39 I.—2.

REPORT on PETITION of HENRY PAGE, Kairori.

THE petitioner prays for redress in the matter of deficient area of land purchased by him from Robert Cockburn, being portion of section 43, originally sold to Cornelius Haynes Butler by the New Zealand

Company.

It appears from the evidence that this section was sold originally as 100 acres, but, as measured by scale on the original plan, its area is $105\frac{1}{2}$ acres. From a subsequent survey by J. Ray, under the New Zealand Company, the plan shows an area of $101\frac{1}{4}$ acres. In 1876, when re-surveyed by the Provincial Government Surveyor, the area is shown as 99a. 3r. 3p. In the original plan the linkage is shown by scale to be, on the south-western boundary, 25.50; on the subsequent survey by J. Ray 26; and on the Provincial Government survey, 1876, 25.43 links. The section was subdivided into twenty allotments after the survey by J. Ray, and a 50-link road was run through it longitudinally in a south-easterly and north-westerly direction. The allotments were laid off on each side of this road—namely, two allotments 865 links each, road 50 links, allotment 820 links; total 2,600 links. Page's purchase consisted of single allotments south-east of the road; and, a Crown grant having been issued for allotments on the north-west side of the road to the first linkage namely, 1,730, and no Crown grant having been issued for the allotments purchased by Page, this threw the roadway of 50 links on to Page's land, causing him a loss of 3 acres, as the actual linkage across the section was found to be 25.43. The petitioner's loss arises from a subdivision of the original section, without the precaution being taken of making an actual survey of such subdivision: but, as this subdivision was not the act of the Government.

making an actual survey of such subdivision; but, as this subdivision was not the act of the Government,
I am directed to report that the claim of the petitioner, if any, is against the person who sold him
the land, and not against the colony. The Committee cannot, therefore, recommend the prayer of the

petition to the favourable consideration of the House.

T. Kelly, Chairman.

7th December, 1877.

REPORT ON PETITION OF 406 INHABITANTS OF INVERCARGILL AND SURROUNDING DISTRICTS.

The petitioners represent certain grievances alleged to have been suffered by Messrs. J. and N. Campbell in connection with a tender for the construction of railways in the Western District of Otago in 1874. The petitioners pray that the House will do justice to Messrs. Campbell.

I am directed to report that, however eligible the petitioners may be as witnesses in the case of the alleged grievance of Messrs. Campbell, having no *locus standi* in the matter, the Committee decline to make any inquiry or deal with the case.

7th December, 1877.

T. Kelly, Chairman.

REPORT ON PETITION OF ARCHIBALD COCHRANE.

THE petitioner prays that he may be allowed to exercise his Militia Remission Scrip in the purchase of waste land.

I am directed to report that, as it appears that the petitioner can exercise his scrip in the purchase of waste lands in the Province of Auckland, the Committee have no recommendation to make.

7th December, 1877.

T. Kelly, Chairman.

REPORT ON PETITION of the CHAIRMAN of the KAUAERANGA DISTRICT.

THE petitioner prays that before the Kauaeranga Highway District is merged into the County of Thames, a Commission be appointed and inquiries be made by such Commission into the case.

I am directed to report that the Committee are of opinion that this petition should be referred

to the Government for consideration.

7th December, 1877.

T. Kelly, Chairman.

REPORT ON PETITION OF GEORGE HOLMES AND Co.

The petitioners were contractors for the Lyttelton and Christchurch Railway under the Provincial Government of Canterbury, and they state that deviations were made by the contracting parties from the original contract which involved the straightening of the tunnel and various alterations in the vicinity of the tunnel mouth, for which deviation and alteration a sum of £5,000 was agreed to be paid. This alteration of the original plan necessitated the original lines of reclamation to be extended seaward, and the petitioners claim payment for this extended reclamation, which they state was not included in the sum of £5,000 agreed to be paid for the alterations in the tunnel and tunnel mouth.

The Committee, having examined the documents bearing on the case, and taken the evidence of

The Committee, having examined the documents bearing on the case, and taken the evidence of W. S. Moorhouse, W. Rolleston, and W. Montgomery, who were connected with the Government of Canterbury during the progress of the contract, and also examined Mr. Dobson, C.E., who was engineer of the works, direct me to report that the Committee are unable, at this period of the session, to give that careful consideration to the mass of evidence before them that the importance of the case demands, but are of opinion that the petition and evidence should be referred to the Government for consideration during the recess, with a view to instituting an inquiry into the matter if necessary.

T. KELLY,

7th December, 1877.

Chairman.