685. Then, you have no opinion as to whether land is likely to increase or diminish in value?—No.

686. Do you not think for a public institution land is a very much more valuable commodity for the purpose of carrying out a trust than money?—It may or may not be. It is impossible to say that. It depends what the land would produce.

687. You have no opinion on that point?—It is impossible to have, unless you say what land you mean.

688. I mean land in general—whether the permanent interests of a trust can be better benefited by a land-endowment than by a grant of money?—It all depends what the land is. If you get land at Epsom it would be very different from land, say, at Waimauku.

689. Why?—Because one is fertile and the other is sterile.

690. If a town were built on it?—That is a different thing.

691. Is not land in general a better thing to hold for the purposes of a trust than money?—It all depends upon circumstances.

692. What are the grounds of your strong determination as a Trustee against the selling of land under any circumstances?—Because I think when land is given by a person who has control of his actions it should be reserved for that purpose and no other, whether it is good or bad. I do not think it is a safe principle to interfere with trusts.

693. I mean, is not land a safer thing for the ultimate benefit of the trust: is not that the foundation of your opinion?—No; the foundation of my opinion is I respect the wishes of the founder: whether it is valuable or valueless, I care not.

694. It is not because you think land is more likely to be of greater ultimate benefit to the trust?—I say it is a matter of right and wrong. A man gives a piece of land for a particular purpose. Use it, or give it back to him or his heirs. Do not cheat him.

695. You have lived here for some years?—I have.

696. Land has very much increased in value since the early days of the colony?—In some cases it has.

697. Has it not in all cases?—I think not for a long time.

698. There have been fluctuations; but if we go back before the first fluctuation—which I think was 1863—from 1850, has there not been a steady increase in church properties?—Many years ago Bishop Selwyn, whose name we all mention with respect in connection with these land purchases, bought a quantity of land at Kohimarama, and he gave for it a higher price than it is worth now.

699. That is before the site of the city was fixed?—Not so far back as that.

700. You assume, then, that £6,000 was the value of the land in 1885, though, perhaps, somewhat high?—Yes; I think it was a very high price.

701. And you calculated that the present value of £6,000 was payable forty-eight years hence?—That is so.

702. But the £6,000 was not paid forty-eight years hence, but was actually payable and paid in 1885?—It was payable to the freeholder. I may be wrong, but I think what the Trustees had done was to part with their interest for a period of sixty years, and forty-eight years was to run from that date.

703. The value of the land, all the interests being merged, was £6,000?—Yes.

704. That meant, in fact, that the £6,000 was then payable?—To somebody, undoubtedly.

705. But you calculated that the £6,000 was only payable forty-eight years hence?—No, I did not; I calculated that it was only payable to the Trustees forty-eight years hence.

706. The value of the land forty-eight years hence may be £20,000?—It is not the future value, it is the present value.

707. But the money was payable, and was actually paid in 1885?—To some one.

708. Assuming that the Trustees had parted with their interest, and that Kissling had parted with his interest absolutely, and the Government had the land, the question now is, how is that money to be divided? Why, then, should you say our share is such a sum as will produce so much forty-eight years hence?—Because you are only entitled to the land. I say £6,000 represents the freehold. All that the landlord is entitled to who has leased his property for a long time is the annual rent. He is entitled to the freehold at the end of the lease.

709. At the end of the lease you would have had your £17 a year rent and the land too?—Yes.

710. So that the £6,000 you calculated was really what you estimated the land would fetch at the end of the lease?—I suppose you really know you have left out a very important element.

711. What is it?—That the Government took the land from us.

712. That is not a very important matter?—I think it is, to that calculation.

713. Supposing this transaction had never occurred the Trustees would have received their £17 a year for forty-eight years, and then they would have had their land, and, assuming they had the power to sell, they would then get what that land would fetch in the market?—Yes.

714. So that the interests of the trust would have been benefited to this extent: they would have received forty-eight years' rental of £17 a year, and then they would have the then marketable value of the land in money?—Yes; if they had sold it.

715. For the purpose of estimating your interest you calculated an amount which would realise £17 a year for forty-eight years, and you found that came to £266?—Yes.

716. Then you went on and you said £366 in addition will produce what we shall get for the land at the expiration of the lease?—No, I did not.

717. Do you not think you ought to have done that?—No, I do not.

718. On a pure arithmetical basis, have not the permanent interests of the trust suffered because you did not do that?—What do you mean by an arithmetical basis?