

289. For the value at the end of the lease?—Yes.

290. Did you ever hear of the sum of £20,000 being estimated for it?—No; I should think that was an exaggerated idea.

*Dr. Giles:* That is a sum that has been mentioned in the papers before us—in the Public Works Office.

Rev. ROBERT BURROWS sworn and examined.

291. *Dr. Giles.*] You are a clergyman residing in Auckland, Mr. Burrows?—Yes.

292. You are a member of the General Trust Board?—Yes.

293. And were so in the year 1885, at the time this transaction took place?—Yes.

294. Do you remember what occurred at any meetings of the Board in connection with the taking of this land at Point Resolution, and the compensation to be given for it?—I do not remember any particulars, but we had a general discussion on the question at two meetings, I fancy. The first occasion was on receipt of Mr. Kissling's letter informing the Board what the Government were about to do—to take the whole of that block.

295. Do you recollect any particulars of the discussion that took place on that occasion?—There was nothing very particular then, because it was only information from an outsider—at least, so far as the Board was concerned.

296. Was it known or supposed at that time that the Government did not require the whole of the land—that they did not intend to keep the whole of it after they had got it?—Not that I am aware of. I have no knowledge of it.

297. And at a subsequent meeting the letter of Mr. Brewer was discussed, was it not?—Yes.

298. Naming the sum of £632?—Yes.

299. Can you say what turn the discussion took then?—It was just discussed, and, as Mr. Kissling has already said, the question of the Government having in the first instance given the land was considered, and it was thought it would not be desirable, even if we had any disposition ourselves, to be hard with them; but more especially we were of the opinion that the sum offered by the Government was a very fair one.

300. Did you go into the calculation yourself?—I did to some extent. I took the figures to the Board and put them on the table, but Mr. Upton had come very much better prepared than I was on the subject, and mine, I presume, were put aside.

301. Then I suppose the contents of Mr. Brewer's letter were known to the members of the Board before the meeting took place? Some of them came prepared with an opinion on the point?—Yes.

302. And you do not remember that any particular objection was made or opposition raised to the accepting of the terms offered?—I am not aware of any. I think we were unanimous, so far as my knowledge goes.

303. Can you say whether you had any knowledge of what was going on, outside the letter that the Board had received from Kissling and Brewer?—None whatever.

304. Nothing of any negotiations?—Nothing.

305. Nothing about the return of a portion of the land as a freehold to Kissling?—No.

306. *Mr. Hesketh.*] Were you present when the offer of £632 was accepted?—Yes.

307. At the time it was accepted, did you believe that the Government wanted the whole of the land for defence purposes?—We had already the letter in hand to say they wanted the whole.

308. Did you, individually, believe that the Government wanted all the land for defence purposes?—I thought they wanted it for public purposes, and that we were powerless in the matter.

309. Did you believe another thing at the same time, and that was, if they did not want it for defence purposes they could do what they liked with it?—I did.

310. Can you tell us whether your fellow-trustees thought so at the time the sum was accepted?—I think so.

311. Have you any reason to think they were under a different impression?—The only individual I remember who made some remarks was Mr. Pierce, but I do not think it was in direct opposition to the acceptance.

312. Had you any idea that the Board could stop the Government from taking any more of the land than they actually required?—No.

313. Had you any idea of this sort: that, if they did take more than they wanted, they were bound to offer the surplus back to the Trustees?—No; I had not.

314. *Mr. Mahony.*] That sum of £632 satisfied you and your co-trustees as a payment for parting with the land once and for ever?—I believe so.

315. Supposing you had been told that this land was to be conveyed in fee-simple to A, B, or C, or to Kissling, would it have affected your calculation in regard to the £632?—I think not. For this reason: I thought the Government could do what they liked.

316. In other words, that they could convey it to Mrs. Kissling or to anybody else?—That did not come into my mind. Inasmuch as they gave us the information that they wanted the whole they had to take the whole.

317. You said the sum of £632 was a satisfactory one for the whole of your interest?—I think so.

318. Supposing you had been told that, in time, the balance of that land not used for defence purposes would be conveyed to Mrs. Kissling at a price agreed upon between her and the Government, would that have affected you in demanding more than £632?—No, I think not.

319. *Dr. Giles.*] If you had known that Kissling, before he wrote to the Board on the subject, had made an arrangement with Brewer for the conveyance of the balance of the freehold to Mrs. Kissling, would that have made any difference in your acceptance of the terms offered?—I think it is very probable it would, if I had known; but, still, what was uppermost in my mind was that the