I.-12.130

We say this, sir, that if renewals are to be granted the rents should be determined on the improved value of the lands, at any rate from the termination of the original leases. We are quite prepared to go on with the old rents, even in the solitary cases where the rent has been increased, until the expiry of the old confirmed leases; but we say after that time the new rents should be determined on the improved value of the land, because the improvements belong to the Natives. In saying that the improvements are the property of the Natives, I am assuming that the Act of 1887 was not passed, and I say that Act took away the improvements which belonged to the Natives. Now, sir, I would like also to draw the Committee's attention to some figures I have been at some little trouble to compile, for the purpose of showing what the Natives lose by these improvements being taken away from them. I have been through Mr. Livingston's bag and note-books, and I have taken out, in every case, the details showing how he arrived at his award. I have taken out in each case the total amount at which he values the land with improvements and the total amount at which he assessed the improvements. I have taken out forty-four cases, and I find the total amount of improvements in those cases is valued by Mr. Livingston at £19,821 4s. 9d., while the total value of the land with the improvements amounts to £86,770 16s. 3d. In some cases the value of the improvements amounted to more than half the total value of the land; so that the rent based on improved value would be double that based on unimproved value. In the case of George Gower, lease No. 41—that lease we have heard so much about—the total value of the land is £2,028 15s. and the value of the improvements £1,022 14s., which would be more than half; and in the case of T. H. Nicholson, lease No. 39, the total value is £2,433 1s. and the value of the improvements—

Mr. Bell (interrupting): It is not fair. Mr. Levi must put in the whole of his list; he cannot get merely selections from Mr. Livingston's books in the shorthand writer's notes.

 $Mr. \ Levi$: I am quite willing to put in the list. $Mr. \ Bell$: The whole must go in. Mr. Levi cannot be permitted to use his selections. If there was a return before the Committee Mr. Levi could comment upon it; but he cannot take certain things out of the books and get them on the shorthand writer's notes as particular instances; the whole must be put in.

Mr. Levi: The whole thing is before the Committee. Mr. Livingston's bag is there. I am

quite willing to put it in.

Agreed that complete list be put in, and Committee adjourned till following day.

Thursday, 7th August, 1890.

Mr. Levi's Address to the Committee continued.

When I finished yesterday I referred to a return made out from Mr. Livingston's note-books, showing the amounts that the Natives had lost in being deprived of the value of the improvements. I would now ask the Chairman to give direction that it may be printed. I will put it in.

Hon. the Chairman: That does not apply to all the awards, but only to those with which Mr.

Livingston was connected.

Mr. Levi: Mr. Livingston acted as arbitrator or umpire in every case but one, and gave a decision either as arbitrator or umpire. However, the return will be put in, showing, in connection with this matter of the arbitration, how much the Natives lost in the forty-four cases decided by Mr. Livingston, when the value of the improvements was taken away.

Number of Lease and Lessee.	Total Valuation of Land Improvements.	Valuation of Improve- ments.	Number of Lease and Lessee.	Total Valuation of Land Improvements.	Valuation of Improve- ments.
2. F. Riddiford 3. W. and G. Wilson 4. J. R. Lysaght 5. A. S. Hobbs 7. G. Johnstone 8. G. V. Pearce 10. J. S. Caverhill 11. J. S. Caverhill 12. G. S. Newland 13. B. C. Lysaght 14. J. R. Lysaght 15. J. R. Lysaght 16. W. Symes 17. W. and A. Symes 18. Wilson and Frere 19. Wilson and Frere 20. Wilson and Frere 21. W. McBroom 22. D. Buchanan 23. D. Buchanan 24. F. Riddiford	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	# s. d. 405 2 6 993 5 0 668 15 0 477 18 0 97 5 0 119 19 0 334 12 0 750 0 0 231 8 6 256 19 0 2,336 0 0 281 6 6 601 18 6 452 19 0 127 12 0 130 8 0 897 13 6 40 18 0 457 0 0 371 15 0 687 14 0	30. F. V. Lysaght 31. F. V. Lysaght 32. R. Law 38. J. Verry 39. T. H. Nicholson 40. John Ross 41. George Gower 42. George Gower 43. W. and S. Gower 44. W. and S. Gower 45. George Hutchison 46. H. Turner 47. W. Wilson 48. F. Riddiford 49. D. Buchanan 50. J. H. Siggs 51. W. Douglas 52. J. Copeland 53. F. V. Lysaght 54. F. Riddiford 55. J. S. Caverhill	# s. d. 1,242 7 6 4,178 15 0 1,609 0 0 0 1,878 5 0 2,433 1 0 6,191 15 0 2,028 15 0 1,095 10 0 6,07 0 0 1,047 0 0 4,133 18 9 1,812 5 0 460 0 0 464 10 0 1,374 15 0 1,249 15 0 236 0 0 269 0 0 0 125 19 0 2,665 0 0	# s. d. 197 0 0 660 0 0 328 12 0 823 9 0 1,116 14 0 1,142 19 6 1,022 14 0 481 17 0 87 15 0 249 10 6 822 0 0 352 7 6 195 19 9 144 10 0 187 12 0 228 7 0 120 4 0 137 2 0 62 0 0 41 16 0 192 0 0
*25. F. Riddiford 28. F. Riddiford	89 0 0 706 10 0	$\begin{array}{cccc} 138 & 12 & 0 \\ 367 & 15 & 0 \end{array}$	Totals	£86,770 16 3	£19,821 4 9

^{*}The arbitrators considered the improvements on this lease out of all proportion to the requirements, and assessed them in conjunction with the other leases of Mr. Riddiford's, for whose accommodation they were erected.

I would like, with leave of the Committee, to refer to one more fact bearing on this point that has come out in the evidence—viz., that the leases of Okahu and Ruaohemokei were sold by the Bank of Australasia shortly after the award to Mr. Lysaght for £2,100, thus showing the value which was put on the new lease that had just been obtained.