

64. Was there a motion proposed and seconded?—Yes.
65. Do you know who proposed it?—I have it in the minutes.
66. It was on your suggestion?—Yes; but I took a motion, seeing there was no prospect of unanimity.
67. Is it usual to adjourn these cases until there is unanimity?—Quite common.
68. Does it not sometimes happen that when there is no prospect the proceedings terminate?—Yes, it does, if there is no prospect of a vote in favour of alienation; but in this case we had a very strong faction in favour of sale.
69. There is no doubt the meeting was adjourned in order that they might come to a decision?—It was adjourned in order to enable the Natives to have an opportunity of further considering the matter, and in order to enable them to get into touch with a number who had not been able to attend the first meeting, it having been fixed at short notice.
70. It was adjourned in order that they should become unanimous?—No. It was adjourned so that a more representative meeting could be obtained, and so that they could think the matter over.
71. Was there any suggestion that the whole proceedings should be dropped?—No; in fact, if the Board had been anxious to force the matter through, I could then have carried resolutions covering over 30,000 acres.
72. Was there any talk at that time about the sale—whether it was to Mr. Lewis himself or to a company?—No.
73. I think Tuiti Macdonald said he understood it was to a company?—I understood the sale was to Mr. Lewis. I did not know there was a company concerned at all.
74. At the meeting of assembled owners on the 10th March was Mr. Dalziell present?—Yes.
75. Did he make any statement?—He addressed the Natives at some length, I think.
76. Was it the same question that was put?—No question was put at all. The resolution before the meeting was the same one.
77. There was no mention then about shares in the resolution?—No.
78. At the meeting of assembled owners of the 22nd March you were not present?—No.
79. Was a meeting of the Board held on the same day?—Yes, but in Auckland. The Board was not present at Te Kuiti.
80. You were present at the Board?—Yes, in Auckland.
81. What was the exact offer that was made at that meeting?—I was not present. The upshot was that a resolution was carried in favour of selling for £25,000, plus £2,500 worth of shares.
82. Was there any mention in the resolution about £2,500?—I am talking about the resolution carried at the meeting of assembled owners.
83. That was the first time that the question of the £2,500 cropped up?—The first intimation I had of the £2,500 was in Judge Holland's report to me of the proceedings.
84. Did it then become apparent to you that the sale was not to Mr. Lewis but to a company?—Not necessarily.
85. How were they to get £2,500 worth of shares if there was no company?—Well, Mr. Lewis might have been the owner of the shares for all I know.
86. So you knew nothing about the company?—No.
87. Was Mr. Dalziell present, do you know, at that meeting of assembled owners?—I could not say. Probably he was.
88. You do not know how long the meeting took?—No.
89. When was the meeting of the Board held to confirm the resolutions?—On the 23rd.
90. That was in Auckland?—Yes.
91. That was the same meeting that started on the 21st, I suppose?—The Board was then in session in Auckland.
92. When did you get Mr. Holland's report?—On the 23rd, I think. I had an intimation by wire from him that the resolution had been carried.
93. Have you got his report?—I have put it in. Yes, here it is. It was forwarded to me on the 22nd, under a covering letter.
94. You state that the resolution contained a statement about the shares?—Yes.
95. I see that that has been added: the rest of the resolution is typewritten, and that has been added in writing. Is this Mr. Holland's writing?—No. I do not know whose it is.
96. This report of Mr. Holland's mentions nothing about the shares?—This is the report here [indicated].
97. But this is a copy of the resolution, is it not?—The proper copies are signed. Those that you have there are spare copies—they are not signed.
98. You are satisfied that the £2,500 worth of shares were voted on by the Natives?—Oh, quite.
99. I ask because it does not appear at all on the spare copies, and has been put in in writing in the signed copy?—Yes.
100. You think that Judge Holland signed that after the writing was put in?—Oh, yes.
101. I notice that in the minutes of this meeting of assembled owners there is this: "Mr. Macdonald handed in a further proposal regarding the £2,500 worth of shares. Further discussion ensued, and Mr. Macdonald subsequently asked leave to withdraw his proposal, and, no one objecting, leave to withdraw was granted." Do you know what that proposal was?—No. I understand, though, that it was in regard to the allocation of the shares, possibly as between the different parties.
102. You held a meeting of the Board on the 23rd, and Mr. Dalziell appeared before you and asked you to confirm the resolution?—Yes.
103. In these meetings of assembled owners there is no application for confirmation, is there?—No; we confirm as a continuation of the proceedings.