

I am directed to report that the Committee have no recommendation to make on the subject-matter of this petition, as it is one of policy under the consideration of the House.  
6th July, 1880.

No. 34.—Petition of ALFRED TEESDALE.

THE petitioner states that he entered into a contract with the Government to survey a block of Native land, and that, owing to obstruction offered by the Natives, and the extra work incurred by triangulating the block, he has a claim for compensation, and prays that an extra sum of 2d. per acre, or £338 3s. 4d., be paid to him.

I am directed to report that the Committee are of opinion that the petitioner has no claim for extra payment on account of his contract.  
6th July, 1880.

No. 83.—Petition of HENRY OLDHAM and HENRY DE RENZIE TURNER.

THE petitioners pray for compensation for loss said to have been occasioned by or arising out of the Native war in 1863.

I am directed to report that the petitioners' claim is one of a large class arising out of indirect loss occasioned by Native rebellion. While the Committee recognize that great hardship has been occasioned by such losses, they have no recommendation to make in this special case, as the question is one for the House to deal with.

6th July, 1880.

No. 90.—Petition of WELLINGTON CARRINGTON.

THE petitioner enumerates the offices he has held, under the New Zealand Company, the Provincial Government, and the General Government, in the colony since 1839, and states that his services have been dispensed with by the Native Department in consequence of large reductions being made. He prays the House to take into consideration the services he has rendered, and grant him compensation for loss of office.

I am directed to report that it appears from the evidence before the Committee that the petitioner lost his appointment through reductions made in the Native Department. The Committee do not, therefore, consider that he has any special claim for compensation.

6th July, 1880.

No. 45.—Petition of JAMES W. TREADWELL.

THE petitioner states that the procedure of the House in the matter of the Election Petition Committee *re* Christchurch election is informal and illegal.

I am directed to report that the Committee are of opinion that it is not necessary to offer any opinion to the House on this case.

6th July, 1880.

No. 62.—Petition of MICHAEL FAGAN and 37 other Settlers, of Palmerston South.

THE petitioners state that they view with alarm the imposition of a property-tax during the present depression; and suggest the reimposition of the duty on tea and sugar, the abolition of local subsidies, and the imposition of school-fees as a substitute.

I am directed to report that, as the subject-matter of this petition involves a question of public policy now under the consideration of the House, the Committee do not consider it necessary to make any recommendation.

6th July, 1880.

No. 58.—Petition of MALCOLM F. RAMSAY.

THE petitioner states that he is of opinion that 1s. a day extra pay is due to him for the period he served in the 1st Waikato Regiment of Military Settlers in 1863-64, and prays for inquiry.

I am directed to report that there is no evidence before the Committee except the petitioner's own statement to show that he is entitled to extra pay of 1s. per day after he joined the Military Settler Force in 1863.

6th July, 1880.

No. 170.—Petition of JOHN BARRETT.

THE petitioner is the owner and occupier of the Borough Hotel, Christchurch, and states that he was arrested on a charge of aiding and abetting in a riot which took place in the vicinity of his hotel on the 26th day of December last, but the case was summarily dismissed by the Resident Magistrate; that on the 15th day of June he applied to the Licensing Court for a renewal of his license, but the Court decided that the license would only be granted *pro forma* on the condition that the petitioner absolutely leased the hotel within one month from the 1st July. The petitioner prays that steps be taken to prevent the Licensing Commissioners giving effect to their decision, and also to grant such further relief as may be deemed just.

I am directed to report that the Committee, having made inquiry into this case, recognize the fact that the Licensing Court is the tribunal appointed by law to deal finally with such cases, and have no doubt the Commissioners acted in the public interest; but, as it appears the petitioner cannot obtain a suitable tenant for his hotel within the time allowed without a considerable sacrifice, the Committee venture to suggest to the Commissioners the propriety of rehearing the petitioner's application, with the view of extending the time if, on reconsidering the matter, they can do so without public disadvantage. The Committee recommend the Government to forward this report to the Commissioners for their consideration.

14th July, 1880.