

29. *Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] The original is not on the file. I do not question that he gave you the certificate.

30. *Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones.*] What became of the original?—It was attached to my voucher when I submitted it. I kept a copy of the voucher, and also a copy of the certificate.

31. You say that the original of this was not handed to you—that it was attached to your voucher and sent in to the Department?—Quite so. It was attached to the voucher.

32. *Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Where did you get that copy?—I retained it.

33. *Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones.*] How did it come into your possession?—I had two copies type-written, and when I submitted my voucher the original was attached to the voucher. I kept a copy of the voucher and a copy of the certificate. The duplicate copy was not signed. It was simply for retention by me.

34. Was that at the time you were employed in the office?—Immediately I had finished up—the day after.

35. *Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] What typewriting-machine was that done on?—A Government machine. I had a couple of copies made, one for my retention and one for attaching to the voucher.

36. *The Chairman.*] Did you post the voucher yourself, was it left with Major Smith, or did you deliver it?—I think I delivered it.

37. At the Under-Secretary's office?—No. It had then to go from Major Smith to the Accountant's office. I think I took it down there, but I am not quite certain. The work was done in the Government office. Major Smith gave the certificate that the work had been done. Colonel Chaytor said that the work had been done as expeditiously as possible, and the General said in his evidence on Thursday that he had no doubt that if the claim had been presented direct to the Imperial authorities, instead of to the New Zealand Government as agents, it would have been paid without comment. He said he had no doubt that it would have been paid without comment if I had presented it direct to the Imperial authorities. I then ask, why should the New Zealand Government, acting simply as agents for the Imperial Government, retard the payment?

38. *Mr. Hardy.*] A trustee is often more particular than the principal, because he is responsible later on in case of inquiry. If the principal does a thing there is an end of it. That would be a reason why the Government should be more particular?—Quite so. Regarding the King's Medal portion, as distinct from the Seventh work, the work done in connection with the Seventh must be absolutely without question, because Major Johnston or some officer connected with the contingent should have done the work and must have done it. There can be no doubt about the validity of that portion. The other portion simply resolves itself into the question, Was the Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones's authority of the 9th July, 1902, actually acted upon in my (from the 4th November till the 28th February) making out King's Medal rolls? I submit that it could not possibly have been, because, as I have pointed out, the order giving the conditions was not made public in London till the 29th September, nor in the colony till the 20th November, 1902. That was four months clear after the Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones's authority had been given. If it had been acted upon when given the authority would have been worked out a month before. I think that is all I have to say, gentlemen. I thank you for the patient hearing which you have given me.

39. *Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] In your statement you admitted that you had been guilty of negligence in not sending in your vouchers?—I believe I did say that perhaps I made a mistake. I do not say "negligence"; "want of knowledge of the regulations" would perhaps be a better way of putting it.

40. When did you first leave Wellington?—On the 20th January, 1900.

41. When you came back did you remain in Wellington, and, if so, for how long?—I remained in Wellington, I think, till Christmas. During the time the offices were shut at Christmas-time I went away to my brother at Eltham.

42. When you came back you remained in Wellington until Christmas, and then went to Eltham?—Quite so. I was employed in the office up till Christmas, and after the holidays I came back to resume the work. I had not been free to go away earlier.

43. You admit that if I had paid the two vouchers for £50 each which Colonel Porter certified to that would have been a wrong payment, and would have had to be refunded, seeing that the gratuities did not apply to New-Zealanders?—I do not think I admitted that. I do not think it has been suggested that they should be paid or were to be paid.

44. You claimed the money, did you not?—Yes.

45. And you stated in your statement that you had found out since, from what the Department had told you, that those claims were wrong?—No; I said that during the course of the inquiry I had learnt that the gratuities were not applicable to New Zealand contingent men. I did not learn that from the Department; I only casually learnt it during the inquiry.

46. Did you not say that you would not have made the claims for those gratuities had you been acquainted with the fact that they did not apply to New Zealand?—If I had been acquainted with that fact I certainly should not have made the claims.

47. Then the question I ask is, supposing I had paid them I should have been paying them wrongly, should I not?—I presume so, sir, in the light of recent events.

48. This is the minute I put on the paper: "I do not see my way to recognise the claim, and I am surprised at Colonel Porter certifying to the two vouchers for £50 each." That minute is dated "15/4/03," so you see some one had knowledge that it was wrong to pay them?—Quite so; but was I informed of that fact?

49. Now, what replies have you had from the Department? Can you produce them?—I have three or four here. You will remember that a deputation of about eight of us interviewed you about the day after you returned from the Coronation. We submitted our vouchers then for