

53. How does he hold them?—I do not think there is a single man holding two runs.

54. This man does?—No; his mother holds one and he holds one.

55. When you return to Dunedin you will find that his mother holds one and he holds two?—I do not think so.

56. He is in occupation of three?—It is not reported to me to be so.

57. You may not know it; I am telling you it is a fact?—I had a return of small grazing-runs prepared for the Minister of Lands, and if Logan has these runs they must certainly appear in the return.

58. You are not aware, of your own knowledge, with regard to these runs, that Logan holds two?—I am quite sure he does not hold two.

59. Is it not possible that he might hold two runs in this manner: that the first purchase made by Logan was pastoral deferred payment?—Yes.

60. That he afterwards applied for a run and bought it, and having bought that run he might have turned his first purchase into a small grazing-run?—That is the only possible circumstance under which he might acquire two small grazing-runs. When he had taken up the section on pastoral deferred payment, he had not at that time power to exchange it for a small grazing-run. Afterwards there was an amendment in the law giving him a right to exchange a deferred-payment section for a small grazing-run. I am not prepared to say that he had not the right to do that.

61. *The Chairman.*] The effect would be that his name would appear as holding two grazing-runs?—Yes; but if he holds them under these circumstances I am of opinion that he has a right to do it, because he acquired that right from a different direction altogether. It is a substantive right arising out of his having previously held a deferred-payment section. The Act allows him to exchange a deferred-payment section for a small grazing-run.

62. Is it not necessary to make some declaration before obtaining a small grazing-run?—No; there is no declaration at all required. In that case I say he has got a positive right, irrespective of any conditions whatever, to exchange.

63. Can you tell the Committee if there is any other case in Otago except at that particular place where the same thing might happen?—I am not aware that it ever has happened, but I have a sort of recollection of one of my officers drawing my attention to the fact of that one case—that one solitary case. I am not aware of any other. I do not know of my own knowledge that Logan is in that position.

64. Can you recollect which case that was?—I do not know. I do not remember at all. I have a faint recollection of a case. Those are the only circumstances under which it is possible for a man to acquire two small grazing-runs.

65. I have heard it stated in Otago that a large firm in Dunedin hired a number of people with small grazing-runs, which are stocked by the squatting firm, which derives all the profits from them?—I have never heard such a statement. I am not aware of anything of the kind existing.

66. Can you tell me, from memory, if the Greenfield cases, at Waitahuna West, have been purchased and paid for to the Crown?—I cannot tell you.

67. I suppose you could send us up evidence on that point from Dunedin?—Yes; of course. It would be very easily done.

68. *Mr. R. Thompson.*] You stated that a number of selectors' licenses had been forfeited: can you state, of your own knowledge, whether these licenses were forfeited owing to the selectors having dummies in hand, or through failing to pay their rents?—I have stated that those cases of forfeiture I have mentioned occurred from time to time for years past. All except those dummy cases I mentioned specially were for some breach of the conditions of the leases or licenses, such as not living on the land, not paying rent, or not making improvements.

69. Has ever anything occurred during the last three or four years to lead you to suspect that there was any regular system of dummyism ever attempted in your land office?—No.

70. Nothing of the sort? When the New Zealand and Australian Land Company purchased those few sections for cash, did they in any way infringe the provisions of the Land Act by doing so?—No; they purchased under the terms of the present Land Act.

71. *Hon. Mr. Ballance.*] How much land does the New Zealand and Australian Land Company hold in the neighbourhood of Kurov?—I cannot tell.

72. Can you give an approximate estimate of the extent?—I believe it is only a limited amount of land.

73. Freehold and leasehold?—I do not think they have any leasehold land now in that locality.

74. How much freehold land do they hold there?—I do not know. I think it is limited in extent.

75. What do you call limited in extent?—I am only speaking my impression, which is worth very little. I am not aware that they hold any more than the pre-emptive right they had.

76. How much would that be?—Probably, 640 acres.

77. Then, if they hold so little land there, what is their object in buying these small areas?—I do not know; I did not ask them.

78. Was it for *bona fide* occupation?—Well, I imagine so. Buying land for cash they are not required to use it in any particular way; they are not limited to any description of occupation when buying it for cash.

79. What was the size of the sections?—I think, from about 150 to 200 acres.

80. Why were they surveyed in such small areas?—Because it was considered that there was a want of areas of that size in that particular place. If they were surveyed in small areas it was supposed to be because they were suitable for occupation as such. They might have been 200 acres in extent.