

this order the onus of showing it should have been made shall rest on the applicant; and I do further order that this order be transmitted, under the Electric Lines Act, 1884, and the regulations made thereunder, to the District Land Registrar at New Plymouth. Dated at Wellington, this 4th day of July, 1908.—W. B. EDWARDS, J.” I do not adopt the statements in your petition.

52. With regard to the matter being before Justice Edwards at New Plymouth, you say I am wrong?—I am borne out by the order itself.

53. Then there is no object in my putting this [the petition] before the Committee here?—All I say is that I must not, in answering your questions, be understood as adopting the statements made in your petition. I answered your question as to the effect of the judgment which prevented the action going on.

*Hon. the Chairman:* What is your next point, Mr. Jones?

54. *Mr. Jones.*] The case was brought out here on precisely the same papers as appeared before the English Chancery Judge?—That is not correct, because the matters made out here on affidavits could not have been before the English Courts. These are the documents [Court brief referred to] on which the motion was made here, and on which the judgment of the Court was given.

55. The two documents that were placed before Mr. Justice Parker were also held up in the Court here before the five Judges?—There were some documents, but I do not think the final order was produced then. My recollection of it is that one of the orders was produced, and I thought it unfair and protested, because it did not embody the statement made by Mr. Justice Parker.

56. You had Mr. Justice Parker’s decision in your hand?—I think not. Remember that was in July, 1908, and my impression is that it was only after that that the order dismissing the action, which was made on the 11th February, 1908, came into my hands. Of course, I may be wrong. It is ridiculous to suggest that I can retain all the details in my mind.

57. Mr. Hughes appeared for me at the time Mr. Justice Edwards made the order referring the matter to the Full Court?—There is no order referring the matter to the Full Court. There could not be any such order. It was a matter of arrangement with the other Judges in Wellington. The Court of Appeal was sitting at the time. I do not think it matters twopence.

58. It does to me?—I do not think it matters twopence to you.

59. Do you remember when the Committee of the Upper House, on the 7th October, 1908, brought up their report?—I remember appearing for you before a Committee of the Upper House.

60. That was before the hearing?—I do not remember what date it was. It was the first session after you came back. I then put the whole of the facts before the Committee as I then understood them, and as I now believe, in a perfectly accurate form.

61. When the Committee reported I requested you to come up and see the Attorney-General, did I not?—What about?

62. To set up the Commission of inquiry recommended by the Committee, and also to see if he would give effect to the recommendation of the Committee to hold the property from further dealings?—I dare say you did, if you say so.

63. Did Dr. Findlay refuse you the inquiry?—This is a point on which I gave evidence before last year’s Committee, and I said then that my recollection of the matter was not very clear, and a letter was produced—I am not quite sure whether it was this letter or not—but on the 29th October, 1908, a letter was sent to you. I stated that I had no doubt that the representation made was correct at the time I wrote the letter; but what Dr. Findlay said to me at the time it is ridiculous for me to represent, because I do not remember the interview. However, I say in the letter, “The Government, of course, cannot prevent dealing with the land, but we had an intimation from Dr. Findlay before the end of the session that no legislation would be introduced.” I have no doubt that that statement as made in the letter is quite accurate. [See exhibit.]

64. That was legislation for relief?—No doubt.

65. Now, Dr. Findlay is very clear that he never refused the inquiry to you. Who is telling the truth, you or he?—I have no doubt this letter is quite correct.

66. Then Dr. Findlay’s statement in the Council and before the Committee, where he frankly denies it, is not true?—I do not know what Dr. Findlay says, and I do not see why you should endeavour to draw me into a conflict with Dr. Findlay.

67. This Committee wants the truth about it?—The Committee will get all the information I can give within my power. Was my evidence printed last year?

*Hon. the Chairman:* Yes.

*Witness:* Why cannot that be put in as evidence now?

*Hon. the Chairman:* There may be points in your statement that require looking into. We might shorten the proceedings if I say this: With reference to Dr. Findlay’s statement made in Parliament, Mr. Jones, we have got that already, so you need not question Mr. Treadwell about anything of that kind.

*Mr. Jones:* Here is a question put to Mr. Treadwell by Dr. Findlay before the A to L Committee: “It has been set out right through that I refused to set up a Commission?”—(Answer) “In any interview I had with you on the matter it was merely an interview between you and myself. I recognize that Dr. Findlay could not set up a Commission. Of course, it would be an absurdity.”

*Witness:* That means, of course, that it would be an act of the Government.

68. *Mr. Jones.*] “26. It has been alleged by Mr. Jones that I acted in this matter in the interests of my firm and against his interests in order to promote my personal profit.” Did