

you not tell me on that night of the interview that he had given you terms on behalf of Herrman Lewis, and offered to go with you to see Mr. Dalziell and get them put into shape?—I think it is very improbable. I never discussed with Dr. Findlay any terms with Herrman Lewis.

69. And yet you say in that letter he showed you a document that he had submitted to Mr. Carroll, and Mr. Carroll agreed to it as being favourable to the Natives?—Show me the letter. [Letter dated 29th October, 1908, from Messrs. Stafford and Treadwell read—see exhibit.] The man I negotiated with was Mr. Dalziell. I certainly never negotiated with Dr. Findlay.

70. Will you swear that you did not come back to me on the 7th October and say that Dr. Findlay had given you the terms and scraps of paper with which to go to Mr. Dalziell and get it put into shape?—I am quite certain I never did anything of the kind. The negotiations for the settlement of the matter were with Mr. Dalziell entirely. I saw Dr. Findlay, who was representing the Government, but whether he knew the terms put before me by Mr. Dalziell I do not know.

71. A few days after this did you not tell me that you and Mr. Dalziell had knocked the thing into shape, and that you were to meet Dr. Findlay that night? You saw me driving about in a wagonette, and you next day asked me what I was doing?—Possibly. I do not impute dishonest motives to a man because he happens to be a partner of a gentleman who is conducting business with me.

72. And yet you came back and told me that Dr. Findlay said I should not get the inquiry?—That is quite probable. My letter shows that. It afterwards turned out that an inquiry was not justified by the Commissioners' Powers Act. That was at a later stage—about two years later.

73. Dr. Findlay says here in *Hansard*, 1910, page 600, "I could not, I have not, and I shall not in any way defeat or obstruct any petitions Mr. Jones has sent or may send to Parliament or the Government. I should not do so for a moment, and I have not done so." And yet he tells you that I shall not get an inquiry, according to your own letter?—Mr. Chairman, I have brought up a letter I received from Dr. Findlay because I thought Mr. Jones might open up on this attack: "Attorney-General's Office, Wellington, 21st August, 1910.—C. H. Treadwell, Esq., solicitor, Wellington.—Dear Sir,—*Re* Mr. Jones and the Mokau Estate: I have read and carefully considered the memorandum submitted by you in connection with this matter, which, as you know, fully sets out the history and present position of the litigation which has taken place. I regret to say, however, that the Government feel that it would be wholly contrary to precedent and constitutional rule, in such a case as this, to interfere with the rights of private parties as determined now by the Court of Appeal by legislation. It is necessary to point out to you that such interference would establish a most dangerous precedent, apart from other considerations which arise from a perusal of the memorandum you have submitted to me. The Government therefore cannot see its way to accede to the request contained in your application.—Yours faithfully, J. G. FINDLAY." [Exhibit QQQ.]

74. You know that when he wrote you this letter his firm were acting for Herrman Lewis?—The first indication I had that Mr. Dalziell was interested in the matter was about the time of the Legislative Council Committee taking evidence.

75. In 1908 Dr. Findlay delivered a speech, reported in *Hansard*, stating it was open to Jones to petition in the ordinary way and to have his case inquired into. You have just read a letter from him to you stating that it was impossible for him to get it done?—The letter speaks for itself. I do not think it is the least good putting Dr. Findlay's speech to me, because I am not going to criticize it.

*Mr. Jones:* Remember, the House recommended that the Government should set up a Commission and in the meantime protect the property from further dealings. You came back and said that Dr. Findlay told you that there should be no further inquiry, and here is your own letter telling me so.

*Hon. the Chairman:* You put your question.

76. *Mr. Jones:*] How do you reconcile your statement with Dr. Findlay's?—Why should I try?

77. You state here in your evidence before the A to L Committee that he never made any demands on you?—I have not seen the evidence.

78. He asks you in question 27, "In any dealing or interviews you had with me, did I ever make any demands through you upon Mr. Jones?" and you say, "Certainly not." How can you make such a statement when you made demands on me?—Your statement that I made demands on you is untrue: that is definite.

79. It is put to you on that Committee, "What money has been paid to you by Mr. Jones?" and you answer, "I have had no money at all." That is quite true, is it?—Quite true.

80. When I came back from England and you asked me about costs, did I not tell you to send your bill to Lewin and Co. and you would get your money?—No. I got a small amount for costs for work done for them some time ago.

81. Do you mean to say that Lewin and Co. did not send you the money back?—Certainly they did. What has that to do with you? Lewin and Co. paid me a bill of costs for work that I did for Messrs. Lewin and Co. in connection with Mr. Jones; but to say that you ever paid me sixpence in my life is quite another matter. All you did was to give me a note of hand, which I have still got, and am prepared to discount at a very liberal percentage.

82. When you were asked the question and replied, "I have had no money at all," why did you not tell the truth and say that "Jones's solicitors have paid me"?—Because they did not.

83. And yet you now say that they sent you out the money?—Kirkham Lewin's partner paid me money for costs in connection with anterior business long before you came back.