

71. The Q.M.G.'s department?—Yes; and they asked me to get the Board together and consider the plans. We turned down the first plan, and the second one we approved with certain modifications. These were sent on to the Minister.

72. Can we get those plans?—I expect so.

73. Where would they be?—In the Q.M.G.'s department. They were not used.

74. No, but we could see from them the ideas originally submitted?—I know that one of the ideas we turned down was that the men be in bunks; one proposal was for a double bunk like a ship.

75. Or shearers' quarters?—Yes; but we were absolutely opposed to them.

76. Opposed to the double bunk?—Yes.

77. Were you opposed to the single bunk?—No.

78. The records will be in existence?—Yes, sir. The next thing I heard was that the authorities had set up another Board, consisting of a medical man, an architect, and an engineer, which was quite a suitable Board. I thought, to go into the plans. I never saw these plans, and know nothing about them.

79. You have had experience of camps: are these hutments constructed according to military recommendations?—Well, not exactly. I have been several times through the huts. The military regulations with regard to hutments are not mandatory, but they suggest that not more than twenty-four men should be placed in each hut. The ideal arrangement is a hut for each man, but, of course, that is out of the question. I presume the Board went into the matter very thoroughly, because the huts are most admirably adapted for the purpose, and the eave ventilation, which I believe was in the original plan, and which we insisted upon, was quite satisfactory—if it was not provided originally we put it in. I am a great believer in eave ventilation.

80. What was recommended?—Eave ventilation was used. With that I quite agreed. That means that you can put a great many more people in the hut than if the ordinary method of ventilation were provided.

81. Do the military regulations provide for them or for ventilators on the ridge?—The military regulations provide for eave ventilation. I will look up the regulation on the subject and let you have it.

82. And please consider this also: if those huts were built in line and there was a gale of wind, would the air from one hut be conveyed through the openings of the next and so pass right along the line?—We recommended that the huts should be built in echelon, our Board consisting of Majors Holmes, Elliott, and myself.

83. The Board consisting of Messrs. Campbell, Morton, and Dr. Frengley did not approve of building them in echelon: is there military authority for building them in echelon?—I do not know, but I will find the book and let you know what it says on the matter.

84. The position of the Commission is this: that we have had really nothing definite placed before us, and so far our inquiries have been in the nature of a search. We have no definite charge brought against any one. Now, there is some medical evidence forthcoming which is a criticism of the camp methods, and we are able to produce that this morning. I think, therefore, it would be better if we did not examine you further until this evidence is heard both by yourself and by the Commission?—Yes; very well. I might say that early in the year a medical criticism was made in a long communication to the *Evening Post*. The *Evening Post* sent to headquarters to find out if it were true before they published it, and the representative of the paper was sent to me. I said, "Well, I am an interested party; do not listen to what I say, but let the paper send a representative to the camp. Everything will be laid open to him; he may search the records, and so on, and satisfy himself." So the editor of the *Evening Post* sent a representative out to the camp, and when that representative presented his report the editor of the *Post* refused to publish the letter. I suggest that the representative of the *Post* should be called.

85. What is his name?—I think it was a Mr. Muir.

86. In what month was this?—I could not say now. It was before March. The same communication was sent to the Premier on the 26th March, 1915. That communication was forwarded by the Premier to the Minister of Defence, who sent it on to General Robin for inquiry. Then I wrote my report to the Minister and also interviewed the Minister, and he was quite satisfied. Then later the same letter was published in the *New Zealand Times*, which followed with leading articles respecting the camp. There were certain photographs exhibited at the time which are commented upon in my letter. The reply to the *Post* was prepared by the *Post* representative himself for the editor. The *Post* was satisfied that the allegations were not correct, and refused to publish the letter.

---

RONALD SMITH BADGER sworn and examined. (No. 22.)

1. Mr. Skerrett.] Where do you reside?—In Christchurch.

2. What are you?—An indent agent.

3. What was the name of your brother who was a member of the Expeditionary Force?—Archibald Lionel Smith Badger.

4. When did he join the Forces?—He joined about the end of April, and left Christchurch about the 28th May.

5. What was his condition of health then?—Splendid. I do not think he has ailed anything since he was a boy. When he was about ten he had a slight illness.

6. Anyhow, he was a sound man?—Thoroughly.

7. There was some slight eye trouble?—Yes, he wore glasses.

8. But otherwise he was a thoroughly strong man?—Yes.