

|                  | £   | s. | d. |
|------------------|-----|----|----|
| Dunedin ... ..   | 66  | 14 | 9  |
| Melbourne ... .. | 98  | 7  | 1  |
| Sydney ... ..    | 49  | 13 | 0  |
| Hobarton ... ..  | 102 | 3  | 0  |
| Adelaide ... ..  | 45  | 1  | 6  |

Mr. J. Munro has given some very valuable evidence, in which he compares the marine dues levied in the Colony of Nova Scotia with those levied in New Zealand, and the contrast is certainly striking. It appears that a foreign vessel of 843 tons would only have to pay the following marine charges:—

|                       | £   | s. | d.          |
|-----------------------|-----|----|-------------|
| Light dues ... ..     | 21  | 1  | 6           |
| Pilotage ... ..       | 3   | 15 | 0           |
| Harbour Master ... .. | 0   | 5  | 0           |
|                       | £26 | 1  | 6 currency. |
| Equal to ... ..       | £20 | 17 | 4 sterling. |

This compares favourably with New Zealand. As regards coasting vessels, the contrast is still greater. The dues levied on the brigantine "Flirt," of Auckland, a vessel of 90 tons, trading to the various ports of the Colony and to the Fijis, amounted to £51 12s. 6d., while the same vessel, if trading in the Colony of Nova Scotia, would only be subjected to the annual charge of £2 15s. on account of light dues. All other charges being remitted on coasting vessels.

The revenue and expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1872, for the various Provinces of New Zealand, on account of harbour and pilot staff, buoys, beacons, signals, and local light, is as follows:—

|                    | Revenue. |    |    | Expenditure. |    |    |
|--------------------|----------|----|----|--------------|----|----|
|                    | £        | s. | d. | £            | s. | d. |
| Auckland ... ..    | 2,138    | 19 | 6  | 5,239        | 3  | 6  |
| Taranaki ... ..    | 56       | 0  | 5  | 458          | 12 | 2  |
| Wellington ... ..  | 1,421    | 7  | 5  | 2,644        | 0  | 8  |
| Hawke's Bay ... .. | 561      | 9  | 7  | 629          | 16 | 10 |
| Nelson ... ..      | 652      | 5  | 2  | 2,685        | 12 | 2  |
| Marlborough ... .. | Nil.     |    |    | 326          | 10 | 0  |
| Canterbury ... ..  | 2,176    | 12 | 11 | 2,336        | 6  | 7  |
| Westland ... ..    | 34       | 17 | 10 | 1,324        | 8  | 1  |
| Otago ... ..       | 3,068    | 3  | 9  | 4,817        | 18 | 0  |
|                    | £10,109  | 16 | 7  | £20,462      | 8  | 0  |

To this must be added the light dues collected by the Colonial Government, £5,904, and the expenditure on account of lighthouses, exclusive of repairs and stores of a permanent nature, £5,000.

This gives a total revenue of £16,013 16s. 7d., and expenditure of £25,462 8s., showing an excess of expenditure over revenue of £9,448 11s. 5d.

I am directed to report that the Committee consider that it is desirable that the Government should, during the recess, direct the Collectors of Customs at the chief ports of the Colony to take the evidence of shipowners and others interested in the shipping trade with respect to the grievances of which the petitioners complain, and report thereon to the Government; and if it is found possible to make one uniform charge, that action be taken during the next session to give effect to it.

22nd October, 1872.

## 16.

### *On Petition of C. J. Pharazyn.*

The petitioner is acting trustee in the estate of Turnbull, Reeves, and Co., who were creditors to the amount of £900 for materials supplied to Mr. Ben Smith, contractor for building Government House. This claim, for the consideration of the Government, is based on the suggestion of the Commissioner, Mr. Tancred, who was appointed to inquire into the claim of Mr. John Martin, namely, that as a matter of grace the Government might take into favourable consideration the claims of those persons who had supplied labour and material in the construction of Government House, but who have not been paid. The amount of their unsatisfied claims is £1,454 12s. 2d.

The only ground on which these claims could be allowed would be on the supposition that the Government had not paid the contractor the price agreed on for the construction of the building.

It does not appear that such has been the case. The cost of building Government House had been arrived at by a series of agreements between the Government and the contractor; the contractor on his part undertaking to perform certain work, and the Government to pay certain sums for the performance of the work. The Government have paid to the contractor and his representatives all the money to which he is entitled under his contract.

Whether the Government has or has not received a building which exceeds in value the money paid to the contractor is not a question which the Committee think necessary to investigate, as it is evident that if the Government, through a fall in the price of building materials and labour, had received a building of less value, the contractor would not have been called upon to refund.

I am therefore directed to report that the Committee cannot recommend the Government to pay any money on account of the Government House above the sum to which the contractor is legally entitled.

24th October, 1872.