

3a. *Mr. McMillan.*] Did the Board have any reason to believe that there were cases of dummyism before these recent cases?—The evidence given by Williamson, who was a shepherd on this run for a number of years, led the Board to think that some of the land taken up in the Silver Peak District had been taken up in the same manner as we suspect this has been. We had previously no official reason to believe there had been dummyism; but the evidence of Williamson led the Board to suspect that some of the land taken up on the pastoral deferred-payment system on runs held by this same company, which were sold about three years ago, had been taken up by men in their employ and really for their occupation. The Board then decided to hold an inquiry into that, but I see by the papers this morning that the persons who took up the land, and whom the Board were led to believe were shepherds and others employed by the company, have refused to attend and give evidence.

4. Then this action now is as to an evasion of the Act by these men?—It makes the suspicion of dummyism stronger.

4a. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Did the Board take action under "The Commissioners Powers Act, 1867"?—Yes; it is under that Act. The Board held an inquiry, and took evidence on oath, but the Magistrate held there was no such dispute as was contemplated by "The Land Act, 1877," and that therefore the Board had no power to act as it did.

5. *Mr. J. McKenzie.*] You say, I think, that, up to the time when the shepherd Williamson gave evidence, the Board had no official knowledge of dummyism existing; but, as members of the Board, were you not suspicious that such a thing did exist; I will not say you knew it, but had certain suspicions?—I could not say that, as members of the Board, we had any suspicions. As an individual, I myself had suspicions from remarks I had heard in the country.

5a. But you had nothing before you, as a Board, which would enable you to take action?—No; from remarks I had heard in the district I was on the constant watch. As the year came round applications came in from these parties in the Silver Peak and Waikouaiti Districts to be allowed to reside off their lands for three months, to enable them really to earn money to make their payments; so that all the actions, so far as I am aware, taken by these people were in conformity with the Act. I am not aware of any *laches*.

6. *The Chairman.*] You recollect the question as to whether certain lands near Waikouaiti should be sold in any other way than by the pastoral deferred-payment system?—Yes; I was present when the subject was discussed by the Board.

6a. Do you remember Mr. Stout objecting to the land being sold under that system on account of a late sale of the same kind not being satisfactory in that neighbourhood?—Yes; Mr. Stout has often said that he objects entirely to the pastoral deferred-payment system.

7. So that there was a suspicion in the minds of the Board that everything had not been quite straight previously?—I do not think that was the reason Mr. Stout assigned for his objection. I think, in the course of his remarks, he said he did not think that the disposal of the land under the pastoral deferred-payment system had been satisfactory or desirable, and that he did not think this land was suitable for that system.

7a. *Mr. J. McKenzie.*] Have you heard any complaints as to dummyism on Run 106?—Yes.

8. Do you recollect a petition before the Waste Lands Committee last session asking for inquiry into that matter?—Yes. The Land Board have had a report from the Ranger in reference to that, and the report does not bear out the statements made in the petition.

8a. *Mr. J. Buchanan.*] Is there any power of appeal given under the Act of 1877?—The solicitors for Johnston have applied to the Supreme Court for a mandamus to compel the Board to issue the licenses under the Land Act. It was the Resident Magistrate who decided that the Board had no power to exercise the powers given by "The Commissioners Powers Act, 1867." The case in the Supreme Court is not an appeal against that decision, but a motion for a mandamus.

9. Is there no right of appeal against that decision of the Magistrate?—As the solicitor to the Board (who is a Crown Solicitor) intimated that he would probably appeal, I assume there is. I believe the Magistrate was asked to state a case for appeal.

9a. Then, virtually, the case is *sub judice* at the present moment?—The question as to the authority is *sub judice*. As far as I know, the Board has not appealed against the decision of the Magistrate.

10. Do you know why?—No; because the decision has been given since I left Dunedin.

Mr. McKerrow: The Magistrate was asked by the Board to state a case for the Supreme Court.

10a. *Mr. J. McKenzie.*] As to the Ranger's report on Run 106, do you, as a member of the Board, believe that your Ranger's reports are always reliable?—So far as I know, they are; as to matters of fact I should say undoubtedly they are.

11. Would you think it advisable for the Board to give the people who signed the petition an opportunity to confirm their opinion?—I do not see how we can. The Ranger's report is that he finds the persons who purchased those sections living on them and improvements going on.

11a. *The Chairman.*] Is that case under the deferred-payment pastoral system?—No; under the agricultural deferred-payment system, and in the southern part of the province. This other case under the deferred-payment pastoral system is only about thirty miles from Dunedin.

Mr. J. McKenzie: I have a letter from a settler asking me to take up that other matter of Run 106.

MEMORANDUM by Mr. J. GREEN, M.H.R.

Mr. Chairman,
SINCE I gave evidence before you yesterday, Mr. McKenzie has shown me a report in the *Otago Daily Times* of the Land Board's inquiry on the 7th June last, and asked me if that report is correct as regards the evidence of Messrs. Williamson and Bradshaw. I desire to say it is not in