

84. You say you have an I.O.U. for £1,000 from me?—That was in 1908. It was written partly in ink, partly in pencil.

85. You admit getting the money from my solicitors in London?—I admit that Messrs. Lewin and Co. paid me a bill of costs amounting to some £80 for business I had done for them in connection with your affairs, and half of it was for out-of-pocket expenses.

86. *Mr. Bell.*] Mr. Treadwell, the position was this, I think: before Mr. Jones came out Messrs. Lewin and Co. were acting for him, and they instructed you to do some work for them as their agents, they acting for Jones?—Yes.

87. For that work which you did for them you have been paid by Lewin and Co.?—Yes.

88. That was a debt due to you by Lewin and Co. and not by Mr. Jones?—Yes.

89. And they paid you for that?—Yes.

90. You considered that you were not acting for Mr. Jones but for Messrs. Lewin and Co.?—Yes.

91. Since Mr. Jones has been your client you say you have not received any cash from him?—On the contrary, I have given Mr. Jones money which I have not got back.

92. *Mr. Jones.*] Why did you not tell the Committee that you had this money from England and had also got this I.O.U. from me for £1,000?—I never thought of it. Everybody knew that I was acting for you with a view to righting a wrong.

93. Then you admit there was a wrong?—I have always said so, and, notwithstanding your present attitude, I shall still maintain it.

94. And that it ought to be inquired into?—You are getting the inquiry now.

95. Why not about that time?—Do you think I should have taken the matter before the Supreme Court if I had not thought you had a claim?

96. Why did you not appear for me before the Committee of the Upper House in 1908 with the view of getting an inquiry?—I appeared to support your petition.

97. And why did you state before the Committee of 1910 that any inquiry was not worth a snap of the fingers?—Let me see the statement. [Evidence referred to.]

98. How could Parliament know what to do in this matter without an inquiry?—That is not a question on which I can give any evidence.

*Hon. the Chairman:* You are only wasting the time of the Committee, Mr. Jones, by asking these irrelevant questions.

*Mr. Jones:* The position is this, that while he was acting for me he was also acting for Dr. Findlay.

*Witness:* I do think I am entitled to some consideration. I have helped this man for a good many years and spent a good deal of money to right his grievance, and this is the return I get for that. He writes to a newspaper and says that because I was not on my oath before the Committee I was telling lies. Why should not a witness be protected here the same as he is in a Court of law? This course of examination would not be permitted there.

99. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You say there was nothing improper in Dr. Findlay's conduct?—Why should I come here to defend Dr. Findlay? He is quite capable of defending himself. [Exhibit RRR.]

100. *Mr. Bell.*] You said in the course of your evidence that the Full Court's decision stopped Mr. Jones going on with his case against Flower's executors: I do not think that is the position?—No, that is not the position.

101. Am I right in saying that the Full Court's decision was to prevent Mr. Jones having his caveat on pending the action—it has never prevented him bringing his action against Flower's executors for redemption? The only thing to do that is the refusal of the Chief Justice to allow the writ to be served out of the jurisdiction?—Yes. The effect of the judgment was this, that the dealings got on the register. His equity of redemption was gone so soon as the transfer of the Registrar of the Supreme Court was put on the register. His claim would then be a claim for damages, or to set aside the transfer on account of invalidity.

102. You said a reason why the Government objected to your way of settling the matter was that they did not want to have a claim for compensation on their hands?—Yes. Section 375 of the Native Land Act, 1909, says, "(1.) If any land so purchased by the Crown remains subject to any lease or license the Minister of Lands may, if in his opinion the land is required for immediate settlement, determine that lease or license by notice under his hand delivered to the lessee or licensee and to all persons having any legal estate or interest in the lease or license. (2.) The lessee or licensee and all other persons having any estate or interest in the lease or license so determined shall thereupon be entitled to compensation in accordance with the Public Works Act, 1908, in the same manner as if the land had been European land taken by the Crown for a public work, and all the provisions of the said Act shall with all necessary modifications and so far as applicable apply accordingly." My suggestion to the Minister was that the Government should purchase the Natives' interest, and having acquired the freehold they should then determine the outstanding leases under section 375.

103. Determine Lewis's leases?—Determine all the leases. Then there would be a fight as to who was entitled to the compensation-money. In that way the matter would work out. It was rather an ingenious method of getting a settlement.

104. *Mr. McCallum.*] You suggested that in the interest of Mr. Jones?—Yes. I never worked in any other interest.

105. *Mr. Jones.*] Do you remember that during the argument before the Judges here the Chief Justice put the question, "Can you prove fraud?" and you said, "We have our affidavit, but we will prove the fraud at the trial"?—That is quite likely. The proof for the fraud would be at the trial. All that would be put before them would be presumptive evidence of the fraud.