

No. 222.—Petition of CHARLES ANDREWS, of Aratapu, Northern Wairoa.

THE petitioner prays for compensation for military services.

I am directed to report that, as the petitioner's claim has been considered and reported upon by the Commissioner appointed under "The Naval and Military Claims Settlement and Extinguishment Act, 1896," the Committee has no recommendation to make.

20th September, 1898.

No. 227.—Petition of ELIZABETH CLOUT, of Howe Street, Auckland.

THE petitioner prays for compensation for military services rendered by her late husband.

I am directed to report that, as the petitioner's claim has been considered and reported upon by the Commissioner appointed under "The Naval and Military Claims Settlement and Extinguishment Act, 1896," the Committee has no recommendation to make.

20th September, 1898.

Nos. 250 and 251.—Petitions of SCOTT AND Co. and 23 Others, of Wellington, and P. HAYMAN AND Co. and 6 Others, of Dunedin.

THE petitioners pray that the Customs tariff upon wax-vestas may be reduced (say, 25 per cent.), or an excise duty levied to the equivalent thereof, in order that the importers may be placed upon an equality with the local manufacturers.

I am directed to report that, in the opinion of the Committee, this petition should be referred to the Government for consideration; but, as the matter involves a question of public policy, the Committee has no recommendation to make.

20th September, 1898.

No. 293.—Petition of J. R. DUNCAN, of Ponsonby, Auckland (No. 1).

THE petitioner prays for an inquiry into the circumstances under which a petition forwarded by him, and presented to the House last session, has been lost.

I am directed to report that, having made as full an inquiry as possible into the matter, the Committee is of the opinion that the loss of the said petition was an unavoidable accident, and that the Clerk of the Committee is not to be blamed.

22nd September, 1898.

No. 142.—Petition of CHARLOTTE KNIGHT, of New Brighton, Christchurch.

THE petitioner prays for an inquiry and for relief.

I am directed to report that the Committee recommends the Government to cause an inquiry to be made into all the facts of the case by a Magisterial Commission.

22nd September, 1898.

Nos. 96 and 133.—Petitions of H. VON BLARAMBERG (No. 1), of Palmerston North, and J. R. SOMMERVILLE and 51 Others, of Matarawa.

THE petitioners pray for inquiry into the matter of H. von Blaramberg's dismissal by the Wanganui Education Board, and for relief.

I am directed to report that, the Minister of Education having made the inquiry recommended by the Committee upon a former occasion, and having found that no cause had been shown for the appointment of a Royal Commission, and also having regard to the fact that the Education Act does not authorise the Minister to review the actions of an Education Board, the Committee has no recommendation to make.

22nd September, 1898.

No. 266.—Petition of JOSEPH JOHNSTON, of Arch Hill, Auckland.

THE petitioner prays for an inquiry and for relief.

I am directed to report that the Committee, having carefully considered the evidence before it, has no recommendation to make.

27th September, 1898.

No. 162.—Petition of W. R. C. ERSON and 2 Others, of Onehunga.

THE petitioners pray that the cost of maintenance of the Mangere Bridge may be readjusted.

I am directed to report that the Committee recommends that, upon the application of the Onehunga Borough Council, a Commission be appointed to readjust the proportionate payments of the cost of maintaining the said bridge.

27th September, 1898.

No. 192.—Petition of WILLIAM C. FITZGERALD, of Willis Street, Wellington.

THE petitioner prays that the Government may reimburse him the moneys expended in defending an action in the Supreme Court brought against him as a Public Vaccinator.

I am directed to report that the Committee finds,—(1.) That the petitioner has had to defend an unwarranted civil action in the Supreme Court, in which his ability as a Public Vaccinator was assailed, and that judgment was given for the petitioner with costs. (2.) That from the evidence given before the Committee there was not a shadow of proof to show that the petitioner was incompetent or wanting in ability to discharge the duties of a Public Vaccinator. (3.) That in the civil action in the Supreme Court the plaintiff was a man without money, and without good reputation, and the petitioner cannot obtain from him the costs awarded by the Supreme Court. (4.) That, in the interests of the public generally, and of its public officials, the petitioner should be paid out of the public exchequer all moneys properly expended by him in defending the action in