

SUPPLEMENTARY ORDER PAPER.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, the 15th Day of September, 1891.

SELECTORS' LANDS REVALUATION AND CONTINUANCE ACT 1890 AMENDMENT BILL.

Reasons for disagreeing with the Amendments made by the Legislative Council.

1. Clause 2, line 13. Pastoral tenants are not mentioned in the title to the Bill, and this Bill was never meant to apply to them. It is intended to apply to selectors only. Pastoral tenants are generally better informed as to values, and have not applied for redress or revaluation; moreover, it would be most mischievous to adopt a provision of this sort, as under it the runs would be revalued without competition.

2. Clause 3, line 29. Same objection as No. 1.

3. Clause 4, lines 9 to 11. A number of petitions and letters have been received complaining of excessive values, and it is believed that in the hurry with which it was necessary to make the large number of revaluations under the original Act some have been incorrectly valued. Any objection to the policy of such valuation should have been made when the original Act was passed. The principle having been admitted, and revaluations granted, it would be wrong now, if injustice has been done in a few cases, to prevent the sufferers from obtaining the same justice as the large body of those who derived benefit from the original Act. The safeguard of a deposit will, it is anticipated, prevent other than real cases of wrong being brought forward.

4. Line 14. The same reason applies.

5. Line 15. "Or run" is not required, for reasons given in No. 1.

6. Line 20, subsection (1). It is believed that a statutory declaration and valuation by a reputable valuer would save both the selector and the Board from the trouble of investigating cases in which the selector probably does not know the real value of his land, and will prevent bogus claims for revaluation.

7. Clause 4, subsection (2). The deposit should be left to the discretion of the Board, because even £5 may cause some inconvenience to a needy selector, and this is the class which the Bill proposes to relieve. The undertaking to pay should also be retained. The Board has many opportunities of recovering, through Rangers, in case of default.

8. Line 34. It might be an injustice to charge the selector the whole cost of an inquiry into a matter in which he has been misled. It seems sufficient to charge him costs if he fails to make out a case for redress. No charge whatever was made under the previous Act; consequently it would be unfair now, in an amendment of the Act, to enforce a payment which has not been made in former cases, except as provided in clause for prevention of bogus claims for revaluation.

DENTISTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Reasons for disagreeing with the Amendments made by the Legislative Council.

1. The House of Representatives disagrees with the amended section 2 because it is of opinion that it is undesirable that special examinations should be provided; the ordinary examinations should meet all requirements.

2. Section 4. The present law requires all candidates to be examined at Dunedin, thereby incurring loss of time and considerable expense, and is calculated to exclude merit in many cases where not associated with wealth.

This would be avoided if Boards of Examiners were formed in the four centres—Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin.