

## No. 374.—Petition of MARIE A. GRIMSTONE, of Wellington.

THE petitioner prays that she may be granted a compassionate allowance upon account of her late husband's services.

I am directed to report that, upon the evidence adduced, the Committee has no recommendation to make.

28th October, 1898.

## No. 249.—Petition of D. BANKS, of Ashley.

THE petitioner prays that he may receive compensation for the loss of certain sheep, entailed by an action at law.

I am directed to report that, upon the evidence adduced, the Committee has no recommendation to make.

28th October, 1898.

## No. 334.—Petition of HELEN FRY, of Wellington.

THE petitioner prays for relief under circumstances arising out of the stranding of the barque "William Manson."

I am directed to report that the Committee, having gone very carefully and exhaustively into the subject-matter of the petition—viz., the stranding of the "William Manson"—finds as follows:—

1. That the stranding was caused by an error of judgment upon the part of Pilot Cox, and that Captain Fry was in no way responsible; *vide* the finding of the nautical inquiry, which was as follows: "The decision of the Court in this matter has been come to after careful consideration, and the conclusion we have come to is that the captain and officers of the vessel are not at all to blame, and their certificates will be returned; and, upon the other matter, that it appears to us that the only person responsible must be taken to be the pilot who was in charge of the vessel at the time of coming in, and that he, in the exercise of his judgment as pilot, chose a certain time for coming in which, in our opinion, was running too fine a risk in relying on the tide running beyond the calendar time. It is clear that at this time the tide was a little earlier than the calendar time. We have to say upon this matter that the loss or damage appears by the evidence to have been caused by the vessel grounding and becoming stranded on the point of Haulashore Island when being brought into harbour by Pilot Frederick William Cox; by her listing over to starboard and starting some of her seams and planks, so as to cause her to leak badly, and to require to be beached when got into the harbour, where she again listed over to starboard. That the nature of the loss or damage done was that the starboard side of the hull is much strained and sagged, and seams, &c., started, so that the water flows in and out. We find,—(1) That no blame attaches to the master or officers of the vessel; (2) that at the time of the casualty the vessel was in the sole charge of Frederick William Cox, Pilot for the Port of Nelson; (3) that the pilot made an error of judgment in attempting to bring in the vessel so late upon the tide; (4) that when he found that the tide had begun to ebb it was better to push on as he did than to try to go back, but that it was a mistake to hug the point of Haulashore Island so closely; (5) that Pilot Cox should pay the expenses and costs of this inquiry, which are ascertained at £6 10s."

2. That the evidence taken upon oath by the Committee, and as to this part of it admitted by Pilot Cox to be correct, shows that the "William Manson" was the first sailing-vessel of her size that he had taken into port at night-time; and that had he taken her into port during daylight—notwithstanding the assertion regarding a phenomenal tide—he would have observed the ebb-tide running out before he reached the narrows, and thus have saved the vessel from stranding.

3. That, Pilot Cox being an officer of the Crown, the petitioner has no remedy at law, and therefore properly applies to Parliament for redress.

4. That the late Captain Fry owned forty-two sixty-fourths of the said barque, the "William Manson," and that he died on or about the 17th August last past, leaving his widow the sole legatee of his estate.

5. That, owing to the loss incurred by the stranding of the said vessel, amounting to over £1,000, which has had far-reaching consequences of a serious nature to the petitioner, such as the total loss of her late husband's life-insurance money, &c., the widow and her infant daughter are left in very straitened circumstances.

The Committee therefore recommends that the Government should place upon the supplementary estimates such a sum as will reasonably compensate the petitioner for her personal share in the said loss; such sum not to be less than £750.

2nd November, 1898.

## No. 333.—Petition of J. G. W. ATKEN and Others, of Wellington.

THE petitioners pray that steps may be taken to suppress various forms of gambling, as set forth.

I am directed to report that the Committee having found the petition to contain certain duplicated signatures, and, having pointed out the fact to the signatories, they have expressed regret that through inadvertence such a thing should have taken place, and asked leave to withdraw the petition. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, the Committee recommends that leave be granted accordingly.

2nd November, 1898.

## No. 13.—Petition of F. J. W. GASCOYNE, of Hastings.

THE petitioner prays that he may be granted a pension in accordance with his military rank and length of service, or such other relief as may seem meet.