

SCHEDULE showing the Distribution of Acreage, &c.—*continued*.

| Names. | Acreage allotted. | | | Gross amount of Share. | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|----|----|------------------------|----|----|
| | A. | B. | P. | £ | s. | d. |
| 15. Hira Makarini | 25 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 |
| 16. Riaki Tauhare | 25 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 |
| 17. Teoti P. Mutu | 25 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 |
| 18. Hira Mutu | 14 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Pita Mutu | 14 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Inia Tauhare | 14 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Wakena Kokorau... .. | 14 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Hinepakia | 14 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| 23. Whakatau Pakapaka | 16 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Ihaia Tuhuru | 20 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 |
| 25. Inia Tuhuru | 25 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 |
| 26. Riki Mairaki Taiaroa | 14 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | 500 | 0 | 0 | £3,000 | 0 | 0 |

Enclosure No. 3.

[From the *Grey River Argus*, Thursday, 6th February, 1879.]

WE promised our readers, especially those who are interested in the question of the Greymouth Native Reserves, that we would endeavour to lay before them further particulars concerning the result of the inquiry that has been lately held in the Volunteer Hall, which has caused such a large influx of Native visitors in our midst. It would seem, from what we can gather, that the object of the inquiry was to investigate the claims of the Native owners to the whole of the Native reserves included in the West Coast purchase, with a view ultimately to issue Crown grants to the persons concerned, restricting the alienation of the land by sale or by mortgage. The cause that has led to this appears to have been the dread that pervaded the minds of the Native owners of the Greymouth and other valuable reserves on the Coast, of the possibility of the Government sanctioning the sale of these lands to the European tenants, a strong desire having been evidenced, especially at Greymouth, to acquire the fee of the land. It is true that under the provisions of "The Native Reserves Act, 1856," the Governor is empowered to dispose of property vested in him by absolute sale or otherwise; but, as we have pointed out on previous occasions, it is not probable that this right would have been exercised detrimentally; moreover, the Act in question forbids the alienation of the land except for the benefit of the Natives interested, and it is not probable that adverse action would be taken against the expressed wishes of the owners. Under the circumstances, therefore, there was no real cause for apprehension that the sale of the Greymouth Estate would be sanctioned.

Concerning the proposed change in the tenure of the land, we do not propose to discuss the question adversely to the interests of the Native owners, but our present object is to point out that the issue of Crown grants to them involves a large and important question, and it behoves the tenants, as a body, to unite together for the protection of their interests.

Before proceeding further with that part of the question we propose to give a brief sketch of the circumstances that led to the occupation of the Greymouth Reserve by European tenants under the present system.

The Native Reserve, Greymouth, upon which a large portion of the town now stands, comprises an area of 500 acres, and was set apart in 1860 for the use and occupation of the members of the Ngaitahu Tribe, then residing on the west coast of the Province of Canterbury.

In consequence of the discovery of gold in the Grey District in 1865, a large demand arose for business sites near the mouth of the river, and, the Native reserve offering greater facilities for this purpose than the surrounding land, the business portion of the community located themselves there. As this mode of irregular occupation was likely to lead to serious complications with the Native owners, the Government requested Mr. Commissioner Mackay to proceed to the West Coast, and take such steps as would legalize the occupation of the land.

It was found on investigation that a number of persons had unadvisedly entered into arrangements with the Native owners for the occupation of the land adjacent to the river-frontage without being aware that such agreements were invalid. The agreements entered into were mostly for a short time, with a right of renewal; and, as all of the occupants had paid the full sum demanded by the owners for the use of the land, it was considered advisable, in order to rectify any difficulties that might eventually occur if this state of affairs were allowed to continue, as well as to protect the interests of all concerned, to bring the land in question under the operation of "The Native Reserves Act, 1856," with the consent of the Native owners. This proposition was willingly assented to by the Natives, as they foresaw the difficulties that were likely to ensue through the irregular occupation of their land, as well as their own incapacity to deal with the question. On the consent of the Natives being obtained, and the lands formally gazetted, it became vested in the Governor under the Act of 1856, as amended by the Act of 1862, and the officer holding delegated powers became empowered to issue leases for any period not exceeding twenty-one years. A system of leasing thereupon commenced, under which the persons who are now in occupation hold their present tenure.

The application made by the Natives interested in the estate, to have a Crown title issued in their favour, cannot, in justice to the lessees, be given effect to until the interests of the tenants are fully protected, as it would be a breach of faith to those persons who have improved the property by their capital and labour, if they were debarred by the issue of a grant to the beneficiaries from obtaining a renewal of their leases, to which they are justly entitled, and on the faith of which they have expended large sums, both in the erection of buildings and otherwise improving the estate.