

96. You said that men with a temperature of 99 would be allowed up to wash themselves: that is what you called "semi-convalescent"?—Say a man had come in with a cold and his temperature rose to 102 and then gradually dropped down: that man would say to me, "I cannot use the bed-pan any longer. If you will let me up I will put on my overcoat." I would allow that man to get up.

97. *Mr. Salmon.*] A man with a slight cold, you say, would have a temperature of 102?—Yes, and I guarantee that many men walking about Wellington have a temperature above that.

98. Where were you before you went to the hospital on the Monday night: what were you doing?—I only joined the service on the Tuesday.

99. *Mr. Skerrett.*] I understand that you did not join until the morning of Tuesday, the 29th?—No; I reported for duty on the Monday, and started work punctually at 6.30 on Tuesday, the 29th.

100. When was Badger removed to the other hospital?—On Thursday.

101. At the time you joined Badger was in a serious condition?—I would not say that when I first saw him.

102. We are told that he had a relapse on the Monday, and you yourself say that he attracted your attention on the Tuesday as being in a serious condition?—I did not say that. I said that I was attracted to the man by the similarity in our names.

103. Was he able to talk freely with you on the Tuesday?—Yes.

104. What was your observation of his condition: was he bright?—No, far from that.

105. Was he comatose or semi-comatose?—He was languid and tired, and did not seem to want any conversation. He might have appreciated his surroundings.

106. Under any fair and reasonable system of hospital routine ought not Badger's friends to have been informed of his condition on the 29th June: was he then in such a condition that it ought to have been reported to his friends?—No.

107. When do you say it ought to have been reported, according to any ordinary system of hospital routine?—I would have said that it ought to have been reported on the Wednesday night.

108. His condition on Wednesday night was very serious?—I would not say so.

109. What was his condition then?—I do not know.

110. You are called here to give evidence dealing with Badger's case, and you have not examined his temperature at all?—No; I consider that Dr. Ferguson should give that evidence.

111. Do you now say there has been no neglect—I am now referring to the system—that there was no neglect under a rational system of hospital routine in notifying Badger's relatives of his condition?—No. I would like to back that up by saying that if the relatives of every patient in the same condition were to come we would have had the place inundated with people.

112. According to your notion of a rational system of hospital, there was no neglect in Badger's case?—No; I would not say there was any neglect.

113. So that it is according to your ideas of a reasonable hospital system or routine the relatives ought to have been apprised only on the eve of a man's death?—No. If you have in a general hospital a man with a rising temperature, with very quick pulsation, and general distress, it is then for the medical officer to decide whether that is going to continue or what is to be the result of it.

114. I want to call your attention to the fact that a patient who had been next door to this man was able on the 1st July to inform his (Badger's) relatives that he was seriously ill?—That man may have known more than we did.

115. How many times did you wash Badger between the morning of the 29th and his removal to the other hospital?—I went to his bedside frequently.

116. How many times did you personally wash Badger between the 29th and his removal?—I washed him once on the Tuesday and once on the Wednesday.

117. Was it a thorough or complete washing?—Just hands and face and neck. The second occasion was after vomiting.

118. Did you make any examination of him for the purpose of ascertaining whether he required a general wash?—No; that was not our duty.

---

HARRY ARCHIBALD DE LATOUR SWORN and examined. (No. 25.)

1. *Mr. Skerrett.*] You reside now at Wellington?—Yes, at Kilbirnie.

2. Will you tell the Commission shortly your experience in medicine and military hygiene?—I am a duly qualified medical practitioner, a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, England, Associate of the King's College, London, and I have had thirty-five years' continuous service in the New Zealand Defence Forces, from 1875 to 1911.

3. Would you mind detailing a little further your experience in connection with camps and military hygiene?—I have been in charge of every camp that has been held in South Canterbury and Otago districts for thirty-three years. Feeling the necessity for knowing my work as a military medical man more, I joined the correspondence class of the Volunteer Ambulance School of Instruction, a class which had been set up to instruct all members of the Auxiliary Forces residing not only in the United Kingdom, but throughout the Empire. In 1897 I proceeded Home and got practical instruction at that school. I went Home on leave for that purpose from the then Acting Minister of Defence of New Zealand, accredited to the Agent-General, and after going through my course of instruction I was attached for further instruction to Aldershot by the War Office, and I was then instructed to present myself for examination by the War Office at the Chelsea Barracks. Having passed my examination, I received the certificate of proficiency