

40. Do you say that Major Smith does not certify to the vouchers sent in?—Not to my knowledge.

41. Whose signature is that on this document? [Document shown to witness.]—That is Major Smith's.

42. What is that document?—A voucher of Captain Clark's. I certify to no vouchers.

43. You do not certify to vouchers?—No.

44. You would not say that your staff officers do not certify?—No; I do not know whether they do or not.

45. Would you think it a most unusual thing for an officer to be employed for months without sending in his vouchers?—Yes, I certainly would. That is where the whole difficulty in this case has come up—that the vouchers were not rendered monthly. I think it most unusual that they were not rendered monthly.

46. You see this document, General. [Authority shown to witness.] You asked for special authority to have that particular work done. Is that your signature?—That is my signature.

47. You recommended the payment of £4 per week?—Yes.

48. Do you think £4 a week a fair payment for that particular work?—I think the Imperial authorities would have granted any officer employed up to the rank of captain certainly his pay as a captain for the time he was engaged on the work. The whole of these rolls, discharges, and medal rolls have to be certified to by a person who is personally acquainted with the services of the men. I could not do it; the War Office would not accept my certificate. Major Smith could not do it; probably they would not accept his. As far as my knowledge of the Imperial service goes, I think that if the charge had been left to the Imperial authorities they would have passed it.

49. You state in this letter, "The period for which the officer will be required will be three months, and I recommend pay at the rate of £4 per week"?—Yes.

50. When you made that recommendation you believed it to be a fair payment?—Yes, because I knew that in this colony we do not pay more than we can help. It is less than the officer was getting in South Africa.

51. Your recommendation to the Acting-Minister was for £4 a week?—Yes.

52. When the Minister gave that authority it would go back to you, would it not? What is the practice?—To send it to the Under-Secretary for Defence.

53. That would be the authority for the payment of £4 a week to whoever did the particular work?—Yes.

54. The question has been raised that Captain Clark was never appointed to do the work, because the authority to do it was given while he was in South Africa?—The authority was never acted on.

55. It was a general order standing over for whoever did the work?—Yes, it stood over. The £4 a week has never been drawn.

56. *Mr. Wood.*] You say that the money has never been drawn: Somebody was appointed?—No.

57. Not to do that work?—No; the £4 a week has never been drawn.

58. But somebody was appointed to do the work. I presume you knew who was appointed to do it?—Oh, yes. As each of the contingents came home an officer was delegated to do the discharge-work till it was finished.

59. Whose duty is it to see that vouchers are sent in?—The Under-Secretary ought to report if a voucher is not sent in. There is no question of payment in my hands at all.

60. Still, somebody is supposed to see that the vouchers are sent in monthly?—No; I certify to nothing. In the Imperial service I should certify for the whole of my staff, but it is not the practice here.

61. Would the practice be that men could be put on in the Department and work for six, eight, or twelve months, no one being responsible to them, and they being responsible to no one, and then at the end of that time a voucher be sent in?—No. I believe the regulation is that vouchers ought to go in monthly. If that had been done it would have been checked at once.

62. That is not the point. This man Clark was put on by somebody?—Yes.

63. Then somebody ought to see that his vouchers were sent in monthly?—The Under-Secretary for Defence.

64. He would be the responsible person?—Yes.

65. *Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Did you notify the Under-Secretary for Defence that an officer had been put on to do this work under the authority for £4 a week?—I presume it went down. I cannot say for certain without referring to the registers in the office. All authorities are sent down.

66. When asked for the Ministerial authority are you aware that you stated that the authority under which Captain Clark was put on was the £4-a-week one—this was when Captain Clark's claim came in? You were asked for the Ministerial authority, and your reply was that there it was?—For the work beyond that of the Ninth and Seventh Contingents, for which there was the ordinary authority?

67. Yes?—I think I stated in a letter that I asked for Ministerial authority. I have a copy of that letter. It was dated the 11th July, 1903, and in it I said that although the application for the salary of Captain Clark was forwarded and recommended this was not claimed for under Ministerial authority, but was submitted for approval. That was my minute of the 11th July.

68. *Mr. Wood.*] You did not make any recommendation at all?—Oh, yes: "Forwarded and recommended."

69. *Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] This is my minute of the 20th July, 1903: "The attempt made by Captain Clark to obtain a large sum of money in excess of what he must have known was pay-