

were issued direct from Marine Office, and that Jones possibly made use of them as authority; and as it was not then apparently the practice to require him to enter and clear each time, that this will account for there being no record for the full period since 1887.

D. McKELLAR, Collector. 19/2/96.

133. Would you allow me to look at the record?—Yes, certainly.

134. Now, you see, Mr. Seddon, if you look at this you will find that the service in respect of which he claims is the service practically from 1887?—Yes, but you have been pinning me to 1890, and you are three years out; that is what I complain of.

135. Are the records kept from 1890?—According to Mr. McKellar here we have only ten prior to 1890 out of the whole list.

136. Are the deductions in respect of the period since 1890?—Most decidedly, yes.

137. And you reduced it by deductions to something like eighteen months: is it not so?—I had come to this conclusion: that as Mr. Williams, the employer of Captain Jones, had put his name to a document, I was not justified, nor would any Minister of the Crown be justified, in coming to the conclusion that a person of good repute would be wilfully guilty of fraud.

138. But did you not come to the conclusion, and act upon that conclusion, that the application as certified was incorrect?—Under the advice of my department and responsible Government officers I refused the application.

139. I suppose you would not have refused if you had thought the application was correct?—I came to the conclusion that my officers were satisfied, and, that being the case, I thought I was justified in refusing.

140. You thought it was a hard case?—Yes, I did think it was at the time, and I think so still.

141. You have already admitted that deductions were made in respect to the period when they did keep the records?—No; there is even a doubt there. I stand by my department.

142. Was not some of the service alleged to be performed illegally?—I am not here to express an opinion upon the law; that is a matter for other persons, not for me. Not being a lawyer, but simply a layman, my interpretations may not be correct.

143. Allow me to suggest to you that you have expressed opinions on the law, ethics, and everything else since you have been here?—There are things so patent—

144. From advice you have received, some service had been performed without a permit being given?—I would not say that. If there had been laxity, and captains had been allowed to perform services, and had performed services, which had not been recorded, I am not aware of it. Of course, Captain Jones might have had to go to the assistance of a vessel in distress when both the Customhouse and the Government Buildings were closed.

145. I want to know whether any of these cases were proved to be cases of this kind? I suppose you would not put such cases on the same level where his master employed him to go outside?—There are records of granting the permits.

146. Have you ascertained if there was any laxity in granting these permits?—No; there was some difficulty in getting them. There might have been a signal for the tug after the Customhouse and Government Buildings had been closed, and if a permit had to be obtained it would entail great loss to the owners.

147. Do you suggest that either loss or inconvenience to the owners is any reason for permission being given to a person to break the law?—No; but it would appear to me that the department had not been over strict in regard to these permits.

148. In regard to permits up to this time?—Yes.

149. Do you say, knowing the due sense of responsibility, that your officers have been lax with regard to granting or not granting permits?—I simply say this: that it is quite evident to me that service has been claimed for dates which are not recorded in the department.

150. If there had been no laxity the record must be there?—Up to what date?

151. Up to 1890?—We will eliminate 1890 altogether.

152. Has there been any laxity, so far as you know, since 1890; and, if so, will you kindly specify that upon which you base your opinion?—Well, I will take this paper which is marked in red ink, "Steamship 'Mana': No record, 3/6/90." Now, there were four cases in the year 1890.

153. Of what, Mr. Seddon?—Well, in the first place—call it what you like—there is no record in June, August, and October; and Jones is actually allowed to be in charge himself on the 30th December of the same year. Now, we come to 1891 and 1892:—

Ship's Name.	Date of Commencement.	Date of Termination.	Time engaged.		Where trading.
			Months.	Days.	
Mana (Jones) ..	23/1/91	23/1/91	0	1	Wellington, Ohau Bay, Te Kamora, Cook Strait.
Mana (no record)	31/5/91	4/7/91	1	4	Wellington, Terawhiti, Oteranei, Cook Strait
Mana (no record)	11/9/91	26/9/91	0	15	Wellington, Palliser Bay, Ohau Bay.
Mana (no record)	17/10/91	22/11/91	1	5	Wellington, Palliser Bay, French Pass.
Mana (Jones) ..	3/12/91	3/12/91	0	1	Wellington, Terawhiti.
Mana (Jones) ..	9/1/92	13/1/92	0	5	Wellington, Terawhiti.
Mana (no record)	5/3/92	2/4/92	0	28	Wellington, Terawhiti, Mana Island.
Mana (no record)	14/6/92	30/6/92	0	16	Wellington, Cook Strait.
Mana (no record)	1/8/92	8/9/92	1	7	Wellington, Cook Strait, Wairau.
Mana (Jones) ..	17/11/92	17/11/92	0	1	Otaki.

The department had evidently allowed Jones to go on the 12th November, 1892, and there was no time shown as to how long he took. I know, of course, when I get hold of the file of papers