

branch of the Defence Forces given under the authority of or in execution of this Act by the Commander-in-Chief, or by any officer of the said Forces, shall be valid and effectual if given verbally on parade, or by advertisement in a newspaper circulating in the district, or by a printed or written notice affixed at a place previously appointed for that purpose, or issued in any other manner customary in His Majesty's military service, unless in cases where this Act specially requires any such order to be in writing." I fancy that was the Crown Law Officer's ground for saying that they need not be gazetted.

79. Is there any definition in that Act of the term "prescribed"?—Yes, in section 2 of the Act of 1909 "prescribed" means "prescribed by this Act or by regulations or military order hereunder."

80. I understand the first regulations were not gazetted, but the second lot were?—Yes, that is so. There were really three sets of regulations. They omitted the dinner-hour in the first set and inserted it in the second.

81. I understood you to say that one set of the regulations was gazetted to obviate the necessity of proving the regulations?—Yes.

82. You were then referring to the second set of regulations, were you not?—Yes.

83. And altogether there have been three sets of regulations issued under the Act: is that so?—If you could call the second one a fresh set of regulations: there were one or two very minor alterations.

84. It was an amendment of the first?—Yes. There were practically only two sets of regulations. The first set was not gazetted and the last lot was.

85. In regard to the demeanour of Worrall, you said his demeanour was truculent, and that it was similar to what it was here. Would you call his demeanour the other day truculent?—It was improper.

86. In what respect?—It was wanting in respect.

87. To whom?—I think, to most people who addressed questions to him.

88. Did it not occur to you that he might have been suffering from nervous excitement, and therefore rather inclined to be argumentative?—Possibly.

89. Did he, in your opinion, go beyond what you would call being argumentative?—Not here, but he did at Ripa Island.

90. In what sense at Ripa Island?—I cannot remember the terms of his threat, but he threatened me at the end that he would make it very hot for me.

91. *Hon. Dr. Collins.*] Under the regulations the medical officer should examine all the men on arrival. Is that done always?—I presume it is.

92. And the medical officer would have to certify to all the cells before any men were placed in them?—I believe so.

93. And the medical officer, when the men were to be confined, would naturally be the man who would order the dietary and also the amount of exercise they should have?—Yes.

94. I suppose there is some evidence of the notes the doctor put down as to what exercise they should have and what confinement?—The routine laid down, of course, was taken from the rules for detention in barracks in force in England.

95. The medical officer certifies as to the condition of health and what kind of treatment they should have?—Yes.

96. *Hon. Mr. Smith.*] In regard to proof of the regulations, you remember that Mr. Bishop dismissed a case, and is not this the correct position: that unless you can produce a copy of the *Gazette* containing the regulations it is necessary for you to get either the Minister or the Commandant to appear in Court and prove the regulations, whereas if a copy of the *Gazette* is produced in Court that is accepted as proof?—I am afraid I cannot answer that.

97. *Hon. Mr. Anstey.*] In regard to posting up the regulations, could you not very easily get over the whole trouble by personally giving to each person when he arrives at the barracks a copy of the regulations?—Of course, that might be done, but then they probably would not read them.

98. That would not matter—that is their picnic?—It would be better to read them to the men.

99. They say they did not understand them when read. In regard to the rations, have you ever had any complaint either by these men or others that the regulation ration is not sufficient for some men while it is more than ample for others?—No, I have no knowledge of that personally.

100. Would it apply when there were reduced rations? Take, for instance, a man who required a large quantity of food: if you reduced the rations it might be a great hardship to him, while it would not be to another?—I think that is rather a question for the medical officer in charge. If the men were unwell or anything of that kind it would be for him to inquire whether they were getting sufficient food, or what the cause of their illness was.

101. Do you never have any complaint generally that the regulation ration is too small for some?—The regulation ration, when men are doing full work, is exactly the same as it is for the personnel of the Royal New Zealand Artillery.

102. But they all mess together, and one can have more or less as he desires, whereas when these men are in solitary confinement that is not so?—I think they are fed together.

103. When in solitary confinement?—Yes. It is not what you would imagine from the term "solitary confinement."

104. With regard to this military punishment, I understood you to say that as far as possible you provide the offenders with work other than military duties?—That was done in this case, but there is no obligation to do so. That was a sort of concession, really, on the part of Lieutenant MacDonald.