

There are some further minutes on this, but they are simply for the purpose of record. The evidence given in Court was that this letter had been written by my direction or authority. I was under the impression that Mr. Allport might have made this statement—the thing occurred so long ago—without the actual knowledge of the nature of the authority, or what he deemed to be the authority. Then, there was another point. Mr. Allport occupies a responsible position in the department, and I wanted to know if he considered an envelope such as that before the Court a Ministerial authority—that is, roughly written—abbreviated words, sufficient for any officer to make a departure from the regulations. On the 9th March I sent this memorandum to Mr. Glasgow:—

I WOULD like to know from Mr. Allport whether he still adheres to the statement made by him on oath in Court that the official letter sent by him to the Collector dispensing with the production of the mate's certificate was written by my authority or direction. Will you kindly obtain this from Mr. Allport?

WM. HALL-JONES.

It goes on from Mr. Glasgow to Mr. Allport, asking him to send a reply, and the reply comes from Mr. Allport to the Secretary, who forwarded it on to me on the 9th March:—

Secretary, Marine Department.

I HAVE already explained in my memorandum of the 27th ultimo my reasons for believing at the time my evidence was given that it was true that the Minister had given the direction that the qualification as to holding a mate's certificate was to be dispensed with in the case of Captain Jones, and I still think that if I had stated otherwise I should not have said what I believed to be true.

GEORGE ALLPORT. 9/3/99.

I then wrote another memorandum to Mr. Glasgow on the 11th March, as follows:—

Office of Minister Public Works, Wellington, 11th March, 1899.

Memorandum for Mr. Glasgow.

MR. ALLPORT'S memorandum is not an answer to my question. I do not for a moment suggest that, in stating in Court what he did, he was saying other than what he then believed to be true. The point is whether he still adheres to it as being the fact.

WM. HALL-JONES.

This was forwarded to Mr. Allport by Mr. Glasgow, and he replied as follows:—

Secretary, Marine Department.

I REGRET that the Minister has deemed it necessary to ask whether I still believe it to be a fact that the official letter to the Collector dispensing with the production of the mate's certificate in the case of Captain Jones was written by his authority, as it places me in a very unfortunate position. However, as I am required to answer it, I can only say that I still believe it to be the fact.

GEORGE ALLPORT. 13/3/99.

225. Do you know whether or not Mr. Glasgow has said that in July, 1897, he showed that envelope to you?—I heard him state that in Court.

226. It is correct, is it not, that, in that correspondence that took place at the end of 1897–98, Mr. Glasgow does not say he showed you that envelope in 1897?—That was the whole ground of my complaint; and in my office he admitted to me that it should have been brought to me.

227. Do you know as a fact that Mr. Glasgow swore positively and specifically that he had shown that envelope to you in July, 1897, before it was acted upon?—Yes; I heard him state that in the course of the proceedings for the cancellation of Captain Jones's certificate.

228. I want to ask you to test your memory as closely as possible: did any such thing as that take place?—Certainly not. Is it likely that if such a thing had occurred I should have put these minutes on these papers?

229. The papers we have just put in?—Yes. The whole complaint was that the envelope had not been brought before me. Take the first minute: "It is astonishing to find that a rough note made upon an envelope, signed by no one, addressed to no one, and undated, has been deemed sufficient authority for a breach of the regulations.—W. H.-J." First of all we have the statement from Mr. Allport. Mr. Glasgow on the same date says he has no distinct recollection of having had a note in my handwriting put before him, but he cannot contradict the positive recollection of Mr. Allport on that point. Then I expressed my astonishment that a rough note should have been used for the purpose. Then I received this letter of Mr. Glasgow's: "After endeavouring to recall the circumstances under which the envelope with your note on it came to be recorded, I am now able definitely to corroborate what Mr. Allport has stated." Now, what did Mr. Allport state? Mr. Allport states that he received this envelope on the 8th July, and that Captain Allman stated that Mr. Hall-Jones had instructed him to bring it as an instruction to the department. He says, "On the same day I inserted the date which appears on the note, brought it in and showed it to you, and then gave it out for record. It was recorded, as you will see by the date on the top of the paper, on the 12th July, and instructions were written to the Collector of Customs on the same date.—GEORGE ALLPORT. 25th January, 1899." Then Mr. Glasgow's memorandum of the 26th January corroborates all that Mr. Allport has said: "I am now able definitely to corroborate what Mr. Allport has stated. It is the case that he brought the envelope to me and told me that it came through Captain Allman, who had stated, when handing it to Mr. Allport, that the Minister had agreed to allow Jones to be examined. I remember commenting on the irregularity, but I concluded that the matter had been fully discussed between yourself and Captain Allman, and I contented myself with directing Mr. Allport to make a record of the envelope. If, therefore, it is decided that Captain Allman's verbal statement and the note on the envelope are not sufficient Ministerial authority for the memorandum which was written to the Collector, then I must accept the responsibility, and submit to the censure implied in your minute of the 25th instant, which, without these further remarks from me, might hereafter be deemed to be directed against Mr. Allport.—W. T. GLASGOW, Secretary." Then my minute on that would give any man the opportunity of saying if the envelope had been placed before me: "Mr. Glasgow.—Even with Captain Allman's statement, it is surprising that no inquiry was made as to the intention or origin of the envelope with a rough note upon it, and which referred to such an important subject; and the fact of your having commented upon the irregularity without directing that my attention should be called to the meagre authority for such an important departure is