

Having explained the principle on which our inquiry was conducted, and our conclusions arrived at, we proceed to lay before your Excellency the results of our deliberations in each case.

[1.] *Hokitika and Greymouth Tramway.*

From Hokitika to Stafford; distance, eight [8] miles. We find the diminution of traffic on this tramway to be due to the construction of the Hokitika to Arahura and Arahura to Stafford Roads; and the sum which, in our opinion, is justly and equitably due to the owners of this tramway is one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five pounds [£1,885].

[2.] *Marsden and Paroa Tramway.*

Length, five and a quarter [$5\frac{1}{4}$] miles. We find the diminution of traffic on this tramway to be due to the construction of the Greymouth to Marsden Road; and the sum which, in our opinion, is justly and equitably due to the owner of this tramway, is one thousand six hundred and twenty-seven pounds [£1,627].

In this case we think it necessary to explain that though the owners applied, in 1869, to be brought under the County Regulations, this does not appear to have been done, but protection to the line was granted, and was renewed from year to year under "The Gold Fields Act, 1866." We are in doubt how far this particular circumstance may have removed this tramway from the scope of our inquiry; but we proceeded to examine into and report upon the general equities of the claim upon the principles which had guided us in other cases, leaving it to His Excellency to decide, under the circumstances, whether or not it should be admitted.

[3.] *Greymouth and Paroa Tramway.*

Length, five [5] miles. We find the diminution of traffic on this tramway to be due to the construction of the Greymouth and Marsden Road; and the sum which, in our opinion, is justly and equitably due to the owners of this tramway is one thousand three hundred and forty pounds [£1,340].

[4.] *Hokitika and Kanieri Tramway.*

Length, two and three quarter [$2\frac{3}{4}$] miles. We find the diminution of traffic on this tramway to be due to the construction of the Hokitika and Kanieri Road; and the sum which, in our opinion, is justly and equitably due to the owners of this tramway is eight hundred and eighty pounds [£880].

[5.] *Hokitika and Houhou Tramway.*

Length, two and three quarter [$2\frac{3}{4}$] miles. We find that the diminution of traffic on this line was not caused by the construction of any Government road; and we do not consider the proprietors of the line to be justly and equitably entitled to any payment by way of compensation. The Hokitika and Houhou Road was constructed by Government on the line of tramway, for which a sum of five hundred pounds [£500] was paid to the proprietors in 1873.

On examining the results arrived at, and on comparing them with the compensation awarded by the Provincial Council in 1875, it will be seen that the payment we have recommended to be made to the Hokitika and Kanieri Tramway is proportionately larger than in any other case. This, we submit, is justified by the consideration that this Company alone has continued its operations up to the present time, keeping carriages running at stated hours for the convenience of the public, and thus affording some of those increased facilities for communication which were contemplated when the idea of compensation was first proposed.

Before concluding, we think it necessary to remark that the owners of several of the above-mentioned tramways appear to have considered themselves entitled to prefer a claim under clause 5 of the Regulations of 1869, which provides that a guarantee of 8 per cent. interest may be given to any company coming under those regulations. We are, however, of opinion that in no case has a right been established to compensation under the clause quoted, as we conceive that such a guarantee as is therein mentioned could only have been accorded by the deliberate action of the County Council, and could not be inferred from any pro-