

No. 2.—Petition of THOMAS NESTOR, of Makairo.

PETITIONER states that in April last he was a first-class constable in charge of the Eketahuna sub-district; that he also acted as clerk and bailiff to the Eketahuna Magistrate's Court; that in August he was charged with perjury in connection with the service of certain summonses; that the grand jury threw out the bill; and that he was then dismissed from the service. He prays that he may be reinstated in his former position in the Police Department, that he may be compensated for loss of office, and that he be refunded the expenses incurred in defending the said charge.

I am directed to report that, having carefully considered the petition, the Committee are of opinion that the offence of the petitioner was to swear that summonses in the cases of *Dutton v. Bodmin* and *Heron v. Bodmin*, at Eketahuna, were personally served upon the defendant while the petitioner was acting as bailiff of the Court in that town; that the summonses were in reality served upon persons upon whom the defendant had previously instructed the petitioner to serve his summonses; that the affidavit should have specified the person upon whom service was actually effected; that the Stipendiary Magistrate at Masterton dismissed the charge against the petitioner, and, when afterwards the Stipendiary Magistrate at Wellington committed the petitioner for trial, the grand jury threw out the bill, with the approval of the presiding Judge; that the record of the petitioner while nearly twenty years in the Police Force of the colony is an excellent one, and the petitioner has always faithfully discharged his duties; that they are of opinion that the punishment meted out to the petitioner was out of proportion to the offence committed, and that the petitioner should either be reinstated in the Force, or receive some compensation for the loss of his position as constable.

8th July, 1896.

No. 62.—Petition of ABRAHAM STOTT, of Wellington.

PETITIONER prays that he may be granted some remuneration on account of his services as drill-instructor to the Volunteers.

I am directed to report that, in the opinion of the Committee, the petitioner has no claim upon the colony.

8th July, 1896.

No. 23.—Petition of ALBERT PLUMMER, of Port Ahuriri.

PETITIONER prays that he may be granted some compensation for loss sustained in connection with his contract to supply Maori prisoners at the Chatham Islands with food in the year 1868, &c.

I am directed to report that, in the opinion of the Committee, the petitioner has no claim whatever upon the colony.

8th July, 1896.

No. 37.—Petition of ALFRED A. PENNEFATHER.

PETITIONER states that in March last he was retired from the position of constable in charge at Ashurst, on account of alleged gross neglect of duty, &c. He prays that inquiry may be made into the circumstances of the case, and that he be restored to his former position in the Police Force, and for other relief.

I am directed to report that, in the opinion of the Committee, the action of the department in dismissing the petitioner from the service was justifiable.

8th July, 1896.

No. 35.—Petition of JOHN J. WALKER, of Bromley, near Christchurch.

PETITIONER states that during the labour strike in September, 1890, he was attacked and badly injured by a band of six union men, and that he is now unable to support himself and family. He prays for relief.

I am directed to report that the Committee has no recommendation to make.

8th July, 1896.

No. 100.—Petition of WILLIAM M. and MARION DE WESTON, of Christchurch.

PETITIONERS pray for relief on account of alleged injuries received from a detective of the New Zealand Police Force.

I am directed to report that the Committee sees no reason for altering the decision arrived at last session by the Public Petitions A to L Committee—namely, "That, in the opinion of the Committee, the petitioners have no claim against the colony."

10th July, 1896.

No. 46.—Petition of WALTER SINCLAIR WATERSTON, of Invercargill.

PETITIONER prays for an inquiry into the circumstances in connection with the interpretation of "The Shipping and Seamen's Act, 1877," by the Collector of Customs at Greymouth, in September, 1895, and November, 1895, as affecting his ships the "Alexa" and "Ganymede," and for other relief, &c.

I am directed to report that, as the facts of this case appear to be of an intricate and complicated nature, requiring expert knowledge, and the matters at issue of an important character to the shipping interests of the colony, the Committee strongly recommends that the Government should institute a judicial inquiry into the whole circumstances of the case at the earliest possible date.

10th July, 1896.