

108. The Land Board allowed them to increase the holding by adding another section?—Yes.
109. Did you recommend that?—Yes.
110. Do you know that in those letters that have been written to the Press those cases have been quoted of aggregation where two sections were given to one man?—I think that was a proper thing to do.
111. And the statement being made about the land being mopped up and aggregated was only a case of necessity?—Yes.
112. Did you know the whole of the Martin Small-farm Settlements—the three of them?—Yes.
113. Were they cut up into 200-acre sections?—Yes.
114. No one was allowed to aggregate at first?—No.
115. And since?—A good many of those sections were forfeited and given out under the optional system, and then they were allowed to take up to 640 acres. They were only held in 320-acre sections previously.
116. Do you know of any cases in that district where one section was allowed to be divided between two adjoining sections?—Yes.
117. Was that because the land was found to be insufficiently large to keep a family on?—Yes, at the time.
118. Your experience of that district is that the original areas have been found to be too small?—Yes.
119. And that the Land Boards, by the recommendation of the Crown Lands Rangers, allowed the holders to increase the areas?—Yes.
120. *Hon. Mr. Buddo.*] You said the value of the land in those sections was, roughly, £10?—Yes.
121. What would you say the carrying-capacity of that land was?—About two and a half to three sheep per acre.
122. Take the first section of 370 acres in the name of the Wilson family: that would carry from nine hundred to twelve hundred sheep?—Yes.
123. Would you consider there would be a living to be made off nine hundred sheep in that district?—A man would not get very fat on it, but he would pull through, I think.
124. At any rate, the 1,605 acres owned by A. and J. Wilson would be?—There is not a great deal of difference in the country.
125. It is quite evident that at that rate the holder would keep from three thousand to four thousand sheep, but by the aggregation of sections on the basis of a thousand sheep it would be possible to make a reasonable living with the equivalent of four holdings?—The configuration of that country is such that you could not make them into four different holdings, on account of giving each one access.
126. Then, by the aggregation of additional sections, you hold that they could have been held in single sections and still a living obtained?—I think so.
127. In regard to village-settlement areas, you said you recommended that some of them should be amalgamated. Would they not have been of advantage to the workers in the districts making homes on them and farming the balance?—That was the intention of the settlement at first. After a few years the work run out, and the settlers had to fall back on the land to make a living. The areas were then found too small to make a living off, and the Board sanctioned the aggregation up to a reasonable living-area.
128. And is the population less there than what it was originally?—Yes; not very much less, but still it is less.
129. And you are of opinion that one of those sections would not have provided a reasonable living for a settler?—Yes.
130. *Mr. Nosworthy.*] When you say that the land is valued at £10 an acre and would carry three sheep to the acre, are you reckoning wet or dry sheep?—Dry sheep.
131. In regard to the A. and J. Wilson's sections of 1,600 acres, do you not think that, taking one year in and one year out, if it carries one sheep to the acre they are doing very well?—It is good country there.
132. *Mr. Witty.*] I notice there is a person named Amy Wilson who has got 200 acres: does she live on the section?—I could not say. I have not been in touch with the settlers.
133. Is she a married woman?—I could not say.
134. I heard a short time ago that she is a married woman and that her husband lives on a Native reserve. Can you give me the area of the Native reserve her husband is living on?—About 1,153 acres.
135. You do not know whether there has ever been a homestead on those 200 acres?—Yes, I think there was one.
136. Are the wife and husband living on the land or not?—I do not know.
137. If the land was divided now would any of the sections marked be deemed first-class land?—Some of it possibly at the present time would be classed as first-class land, but at that time it was all second-class.
138. I think you said that the areas as cut up originally were large enough for a person to get a living off?—Yes, that is so.
139. Take the six sections marked yellow: could that land be divided into six sections and keep six families?—I do not think so—not that particular portion. The back portion is very rough.
140. Would it take four?—I doubt it. It might take two.
141. But originally it would carry one to each section?—Yes, I think so.