

1888.

## NEW ZEALAND.

LEASE OF EDUCATIONAL RESERVES TO HON. R. CAMPBELL  
(PAPERS RELATIVE TO).*Laid on the Table by the Hon. G. Fisher, with Leave of the House.*

## No. 1.

The Rev. W. J. HABENS to the CHAIRMAN of SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS, Otago.

SIR,—

Department of Education, Wellington, 9th June, 1888.

I have been directed by the Minister of Education to bring under your notice a statement which has been made respecting your Board by Mr. Duncan, M.H.R., in a speech delivered by him in the House of Representatives.

The passages in his speech which deal with the matter I have marked in the margin of the enclosed copy. The statement made is of so serious a nature that the Minister thinks it necessary that you should be asked to place him in possession of the facts attending the leasing of the land referred to by Mr. Duncan, its surrender, and its subsequent lease to Mr. Campbell.

As the question of the administration of school reserves has engaged the attention of the Legislature, and much dissatisfaction has been expressed with it, the Minister hopes that you will see the advisableness of enabling him to inform the House fully of the circumstances. The Minister trusts that you will communicate with him at the earliest possible date.

I am further directed to say that complaints have reached the Minister from Oamaru that the Commissioners have in many cases put intending purchasers of leases of land situated near Oamaru to great disadvantage by only advertising intended sales in the Dunedin newspapers, and by holding such sales in Dunedin, instead of in Oamaru.

The Minister does not wish to interfere with your discretion, but, as the matter is one of great public importance, he thinks it right to communicate these expressions of dissatisfaction to you.

I have, &amp;c.,

The Chairman of School Commissioners, Otago.

WM. JAS. HABENS.

## Enclosure.

[Extract from *Hansard*, 31st May, 1888.]

*Mr. Duncan*: I would not have risen on this occasion had not the honourable member for Dunedin West been personal to me in his remarks when trying to bolster up a bad case. He found that one of those silly writers in a silly paper had put in a paragraph saying that the runs—Deepdale and Kurow—had been sold at a less price than they were formerly sold or leased at, and he pointed out to me as the author of that loss. I hope the representative of this silly paper will take a note of what I have to say about the matter; and before I have done I shall say something about the way these high-school and other reserves have been administered in the district I come from. I shall begin with these runs first. The settlers there agitated to get these runs put into smaller holdings; and after a long delay, and while every difficulty was thrown in the way by the department, they succeeded in getting the lease interfered with to the extent of some few sections. The outcome of this was there were eight sections of perpetual lease of an area of 3,518 acres 2 roods and 6 perches at a yearly rental of £343 2s. 4d.; then there were twenty-two sections on deferred payment, with an area of 3,460 acres 1 rood and 21 perches, at a yearly rental of £535 10s. 6d. Then, Sir, there were seven small grazing-runs sold at the yearly rental of £546 3s. 4d. Now, this was formerly held by a company—non-resident—I believe a Scotch company; but, still, there is one lot unlet of 7,000 acres, and I do not believe it will remain long in that state. Besides that there is one section left to be cut up into smaller areas for settlement—about ten or twelve sections still to be cut up. Now, Sir, what was the whole amount paid for this land originally? How much was it over this sum? These sums together amount to £1,424 16s. 6d., and the run originally was sold for something over £1,500. When the rest is let it will come up to the original price, with this difference: We have thirty-seven holdings located where one holding held the land before. Is that no improvement? And, supposing this land was let at a far less rental than before, see how much better it is to have settlers upon it. And as to the next run adjoining this to the west, what do we find? That the lessee is not able to hold out on account of the rabbit-pest. We go