22. You believe you have power to cut down the ration, and you believe you have power to confine in one room?—We had then such power. The regulations were submitted to you again, and you thought it desirable that men unwilling to work should be given ample food.

23. I want to know whether you believe you have power?—If it was prescribed by the Com-

mandant it would be approved by the Defence Minister and would then be in order.

24. What, regulations cutting down rations?—I think that would be a point for the doctor.
25. Apart from those two points, the cutting-down of the rations on the recommendation of the doctor and the confining in one room, what other powers could you obtain under existing law to enforce discipline?—I do not know. The law as at present existing is that if a man commits an offence he must then be taken before a Magistrate, and that takes a very long time-I am advised it takes about a fortnight.

26. What suggestions have you got to make in regard to discipline? Do you think that it is a fair thing that the military should be called upon to carry out this system of detention?—No, sir, I do not; it is really a civil matter. The Royal New Zealand Artillery are not professional gaolers. Detention in the Mother-country is detention of a man who belongs to the service: he is an Army man, and is therefore under the discipline of the Army. Now, detention here, I take it, is detention not of a man who will submit to our law, but of a man who is opposed to our law-who will not give services.

27. Are these men opposed to the law altogether—opposed to military services?—I believe the

majority are.

28. Is it a fair thing to ask the military to have all the worry and trouble of the detention of these men when the offence is not an offence against military law, but against civil law?-I

29. Mr. Coates.] I am not quite clear about one point, and that is, would not the shortening of rations and the confining of a man to a cell be a punishment to a man who is in detentionordinary military detention under the Act?—Confinement in a separate room or cell was the normal procedure in the case of a man committed to detention, so that if a man went into detention, when not at work or drill, he was, so far as possible, placed in a room by himself. Under ordinary conditions he would be in a room by himself.

30. Would it not be a punishment if you shortened his rations?—Well, I think it was for the sake of his health. This man declined to work at all, and with no exercise, and with the necessity to be kept confined out of harm's way, the shortening of rations was to keep him in

- 31. Do you not think it would be a punishment to have your allowance of food cut down?-I do not think it would, sir. I should myself be very sorry to spend three days in a room and eat as much as I would when at work.
- 32. Did this man conform to the spirit of the Act up to the time that they were asked to clean guns, armaments, &c.: were there no complaints up to that time?—I am afraid I cannot say. I do not really remember about that. I could perhaps refer to Lieutenant MacDonald's report and find something about it.

33. From the report I make out that there were no complaints at all?—My impression is

that that is the case, but I cannot say at this distance of time.

34. Mr. Bradney.] Do you not think the boys should be removed from civil jurisdiction that a line should be drawn between the civil and military law—that they should be placed under

strict military discipline and isolated altogether?—I think that is rather a matter of policy.

35. I want to get an opinion from you. If you had it entirely in your own control, do you think, instead of their going before a Magistrate, they should come before a court-martial?—

No, I think it would do more harm than good.

- 36. Mr. Veitch.] What are your suggestions for improving matters: do you suggest that the whole matter of punishments for breach of law be taken out of the hands of the military authorities altogether?-I think perhaps it might be possible to have a separate division for offenders against the Act. If it is left in our hands, and if the offenders in detention are insubordinate, I think that then they should be taken before a Magistrate, and the Magistrate should have power to order them to finish the rest of their sentence in a civil gaol. I believe that would stop a good deal of this nonsense.
- 37. Do you think it will ever be possible to do anything with these people?—No, I do not. 38. Hon. Mr. Smith.] Colonel Collins, do you agree that the punishment under this Act should be entirely with the civil authorities, or that they should be under the military authorities, but with similar powers to those that are given under the present regulations?—You do not mean

the general powers?

- 39. No. Which would you prefer—that you should have increased powers similar to those given under the present regulations, or that it should be vested in the civil authorities?—If it could be done I would prefer the civil authorities; but against that I think it would cause unnecessary delay, and perhaps it would be better that the officer in charge of the detention barracks should have some of the powers of a Visiting Justice.
- 40. You know that there is a very strong objection to sending these young fellows to the civil prison: would that be got over by keeping them in military custody but giving the military authorities the same powers as given to the present officials, or similar powers?—[Colonel Heard] If we have got to keep them we would like to have the necessary powers to deal with them, but on the other hand I would like to point out that officers and men who are concerned in looking after these young men in detention are doing work which is interfering with their own duties. That is to say, men of the Royal Artillery are concerned in artillery work, and most of their time is wasted in looking after these boys in detention; and, further than that, it is a great deal of expense, and it is money which, if it has to be spent, we would far sooner see spent in training