

## QUESTION No. VI.

After the boundaries are defined, should a public notice be given, calling upon all claimants to appear within a given time, or forfeit their claims?

*Affirmative Opinions.*—Joshua Thorpe, Bolger (After boundaries have been defined and surveyed), Searancke, Webster (Future claims, however, would not be barred), Porter, Black, Whiteley, Joseph, Wiremu Maehi, Marshall (After the boundaries are cut), Wilson, Busby.

*Negative Opinions.*—Fenton, J. White (Unnecessary, if boundaries are cut).

*Undecided Opinions.*—Johnson, M'Lean.

## QUESTION No. VII.

Could the parties selling be made to a certain degree answerable for subsequent claims?

*Negative Opinions.*—Searancke, Burrows, Webster, Fenton, Whiteley, Graham, Johnson, Brown, M'Lean, J. White.

*Affirmative Opinions.*—Joshua Thorpe, Black, W. White (In some cases), Wilson (But it would be very difficult), Busby.

*Undecided Opinion.*—Porter.

## II.

## QUESTION No. VIII.

Is it advisable to give Crown Grants to individual Natives who can give proof of ownership of Land?

*Affirmative Opinions.*—Joshua Thorpe (If title good and boundaries defined), Bolger (If they can give proof of ownership), Searancke (If they can prove their title), Webster (If it be possible for the natives to arrange their claims), Burrows (Desirable wherever practicable), Hemi Taka, Fenton (If collective title does not exist, but no such case), Porter, Black (If they can divide their lands), The Bishop (If they can prove their title and clear it of rival claims), Whiteley (If their claims can be arranged), Rogan (If they can prove their title), Joseph, Wiremu Maehi (After Government have settled the claims), Graham, Paora (If they had individual claims), Kepa (If the difficulties are removed, and all the Natives consent), Reid, Johnson (If one sole owner can be found), Brown, W. White (When arranged by mutual concessions), Davis, the Roman Catholic Bishop, J. White (If lands divided).

*Negative Opinions.*—Campbell (The claims are too intricate), Wilson (They could not define their individual rights), Busby, M'Lean.

*Undecided Opinion.*—Te Hira (Does not know).

*Memorandum.*

N.B.—The instructions of his Excellency the Governor to the Board contained this question in the following words:—"Can Crown Grants be given to Maories for land not previously transferred to the Crown?" The question put to the witnesses was in the form above given, viz.:—"Do you think it desirable to give Crown Grants to individual Natives who can give proof of ownership of land?" The meaning of these two questions is clearly widely different. The consent to the *desirability* in no way decides the question of *possibility*—which his Excellency wished to be settled.

Looking at the answers, with the provisions annexed, the general opinion must be taken as follows:—that the issue of Crown Grants to Natives on any extended scale is very desirable; but the difficulties attending are so great as to render such issue impossible.

The only dissentients from this opinion would appear to be—Messrs. Taka, Porter, Joseph, Graham, Reid, Brown, Davis, and the Roman Catholic Bishop.

## QUESTION No. IX.

Should such Grants contain a restriction to the effect that it should not be sold or let to Europeans until after the Grant has been in the possession of the Native proprietor for a given term of years?

*Negative Opinions.*—Joshua Thorpe, Bolger, Searancke, Burrows, Porter, Rogan, Wiremu Maehi, Graham, Marshall, Paora, Johnson, Brown, Davis (If grants are made to individuals), Busby, M'Lean (Except in certain cases).

*Affirmative Opinions.*—Hemi Taka (Does not object to a restriction), Fenton (But not practicable to issue them at all), Black, the Bishop, Whiteley, Wilson (If practicable to give them at all), the Roman Catholic Bishop, J. White.

## QUESTION No. X.

If individual Native owners received Crown Grants, would there be any danger of their selling all their land and becoming paupers?

*Negative Opinions.*—Joshua Thorpe, Bolger, Searancke, Fenton, Porter, Whiteley, Joseph, Wiremu Maehi, Graham, Marshall, Paora, Reid, M'Lean.

*Affirmative Opinions.*—The Bishop, Wilson, J. White.

## III. &amp; IV.

## QUESTION No. XI.

Would it be advisable to make one or two Chiefs in each tribe Resident Magistrates; with a condition that, when an European is an interested party, they will not be competent to sit in judgment without the assistance of an European Magistrate; and that, in case of difference of opinion between the two Magistrates, the offence shall be referred to the European tribunal?

*Negative Opinions.*—Bolger, Searancke, Webster (Approves of the existing Resident Magistrate's Ordinance), Fenton, Porter, the Bishop (Prefers the present system), Whiteley (Ditto), Joseph, Marshall, Johnson, Brown, Campbell, W. White, Wilson (European Magistrates should preside), Davis, the Roman Catholic Bishop, Busby.

*Affirmative Opinions.*—Joshua Thorpe, Burrows, Riwai te Ahu, Graham, Reid, M'Lean (To some districts), J. White.