Major Ponsonby Peacocke, H.M. 59th Regiment: Claim rejected under subsection 2 of section 2, Act of 1889. Did not retire to settle in New Zealand. Retired in 1853; arrived in colony in 1858. Explanation is given of the lapse of time between date of retirement and arrival here.

Rev. Thomas Norrie, Presbyterian Chaplain: Claim rejected by Commissioner on the grounds of claimant being merely temporarily appointed, and that the Act therefore did not apply to this case or service.

Private John Dempsey, H.M. 2nd Battalion 18th Regiment: Claim recommended by Commissioner, but held over on the question of "character." Claimant was discharged with "indifferent" character, owing, however, to minor breaches of

Private Joseph Neylon, H.M. 2nd Battalion 18th Regiment: Claim in the same position as the foregoing.

## Taranaki District.

Lieutenant George Cock, Taranaki Rifle Volunteers: Claim rejected, as this officer received from the Taranaki Provincial Government scrip to the value of £5. The claim is therefore barred by subsection 2 of section 10, Act of 1889, and section 7, Act of 1891. The Commissioner recommends that claimant should receive £25 to bring him up to the sum and section 7, Act of 1891. he would be entitled to if he had not received the £5 scrip.

### Hawke's Bay District.

Private John O'Neill, H.M. 18th Regiment: Claim was recommended by the Commissioner owing to the qualifying term in the character given on discharge—that is, "character bad" while in the service, "has been addicted to drink, but latterly has been well conducted." This claim was held back for further consideration. The Commissioner of Crown Lands remarks: "If the strict reading is to be adhered to, I presume he must be rejected."

Gunner John Ross, 4th Brigade Royal Artillery: Claim rejected by Commissioner because claimant was not discharged, but drowned. Claimant was at the time of his death stationed at Napier in charge of guns.

## Wellington District.

Private James Tracey, H.M. 18th Regiment: Claim was rejected as the word "good" was not on the discharge; claimant was discharged with a "fair" character. On this case the question of interpretation of the term has been raised and various opinions expressed; the issue raised is as yet unanswered.

George Ames, Joseph Ames, James Donnelly, John Gallagher, Bernard Gallagher, Edward Hutchings, J. A. Pain, F. H. Revell, James Smith, George Tait (or Tate), R. H. Elliotte, all of the Wellington Colonial Defence Force: These claims are recommended for special compensation, in a sum of £20 per man. The cases do not come within the Naval and Military Settlers' and Volunteers' Land Acts.

for final approval. Claimant has already received land, but the section of land was forfeited. The point for decision is how the recommendation by the Commissioner of Crown Lands can be carried out in the present state of the law in regard to old soldiers' claims. over for final approval.

Private Wright Harrison, H.M. 70th Regiment: Claim recommended by Commissioner, and held over for the same reason as foregoing case. Claimant selected his land but was not able to take it up, as it was too far away.

reason as foregoing case. Claimant selected his land but was not able to take it up, as it was too far away.

Private Michael Walsh, H.M. 65th Regiment: Claim in same position as the foregoing.

John Jackson, Wellington Armed Police: Claim recommended as a special one, though not coming within the scope of the Acts; the special services are the ground of recommendation by the Commissioner of Crown Lands.

Walter Christie, Wanganui Yeomanry Cavalry: Claim recommended as a special case. There is no provision in the Acts which admits the claim. The yeomanry cavalry corps to which claimant belonged was promised land, but the man was not discharged, as he still remains in the service of the Government, and, having been moved from place to place, did not get his land when the other members of the same corps received theirs.

Private John Smith, 2nd Waikato Militia: Claim recommended as a special case. Claimant received his scrip, but lost it; never received any land; his name was recommended for insertion in Schedule to the Act of 1892.

Private Sydney Stiddolph, Oamaru Rifle Corps: Claim specially recommended, as, owing to a break in his service, the Commissioner of Crown Lands had to reject the claim as not being in accordance with the requirements of the Act of 1889.

Edward Biddle, Royal Navy; John Chamberlain, Private, 57th Regiment; Richard Davis, Sergeant, 65th Regiment; Stephen Duffy, Private, 65th Regiment; E. Duffy (widow of William Duffy), 65th Regiment; William Ellis, Private, 65th Regiment; George Friend, Private, 65th Regiment; William Hamilton, Private, 65th Regiment; Samuel Jenkinson, Private, 65th Regiment; Daniel Lee, Private, 65th Regiment; Michael O'Connor, Private, 57th Regiment; Robert Sands, Private, 65th Regiment; James Smith, Private, 65th Regiment; William Warren, Colour-Sergeant, 65th Regiment; William Whelan, Private, 57th Regiment; William Watts, Private, Auckland Defence Force: These claims, seventeen in number, were approved by the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the Wellington District, but rejected by the House on account of claimants having previously received land or scrip for other services.

#### Canterbury District.

Stephen Fisher, Paymaster, Royal Navy: Claim rejected, as no Acts were in force in 1871 bearing on the claim; claimant did not settle in New Zealand till 1870, and settled in Canterbury. This claim now appears to come under subsection b of section 2 of Act of 1892.

# Otago District.

Corporal John Bevin (by his widow), 8th Royal Hussars: This claim is recommended by the Commissioner for long and meritorious service, but does not come under the provisions of the Acts; the claimant has served in the New Zealand Police Force for thirty years.

#### Westland District.

Private Isaac Williams, 1st Westland Rifles: Claim recommended by Commissioner of Crown Lands, as claimant's service is only three months short of the five years' continuous service required by the Act; but the claim is held over, as the requirements of the Act are not fulfilled.