

in the order-book is blank (page 105). I say that the weight of that should be about 12oz.—on this I propose to call expert evidence.

161. What is the price?—1s. 3d. per lb.

162. What is the next?—Page 21 of the contract journal there appears 20ft. of solid drawn sanitary pipe, 2in., and 90ft., 1½in. The weight of the two combined is given, in my handwriting, 2cwt. 3qr. 18lb.; the entry in the order-book is “20ft. of solid drawn lead pipe”; that was altered by direction to “sanitary pipe.” The price for “lead pipe” is lower than that for sanitary pipe; that is charged at 28s. per hundredweight. There is no weight given in the order-book (page 97). I contend that the weight should be 2cwt. 1qr. 17lb. Upon that I propose to call expert evidence.

163. *Mr. Skerrett.*] What is the overcharge?—57lb.

164. *Mr. Menteath.*] What is the price in the journal?—28s. per hundredweight.

165. Any other item?—Page 22 in the contract journal—

166. *Mr. Blow.*] The work and the date?—About the latter end of February. For Mount Cook store: one coil of ¾-in. flax rope, the weight in the journal, in my handwriting, 29lb., 42s. per hundredweight. The weight in the order-book (page 102) is blank.

167. What should the weight be?—19lb. The weight there was altered by direction.

168. *Mr. Blow.*] It was evidently entered at 19lb?—It was afterwards altered to 29lb. in my handwriting.

169. *Mr. Skerrett.*] When was it made?—When we were calling back; that is the most likely time it would be made.

170. *Mr. Menteath.*] You say the weight should be 19lb.?—Yes, 19lb. I presume the weight was furnished to me from the yard-book. I made the entry 19lb., that was altered to 29lb.

FRIDAY, 23RD AUGUST, 1895.—(MR. A. R. GUINNESS, Chairman.)

Examination of J. H. JENKINS continued.

1. *Mr. Menteath.*] As to that item in March?

*Mr. Tanner:* Is this one of the items that were deferred from yesterday?

*Mr. Menteath:* No, this is a new item, “sanitary piping.”

2. *Mr. Menteath.*] In page 49 in the Government contract journal there appears 30ft. of sanitary piping, 2½in., weighing 1cwt. 2qr. 22lb., and charged at 24s. the hundredweight?—That is in my handwriting.

3. The extended price being?—£2 0s. 9d.

4. *Mr. Blow.*] What for?—Requisition, March; Workshops. The entry in the order-book, page 14, is 30ft. drawn lead pipe, 2½in.; weight, 1cwt. 2qr. 22lb., altered from 1cwt. 0qr. 22lb. in my handwriting. In the same entry, or rather on the same page, on the 13th March (49) in the contract journal, is 35ft. sanitary pipe, 1½in., weighing 1cwt. 1qr., at 24s., in my handwriting. In page 14 of the order-book is 35ft., altered from 30ft., not in my handwriting, 1½in. drawn lead pipe, altered from 0cwt. 3qr. 1lb. to 1cwt. 1qr. 0lb., in my handwriting. Item 544, in the schedule of prices: it states that lead pipe of all sizes is 22s. the hundredweight; sanitary pipe is charged as a non-contract line, at 24s. I propose to tender expert evidence that this is ordinary lead pipe.

5. Then, in that instance, you say that both weight and price were overcharged?—Quite so.

The invoice from Hayes and Co. for those two items supplied as per contract journal (March 13) should be produced.

*Mr. Skerrett:* I cannot produce it, for I have not got it. I will be able to show that I cannot find it. I should say my learned friend can get it from Hayes and Co.

*Mr. Menteath:* The alterations appear in pencil on the invoice, that is the reason I so specially wish that it should be put in.

*Mr. Skerrett:* I have had no notice to produce it.

6. *Mr. Menteath* (to witness).] Is your recollection clear as to this invoice of Hayes and Co.?—No clearer than that I took the note at the time the goods were purchased from Hayes and Co. At page 57 of the Government contract journal.

7. *Mr. Blow.*] The date?—March 20th. There appears an entry for 2 ingots of block tin. Evidently the entry stood at 40lb. block tin, in my handwriting, at 70s. per hundredweight; the alteration made is from 40lb. to 43lb. This alteration, from what I recollect of it, is in Bridson's handwriting. In the order-book, at page 17, the original marked off is 40lb. of block tin. The entry in yard-book, page 346, is altered from 40lb. to 43lb.; two ingots block tin. This, I believe, is in Mr. Hilton's handwriting.

8. *Mr. Skerrett.*] The overcharge you suggest there is 3lb.?—I do not suggest an overcharge; I believe that that is not an overcharge. I believe that is a *bonâ fide* charge. I mention it because I took a note of it.

9. *The Chairman.*] You are writing something; what is it that you are doing?—I am taking a note of the items mentioned yesterday, which were referred to before in the letter put in. Next, at page 52, in the Government contract journal—

10. *Mr. Montgomery.*] What is the date?—March 16 (about). There appears an entry, twenty sheets of No. 10 zinc for the Workshops (requisition, I think, 199), showing 2cwt. 3qr. 20lb., at 24s. per hundredweight. The entry in the order-book, page 14, is twenty sheets No. 10 zinc, in my handwriting, no weight stated. In the yard-book, page 325, the entry is, in my handwriting, “To Departmental Buildings, 10 sheets of No. 10;” weight, in Mr. Hilton's writing, is “8 sheets, 1cwt. 0qr. 8lb.” and “12 sheets—1cwt. 2qr. 12lb.”

11. *Mr. Menteath.*] What is the total?—2cwt. 2qr. 20lb.; the difference being 1qr.

12. And that is charged at a raised price?—That is charged at a raised price.

13. *Mr. Skerrett.*] What is the price charged?—24s.; that is the schedule rate.