

88. Was that the first time you discovered the point?—I think that morning was the first time I discovered it.

89. I suppose, when the plan was received with Mr. Macdonald's letter it passed through your hands?—Yes.

90. And you did not notice then that there was a difference in the figures in the letter?—I was not going to deal with it then, and therefore did not look at it carefully.

91. You just passed it through your hands?—Yes.

92. I understand that when the Mayor saw the plan he said something to the effect, "The brute! He must have seen the plan"?—No; not that. He said, "He had seen the plan, and yet he said it was 4 perches."

93. Did he refer to Mr. Macdonald?—I do not think so.

94. Was he not referring to Mr. Macdonald?—No.

95. Whom do you think he was referring to?—I think he was referring to yourself.

96. *Mr. Symes.*] Is it the practice of the Under-Secretary to detail to yourself incidents that have taken place during the day?—Yes, very often.

97. That is not an exceptional case?—Not by any means. In almost every instance where there has been action taken on matters he has informed me.

98. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] That is done, is it not, because at any moment you may be called upon to act for Mr. Kensington and communicate with the Minister?—Yes, that is so.

99. *Hon. Mr. Hislop.*] And could that not be ascertained from the written statements in the office? Whenever there is anything done on the papers is not that recorded?—Yes.

100. Then, what is the necessity for the other course?—The necessity is in case—well, I am not so sure I know the necessity, except that I may be informed of all the proceedings.

101. Is it not the proper thing in a Government office to record everything material on the papers in writing?—Yes.

102. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] If the next day Mr. Kensington had to go to another part of the country and I had sent for the papers, would you have been able to explain to me the origin of the transaction if Mr. Kensington had not told you about the interview?—No, not in that case.

103. *Hon. Mr. Hislop.*] There is a memo.—is there not—to Mr. Strauchon?—Yes, but that does not explain why it was written.

WILLIAM C. KENSINGTON re-examined. (No. 18.)

1. *Hon. Mr. Hislop.*] You stated in your evidence a matter with regard to something in September: you heard the City Solicitor and Town Clerk give their evidence yesterday?—Yes.

2. You heard the Town Clerk state the reason why I addressed the Minister with regard to this so-called exchange?—I heard him say something, but did not pay much attention to that evidence.

3. The Town Clerk stated that the reason why I wrote to the Minister was that in getting the City Solicitor's advice the matter had got before the Council, and the proposed agreement was ratified by the Council. The Solicitor had it in hand, and he advised certain things. The Town Clerk wrote the letter of the 5th September in pursuance of carrying out the general instructions of the Council. I saw the letter on the 5th September and I told him it was not sufficiently explicit and I would write a letter to the Minister myself. You heard the Town Clerk give that evidence?—That I do not doubt, but I do not remember paying particular attention to it. You wrote the letter.

4. You heard the evidence?—I did not notice it.

5. Are you prepared to contradict the Town Clerk as to the reason why that letter was written?—I do not contradict him.

6. If the Town Clerk's idea of the writing of that letter was evolved after 5 o'clock in the evening?—Yes, but I do not know what that has to do with it. You came and saw me, and I advised you to write to the Minister, and you did write. My evidence is perfectly clear on the point. I do not go back on one single jot of what I stated to the Committee.

7. You do not appreciate the sequence of events stated, not by me, but in the various documents the City Solicitor had and the Town Clerk's letter?—No, I do not appreciate it.

8. You say I first saw you in August in Crawford's matter?—I said you first saw me on the 29th April.

9. But *re* Mr. Crawford's matter?—I believe it was the 2nd August.

10. I again was with you in October?—You saw me on or about the 4th September *re* a certificate of title for the Crown section on Wellington Terrace.

11. Did you tell Mr. O'Neill or anybody else that I had seen you on the 4th September and that I was to write to the Minister?—I believe I did, but I am not certain on the point.

12. Why did you not ask Mr. O'Neill that this morning?—The matter had not turned up.

13. I gave you evidence that that letter was written on the 5th September, contrary to your statement?—It is not contrary to my statement.

14. I said I had not seen you, and the reason I gave, and that was corroborated by the Town Clerk without my having had any communication with him at all?—You wrote the letter to the Minister on my advice. You came to me to ask whether a certificate of title could not be issued direct to Mr. Macdonald in the place of the City Council, as you said it would be a red-tape matter, and I said, "I do not see why not," and advised you to write to the Minister. You admitted in your evidence that you came to me about that letter.

15. On the contrary, I denied ever having spoken to you on the subject. If you see a copy of the evidence, you will see that I denied having spoken to you on the subject, Mr. Kensington, at any time. Is that your memory?—That is my idea.