

No. 131.—Petition of JAMES DUROSS, Coromandel.

THE petitioner claims land as an old soldier and military settler.

I am directed to report: As the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into claims of this character has reported against this claim, the Committee do not consider it desirable to reopen the case.

4th August, 1882.

No. 265.—Petition of JAMES HUME, Dunedin.

THE petitioner claims compensation for service under the Provincial Government of Otago, as Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum, Dunedin.

I am directed to report: The Committee are of opinion that, as the petitioner accepted service under the General Government on the abolition of the provinces, and continued in such service till the end of 1881, he is only entitled to compensation for loss of office as a General Government officer, in the terms of "The Civil Service Act, 1866."

4th August, 1882.

No. 54.—Petition of ROBERT RIDLING, Auckland.

THE petitioner states that he has resided for some years on Cox's Creek, upon land which he purchased for the purpose of a building-yard, on account of the convenience of the creek; that his trade has been totally destroyed by the erection of a bridge over the creek. He prays for relief.

I am directed to report: The Committee, having inquired into the case of the petitioner, find that the bridge in question confers a great benefit on the district, and cannot therefore recommend his claim to the favourable consideration of the House.

4th August, 1882.

No. 95.—Petition of JOHN MCCARTHY, Auckland.

THE petitioner states that he was employed in the railway workshops at Auckland at the wages of 18s. per week; that other apprentices received 24s. per week. He prays that he may receive 6s. per week as back pay.

I am directed to report: The Committee, having considered the petitioner's case, find from the evidence that a special arrangement was made by him with the department, which has been given effect to; the Committee cannot, therefore, recommend the claim of the petitioner to the favourable consideration of the House.

4th August, 1882.

No. 80.—Petition of THOMAS ROACH.

THE petitioner states that in the year 1865 he met with an accident whilst employed by the Railway Department in Canterbury, and has since been unable to follow his trade. He prays for relief.

I am directed to report: The Committee have no recommendation to make in the case of the petitioner.

4th August, 1882.

No. 319.—Petition of W. HALL, Otago.

THE petitioner claims compensation for provincial service as bailiff to the Resident Magistrates' and Wardens' Courts on the Otago Gold Fields.

I am directed to report: The Committee, having inquired into the petitioner's case, are of opinion he is not entitled to compensation for his term of service as a provincial officer, as, on abolition of the provinces, he accepted office in the General Government service, and continued in such service for some years, and received such compensation as "The Civil Service Act, 1866," provides for loss of office.

4th August, 1882.

No. 55.—Petition of RICHARD SANKEY and Others, Matakana District.

THE petitioners complain that, after enjoying for nearly thirty years the privilege of using a landing-place belonging to the Government on the west branch of the Matakana River, also a road leading thereto, they have been deprived of the same through the action of the Road Board. They pray the House to grant them relief.

I am directed to report: It appears from the evidence before the Committee that the Road Board has been remiss in not maintaining the public rights as regards the road in question; but, failing the action of the Board, the Committee consider that, as it is possible the petitioners can enforce their rights in the law Courts, the Committee can make no special recommendations in their case.

4th August, 1882.

No. 118.—Petition of ALEXANDER STITT, Westport.

THE petitioner states that in the year 1874 he contracted with the Government for forming and metalling portions of the Westport and Reefton Road; that in consequence of slips he sustained great loss; an arbitrator was appointed, who decided that £800 should be awarded him, which the Government refused to abide by. He petitioned the House in 1877, and the Public Petitions Committee recommended the above sum should be paid; that in 1879 the Government paid him £620 and refused to pay him any more. He now prays for relief.

I am directed to report: The Committee have no recommendation to make to the House in the case of the petitioner, as the Government appear to have paid him the fair compensation for the loss incurred.

4th August, 1882.