

37. *Mr. Crowther* (to *Mr. Glasgow*.)] You see that that memorandum is founded mainly on the last portion of it—"propelled solely." They are not propelled solely; they are in no way dependent?—I admit that in the case of auxiliary-vessels there is a certain amount of hardship involved.

38. *Mr. Lawry* (to *Mr. Duncan*.)] You heard that minute read by *Mr. Glasgow*?—Yes.

39. Have you seen that before?—No.

40. Do you notice that it says that the owners object to carry a certificated engineer on account of the extra pay?—Yes.

41. Did you tell the Committee the other day that there was a great deal of difference in the pay received by an engineer of a sea-going boat and a man who runs a steamer up a river?—No, I did not make any comparison. I made a comparison between the pay on oil-vessels and those driven by steam.

42. I understood you to say they could get men to go up rivers for £6 a month?—No. I said that on oil-vessels they got about £6, while a mechanical engineer wanted about £12 or £14 a month; and then I went on to show that the difference in wages would not amount to 1d. per ton extra on cargo carried to meet the additional cost of carrying an engineer.

43. Do you suppose that if a man passed the most rigid examination he would not get as much for driving an oil-engine as he would for driving a steamer?—I would rather not answer that question. I do not want to interfere with trade in any way. If a man likes to have an oil-vessel for pleasure it has nothing to do with me. It is purely a matter as between the owner and the engineer as to wages.

44. Then is the Committee to understand that you did not institute a comparison between the cost and wages or anything else?—Yes; I did answer that.

45. *The Chairman*.] I stated that the opinion of the Committee, after reading your report, was this: That you were a partisan of the engineers employed on steam-vessels. Of course you inferred that you drew a little on your imagination, and that if you had known it was coming before this Committee you would have been more guarded. You backed down a little?—I might have qualified my remarks a little if I had known I was coming before the Committee. I received this telegram from *Mr. Blackwood*, engineer surveyor at Auckland, in reply to my query: "Please find out the prices of oils used by gasoline-vessels in Auckland." (Telegram read): "Benzine from 9d. to 1s. 3d., naphtha 2s. 10d. per gallon. Benzine is used for Union engines, and naphtha for Hercules engines."

*Mr. Lane*: That is absolutely untrue. Benzine is used for Hercules engines as well as the others. There is no naphtha used except for the little launches.

46. *The Chairman*.] The owners may be using naphtha without your knowledge?—There are only four vessels in my list using naphtha, and if more are running they are doing so illegally.

47. *Mr. Lawry*.] Have you known of any serious accident to occur in consequence of a non-certificated engineer being employed to drive these oil-engines?—*Mr. Glasgow* sees all the reports relating to accidents, and he would be able to speak on that point. I do not know from memory, except that there have been one or two fires on board. The "Hercules" has been ashore at Hokitika, but I do not know whether it was through the engine breaking down. The "Mavis" and "Oban" have been on shore, and probably others.

48. Could you name the vessels that took fire?—The "Aotea" and "Medora."

49. Do you know what the cause was?—I could not say.

50. Do you know whether it was through the engine?—I believe it was, but could not say for certain.

51. Can you give the cause of the "Oban" coming to grief?—If that is the vessel that went ashore at Waitara, it was through a sea being shipped and the water going into the engine-room. It got into the air-pipes, and, instead of drawing air, she draw water into the vapouriter. The engine was stopped, and she was quite helpless.

52. Would not the same thing happen to a steam-vessel if the fires were put out?—That is to be taken for granted.

53. She carried a certificated engineer?—Yes, by law.

54. If anything did go wrong while a non-certificated engineer was on board who could not work the engine, do you think they would give themselves away, or the master, under the present circumstances?—When they got the vessel on shore or alongside the wharf they would simply go on their way rejoicing, and no one would be any the wiser.

55. Coming back to the question of examinations: Supposing a man had been driving an oil-engine for three years, and under examination could give you the most minute outline of its component parts, could take the engine to pieces and put it together again, and could give you a practical demonstration of this, do you not think that would be sufficient service?—No, a mechanic must understand the proper handling of tools.

56. But supposing he could smash the most delicate part of the machinery and mend it again?—Men of that sort would as soon take a hammer and chisel to break off nuts, and a tradesman would not.

57. Supposing the owners had men in their employ who could do what I have indicated, would you not let them drive an oil-engine?—No, not without shop-service. They can get a service qualification now without an examination if they have been driving for a year before May, 1899.

58. You would only make that prospective?—Yes, make it from the 1st January next.

59. You said you did not interfere with trade: do you not suppose that the owners of oil-engines know what suits them best?—Of course.

60. Do you not suppose that if they could run their boats with steam more economically they would use steam instead of oil?—It is a matter of a man going into business: one uses two windows to his shop and another one. One man goes in for oil and another for steam. We could not interfere with trade of that sort. It is all a matter of opinion.