

5. The second interview?—Yes, I stated that in my evidence just now; and the Mayor's letter dated the 5th September was the result of the Mayor's interview with me with reference to the issue of the certificate of title. I told the Mayor that he must write to the Minister. That is the time I told the Minister that the land belonged to Mr. Macdonald.

6. I think I understood you to state that the land to be exchanged was 4 perches, not '4. When did you first discover it was '4, and not 4?—Not until after the Hon. Mr. McNab drew my attention to the tracing, and said that the question had been raised, and asked me to have a look at the tracing. He spoke to me through the telephone.

7. Do you remember what date that was?—Yes, I think I can tell you from this. It was somewhere about the 7th of 8th June of this year that the Minister called my attention to the fact. Then I took out the linkages, and found that they only gave '4 of a perch instead of 4 perches. That was the first time that I recognised it. As I said in my evidence before, the tracing accompanied Mr. Macdonald's letter, and, knowing the conversation, I did not go into it at all particularly at first.

8. Had you noticed the point before the 4, and known that it was only '4 that was to be exchanged for those 6 perches, would it have made any difference in the transaction?—It would have made no difference in the transaction then, as the matter had already been settled.

9. To you or the Department?—It would have made this difference only: that I would have called the Minister's attention to what I understood was to be the area, and the area shown on the tracing. As far as the transaction itself was concerned, it was purely a matter for the City Council, and it did not matter to me what the area was; only if I had noticed the difference between the area mentioned in the conversation and that shown I should have called the Minister's attention to it. That is probably what I should have done.

10. Would it have made any difference to your carrying the transaction on?—It would have made no difference possibly in the transaction, because we got full value for our land.

11. It was quite immaterial to you what the value of the land to be exchanged was?—Oh, certainly. As I said in my evidence, this area was mentioned, and that was the reason why I never called the Minister's attention to the difference.

12. You had no idea in your mind about the relative values of the approach in Woodward Street or the approach about to be disposed of by the Department?—I never thought of that. I never took it into consideration at all. The whole question in my mind was that a public body wished to widen a street. It is our rule to help them, and if they wish an area by valuation, and not by auction, it was right and proper to recommend the granting of it.

13. And did you recommend the disposal at £652 because the Valuer-General has so assessed it?—Yes, because he had so assessed it.

14. I understand that the title has been given direct to Mr. Macdonald, has it not?—Yes, I explained the reason for that—by particular request from the Council.

15. There is no tracing here showing the road as it is completed just now. Here is the tracing submitted by the Mayor, quite different to the one we have here?—The original tracing accompanied the letter.

16. You had nothing to do with what was transferred?—Nothing. It is a City Council matter.

17. *Mr. Lang.*] Who prepared the plans submitted to you?—You mean the tracing referred to? The tracing that accompanied Messrs. Macdonald, Wilson, and Co.'s letter was furnished with their letter.

18. *Mr. Remington.*] When you say that the interview took place between you, the Mayor, and the Hon. Mr. Kennedy Macdonald, was the matter introduced as one on behalf of the Wellington City Council?—Yes.

19. Entirely?—Entirely.

20. No suggestion was made to you that any private individual was to derive any benefit about it?—No such suggestion was made to me, but the Mayor said that it would materially assist the Council if they could obtain this land to exchange with the owner of an adjoining section. I did not know who the owner was, but that was what they wanted it for.

21. Was any tracing or plan submitted to you to show what the City Council had it in their mind to do?—No.

22. When this letter of Macdonald, Wilson, and Co. came to you, setting forth "that it is necessary that the Council should absorb some four or five perches of the present section at the corner of Woodward Street," you were quite prepared to understand that that was the definite arrangement entered into between the City Council and the Government?—Exactly.

23. And you recommended it to the Minister?—On that I recommended it.

24. Had it been stated that only '4 perches was to be conveyed, and that the other was to be conveyed without competition, would you have recommended it?—I do not think that I should if I had known at the time what has since transpired.

25. Had you the file of papers before you in which there was the Mayor's letter of the 5th September, in which he says, "The Wellington City Council, being anxious to obtain a little land from Mr. T. K. Macdonald for the purpose of improving Woodward Street, asked him to make an arrangement with the Council?"—Yes.

26. He does not say "four or five perches": he says "a little land"?—You see, at that time the arrangement was already being carried out, and it had been before Cabinet and had been decided upon. You must remember that.

27. Reviewing all the circumstances as they are in the full file of papers, if you had had the information at the first interview with the Mayor and Mr. Kennedy Macdonald that he was the