

5 *Mr Buchanan.*] Have you the acreage value?—No, but, of course, it can be worked out. In 1897, the year I have mentioned, the value already stated was reduced, the unimproved value being unaltered, but the capital value being reduced from £4,555 to £4,355. In 1900 a loan valuation was made for the Public Trust Office, the unimproved value being entered at £4,144, and the capital value at £8,496. In 1901 a revised valuation of the property was made, the unimproved value being fixed at £4,144, and the capital value at £8,496, these figures being the same as in 1900. I am giving you the actual extracts from the valuation roll. In 1903 there was a special valuation made for the Lands Department, the unimproved value being £8,404, and the capital value £12,602.

6. Is that for land-settlement?—It was a special valuation for the Lands Department. I cannot say whether it was for the Lands Department or for the Land for Settlements Department. In 1904 the land had been subdivided, and was known as the Clandon Settlement. A valuation was entered on the roll as follows: "Unimproved value, £4,012, capital value, £8,281."

7. Was the area the same?—The area is practically the same as in 1903. It had been subdivided into allotments.

8. *Right Hon. Sir J G Ward.*] Is there not something wrong there?—No. The valuation of 1904 is an adjustment of the valuation made in 1901.

9 *Mr Massey*] Then, what was the value in 1903—the capital value?—The valuation in 1903 was entered on the supplementary roll, and was not, therefore, used for rating or taxation purposes.

10. *Mr Myers*] Then may we take it, Mr Flanagan, that the £12,602 was probably the valuation for the Lands Settlement Department?—Yes.

11. But then the following year it was valued for taxation purposes at £8,281?—Yes. I may say that when a special valuation is made it is put on the supplementary roll, and the ordinary roll valuation cannot be altered till the 31st March next following.

12. The figures could not be altered?—No, they could not be altered under the law.

13. But it was altered in 1904, was it not?—The 1904 valuation was the ordinary roll valuation. The valuation in 1903 was a special valuation. In 1909 a revised valuation took place, and it was entered on the ordinary valuation roll, the unimproved value being £7,246, and the capital value £12,670.

14. You have now brought it up on the roll to about the price which the Government paid for it?—I do not know the price paid, but it was brought up close to the value in 1903. I cannot tell you the price paid by the Government—there was a special valuation made for the Government—but the 1909 valuation brought the property up to practically the special valuation of 1903. [Copies of entries from valuation roll handed in—Exhibit CC.]

15. Now come to Alfred Bayly's property?—The area of Alfred Bayly's property was 2,011 acres. In 1897 the unimproved value was £5,000, and the capital value £10,374. In 1901 a revised valuation took place, the unimproved value being £5,773, and the capital value £12,292. In 1907, when the property had been subdivided and was known as Huinga Settlement, the unimproved value was £6,107, and the capital value £13,009.

16 *Mr Allen.*] Was that for the same area?—Yes, practically—1,853 acres on subdivision, and areas kept out for reserves and roads, &c. In 1909 a revised valuation took place, the unimproved value being £13,250, and the capital value £23,377. In 1897 there were 2,011 acres in the property, in 1901, 1,841 acres (a revised valuation), and when subdivided 1,853 acres.

17 *Right Hon. Sir J G Ward.*] In regard to the valuations of Frederick Bayly's property, was the acreage the same in 1900, 1901, 1903, 1904, and 1909?—The areas at these dates were as follows: In 1900, 944 acres; 1901, 944 acres; 1903, 881 acres; 1904, 880 acres; 1909, 880 acres.

18. *Mr Allen.*] Can you give the acreage of Alfred Bayly's property in 1909?—1,853 acres.

19 *Right Hon. Sir J G Ward.*] What is your experience, Mr Flanagan, in connection with the values of lands by the owners as against the values of lands when the Government purchases—do they vary?—Yes, my experience is—and I have had experience in Canterbury and elsewhere as Commissioner of Crown Lands—that the amounts asked by the owners are largely in excess of the Government valuations in every case.

20. What is your experience in connection with the valuation roll for taxing purposes—do the owners usually give the full valuation of their land for taxation purposes?—No, they do not. My experience is that when owners seek loans they want the values to go up, and when they have to pay taxes they want values to go down.

21. So that the owners' values either for advancing purposes by way of loans or for taxation purposes cannot be accepted as reliable?—No, they cannot.

22 *Mr Buchanan*] Do you recollect an offer of 10,000 acres, at £7 an acre, by a Wairarapa settler—

*Right Hon. Sir J G Ward* If you are going into that I will bring up a case where Mr Buchanan interviewed me with a number of people to purchase land at £8 over its value.

*The Chairman* I gave a ruling at the beginning, and the Committee desired this matter gone into. It has been opened, and I cannot see that I can prevent you putting the question.

23 *Mr Buchanan*] Do you happen to know of a case of 10,000 acres being offered to the Government at £7 an acre, the property being within quite a short distance of Masterton, and it was refused by the Government?—No, I have no knowledge of it.

24. Would you be surprised to know that that property has since been cut up and most of it sold at from £12 to £13 per acre?—My answer is that I have no such knowledge.