

- (b) A cottage marked "N" on the same plan. The records show it to be owned by Te Hira Pateoro. This is an old building and appears to be the one shown in the District Valuer's report of the 13th May, 1918, as belonging to Joe Maggei (Mackay). Its value was given as £40, and this would be the roll valuation at the time when Te Hira last disposed of an interest in the papakainga on the 26th August, 1922. Its value should be paid to Te Hira Pateoro's successors.
- (c) A cottage marked "O" on the same plan, removed from the line of the waterfront road to adjoining Crown land and subsequently demolished. It belonged to Otene Paora. The value should be paid to his successors. I deduce that the roll valuation of the house was £100 when Otene Paora finally disposed of his interest to the Crown in 1926.
- (d) A cottage marked "Q" on the same plan. This belonged to Te Hira Pateoro, and its value should be paid to his successors. The roll valuation of the building when Te Hira last sold an interest was £150.
- (e) A cottage marked "S" on the same plan. This was owned by Otene Paora, who sold to the Crown in 1926. The roll valuation at the time of sale was £175. This amount should be paid to Otene Paora's successors.
- (f) A small store marked "T" on the same plan. It appears that the store, since removed comprised a building which belonged to Manuera Paora, who finally disposed of his interest to the Crown on the 15th February, 1926. If it should be found that this is the case, the value of the building as at that date should, if ascertainable, be paid to him or his successors. Otherwise, some price might be fixed by agreement.

In dealing with these buildings I have expressed certain views as to ownership. This has not been a matter of evidence before me, and it is not possible in this report to say with certainty who is entitled. I do not express, therefore, any final opinion as to who should receive the moneys, but no doubt if there is real dispute the Native Land Court might, if necessary, be given statutory authority to determine it. Payment might then be made to whomsoever is found to be really entitled.

I have also, in certain cases, indicated what I consider to be the roll valuation of the building at the time when the Native sold his interest in the land to the Crown. Unless it can be shown that the value is not that according to the district valuation roll, I think the person or persons entitled should be paid the sum mentioned.

I may add that in respect of the structures marked "N," "O," "Q," and "S" on Plan No. 12879, the Commissioner of Crown Lands on the 8th September, 1928, recommended that the Under-Secretary for Lands arrange for their purchase at the Government valuation. No steps were taken to give effect to this recommendation, for, in the proceedings on the partition of Orakei No. 1 Reserve C 2B taken on the 18th December, 1928, an undertaking was given on behalf of the Crown that the houses of the Natives on the area awarded to the Crown, with the exception of the house marked "O," would not be disturbed until petitions to Parliament lodged by Te Hira Pateoro for the return of the papakainga to the Natives had been finally dealt with in accordance with section 50 of the Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1928.

53. There are certain other buildings on the lands awarded to the Crown, but, with the exception of two, they are so unsuitable for human habitation, or for any other proper purpose, that they must be regarded as worthless. The exceptions are:—

(a) A cottage marked "F1" on Plan No. 12879.

(b) A hutment shown on Plan No. 12879 as occupied by M. Katene.

The evidence before me is not sufficient to establish ownership of these two buildings, but it appears that the occupiers are merely licensees or squatters. If it should be found that the buildings belong to Natives who sold their interests in the papakainga to the Crown, I recommend that the values be ascertained and payment made to the persons entitled. Should either be the property of a person who was not an owner in the land, that person should have a right of removal.

54. The cases in which I have recommended payment of definite sums to cover deficiencies in the purchase-price are:—

Vendor.	Amount.		
	£	s.	d.
Te Hira Pateoro	10	0	6
Hiria Paora	2	2	11
Koria Watene	9	12	6
Mata Hare Terewai	209	16	3
Merea Kingi	21	9	4
Mereana Roera	3	9	11
Muri Watene	100	0	0
Ngakuku Paora	11	9	9
Ngapipi Reweti	16	2	2
Paipa Taierua	1	7	4
Rotana Ropiha Reihana	28	16	11
Taoho Watene	9	12	6
Tataiarangi Watene	9	12	6
Timi Paora	11	9	9
	£445	2	4