, 1908, p. 391—Exhibit VV.] I will put that in, because at the conversation we had with him Sir Joseph Ward said he would gladly act upon any recommendation. It might save a good deal of time if I ask the Committee to take Jones's evidence, pages 6 to 14, from the inquiry into the Mokau-Mohakatino Block, 1911, and his statements given in pages 139 to 147. With your permission I will put in this plan, which will answer two questions. [Plan in connection with the Native Lands Restriction Act of 1884—Exhibit WW.] The object is this: it will show that when I went into that country with my party there were no lands taken up at all, and it will show the boundaries of the block. The only piece of land purchased many years previously by the Government was on behalf of Judge Rogan, and the Government could not occupy it. It lies between Mokau and Kawhia. Here is the statute appertaining to the land. It necessitated a special Act of Parliament in 1884 to release my lands, which had been unintentionally included. There is another point it serves. In the Stout-Palmer report it is said that the Mokau Natives owning as a hapu had little or no lands left. When I went into that block they owned all this land near Morikupa to the Main Trunk line [place pointed out on map.] They have any amount of land left. The land was worth 3s. per acre when the Government bought, but the Natives have land there now worth £30 per acre. I desire to put in *Hansard*, 1908, page 279. The Hon. Mr. McCardle moved a motion kindred to what Mr. Jennings had asked the Prime Minister in the Lower House. A number of members spoke on the motion, and the Hon. Dr. Findlay replied as follows: "The Council was probably entitled to ask that the Government should as early as possible give some expression of its intention in regard to this matter. The course was open to Mr. Jones to petition in the ordinary way and have his case heard fully on that petition. He understood that some such step had been taken, but, if not, it was still open to Mr. Jones to have the rights or the wrongs of the matter fully investigated and ventilated, and some recommendation made regarding it by a Committee. On general principles, however, he thought that it was an exceedingly unwise precedent for Parliament to step in in the way suggested and interfere after the highest Court in the country had decided the legal rights of the parties. If they once began to take the side of a defeated litigant—and a defeated litigant had always some justice on his side, or thought so—to restore to him the property he had lost, after the fullest investigation by a Court, they would require a special Parliament to attend to nothing else; and, speaking for himself—because this matter had not been referred to the Government—he thought it would be an exceedingly dangerous thing indeed in such cases as the present one to start legislation to restore rights which the highest Court had decided had been lost, without fraud on any one's part, by Mr. Jones. While he should submit the matter to his colleagues, in deference to the motion—— An Hon. Member: It is not passed yet. The Hon. Dr. Findlay: Of course, only if it passed. At the same time, he wished honourable members to share with him the view that they should not encourage this kind of recourse to Parliament. Where rights had been defeated in some wholly unexpected or unfair way they had some precedent for such recourse. It would take the Hon. Mr. McCardle himself, or any one else, more than a whole afternoon to even outline the history of this matter; and, if it were outlined, it would then be seen that Mr. Jones's claim was not as clear and plain as the Hon. Mr. McCardle thought it would be. Personally, he was opposed to Parliament interfering in cases of this kind. The Courts were open to those who wished to defend their property: these had been invoked by Mr. Jones; he had been defeated, and he (Hon. the Attorney-General) said that it was unconstitutional to come to Parliament and ask it to interfere in such a case as this. For that reason he thought the motion should not be passed." There was a debate, and on the understanding that Jones could present a petition Mr. McCardle withdrew his motion. [Exhibit XX.] The point is that at the time Dr. Findlay made that speech his firm were acting as solicitors for the owners of the property. I might say that I did act as he suggested. I did petition the House, and the Committee recommended that an inquiry should be set up, and that in the meantime the Government should hold the property from any further dealings. As I will show you a little further on, immediately the Committee reported Dr. Findlay informed my solicitor that there should be no inquiry and that no effect should be given to the report of the Committee, notwithstanding that the Prime Minister had advised me to petition Parliament, and would be glad to act on any recommendation. In 1910 I petitioned the Lower House. Immediately