

“wishes” Jane Brown to be guardian with Eruini for her child Patuone. Then follows an explanation of her reasons concerning the sale of her said land to Bayly, viz., that she wished for the purchase-money to cherish her body during her illness, but that he had refused to make advances beyond one £5, “therefore I do not wish my husband or child to confirm the sale when I am gone.” Shortly after the last date, about the 1st September, 1883, Rehara died, leaving her sole child Patuone and her husband her surviving, but without having applied for or obtained a succession order as the representative of her father Hami Puanu.

It appears quite clear that Rehara's sale of the unallocated award of 200 acres made to her father was void, on the ground, among others, that she had not during her lifetime been declared his successor. It seems also clear that the amount agreed to be paid to her for her own award and that of her father by Walker was very inadequate, from the fact that Bayly, even after my unfavourable decision on Mr. Walker's claim, actually agreed to give him £1,000 cash for what, not long before, Walker had agreed to pay only £400 or £500 at an indefinite future date. It is not, however, my duty to decide whether and to what extent Mr. Bayly may, by this payment, to Walker, have acquired an equitable right as against Rehara and her husband or either of them. The question for my consideration is, to whom the grants of the land allocated to these awardees should be made in satisfaction of the pledges of the Government, and to whom they ought to be handed. The only persons who appear to me to stand in a position to demand these grants from the Crown are Patuone, the sole child of Rehara and heiress-at-law, whom I consider entitled to the entirety of the sections awarded to Hemi Puanu as his granddaughter and heiress, and the said Patuone and Eruini te Rangirihau, to the sections awarded to Rehara Hami, in undivided moieties, as tenants in common, by virtue of the will of the said Rehara Hami.

I beg therefore respectfully to recommend that a grant of Sections 10, Block IV., Waitara, and 20, Block V., Upper Waitara, be made in favour of Rehara Hami, to vest in her from the 6th August, 1883, and a grant of Sections 20, Block IV., Waitara, and 35, Block V., Upper Waitara, in favour of Hemi Puanu, to vest from the same date; and that both grants be handed to the Public Trustee—that in favour of Rehara to be in trust for Patuone and her father Eruini te Rangirihau as tenants in common, and that in favour of Hemi Puanu in trust for Patuone and her heirs. Succession orders have been made accordingly.

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 26th April, 1884.

APPENDIX VIII.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE HON. THE MINISTER OF LANDS AND THE WEST COAST COMMISSIONER IN REFERENCE TO RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF MR. HUMPHRIES IN CHARGE OF THE COMMISSION SURVEYS.

No. 1.

Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the MINISTER of LANDS.

SIR,—

West Coast Commission Office, Wellington, 13th May, 1884.

The surveys connected with the West Coast Commission having been completed, and the several parties of surveyors engaged upon the work having been dispensed with, I am desirous of expressing my entire satisfaction with the manner in which, since the death of Captain Skeet, in July, 1882, Mr. Humphries, the District Surveyor of Taranaki, has performed the duty of Chief Surveyor to the Commission, which at that time, under arrangements made with yourself, devolved upon him. Owing to the complicated character of the work, the very rough country in which much of it had to be done, and the unprecedentedly wet weather which prevailed during a great part of the time, the task was a very severe one, and required the employment of ten or eleven survey parties for the greater part of the time, nearly doubling the amount of work which would have occupied the time of the District Surveyor in the ordinary course of events in connection with the district surveys. Under these circumstances I have the honour to suggest that some substantial recognition of Mr. Humphries' services should be made by the Government. He has received no salary from the Commission, while his undertaking the work has saved the salary, for about eleven months, which would have been paid to the Chief Surveyor of the Commission if the special appointment had existed as it did before July, 1882. In other particulars also there has been a considerable saving upon the estimate made by Captain Skeet immediately before his death (see Appendix to my report to His Excellency, 3rd June, 1882). In support of this I have appended a brief statement, to which I have the honour to refer you.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Minister of Lands.

Statement above referred to.

	£
Actual cost under Captain Skeet, twelve months of 1881	2,904
Six months of 1882, say	1,500
Year-and-half of Captain Skeet's salary, forage, &c., say	900

£5,304

Captain Skeet's estimate for two years following, to complete the work

9,500

Total according to Captain Skeet

14,804

Actual cost under Mr. Humphries, nearly two years

£6,850

Saving as between Mr. Humphries' and Captain Skeet's actual work and estimate

£2,650

—about £1,500 of which represents the salary of Chief Surveyor, saved by Mr. Humphries performing the duty without pay.

WILLIAM FOX.