- 36. You know what was the practice in the British Army fifty years ago: insubordinate boys of that sort were flogged. If that were law now it would not alter your determination?-Not the least bit.
 - 37. It would not be a bad thing to try, perhaps?—We are prepared to go to any extent.
- 38. Hon. Major Harris.] Would you think if this country were attacked by any Power that you would be deserving of the food you would be eating—taking from the men, women, and children? From my point of view you would not be entitled to anything: you would be living on their food?—A soldier is living on the food of the people. The question of alternative service might be raised. Every man that is doing work might be considered as doing alternative service. I might be one of those who was supplying the food.

39. You people go occasionally on starvation and still you grumble about getting half-rations? -We were entitled under the regulations to receive food up to 2s. a day; half-rations were given

us and we refused to accept them.

40. But would you not consider that you would have to do something for it?-Yes, if I work I expect to get something for it; but when a man works he works of his own free will. We were

taken against our free will, simply because we objected to a system.

- 41. Hon. Mr. Smith.] Supposing it was laid down as a general principle that every citizen of New Zealand should render the State some service, and it was optional to give military or alternative service, would you then object to alternative service? Your objection is possibly to the alternative service being in lieu of military; but assuming it was optional for you to take military service or to do tree-planting, for instance?-You must remember this: that at the present time every man is rendering alternative service—every milkman is doing alternative
- service; every farmer is doing alternative service.

 42. Of course, I recognize that we are all doing work for the country in that sense, but it is thought necessary that we should have a system of defence?—But you had alternative service
- 43. No, that was voluntary service; but you know, under the voluntary service we did not get the number of men considered sufficient. Would you object to such alternative service?— Yes, as an alternative to this scheme.
- 44. Your evidence is pretty much the same on the same lines as Mr. Mackie's?—Yes. 45. Hon. Mr. Anstey.] But I understood you to say that you had already served as a Volunteer?—Yes.
- 46. Would you object to a voluntary system such as is established in England?—No, as long as you did not force people into it. At one time I had no objection to it; to-day I have an objection to a military system.
- 47. As a Volunteer, does that involve any expense or loss of time or money to the Volunteer? -It should not involve expense; he would lose a certain amount of time. You could say when working you lose a certain amount of time.
 - 48. Do you think it would be satisfactory to have a Volunteer system whereby members were

paid for the loss of time and money?—It would be for the men who believed in it.

49. Hon. Mr. Smith. If the voluntary system were set up in New Zealand and you went on with your educationary process, I suppose you would do your best to convert every one to the belief that the voluntary system was not necessary?—Yes; I am against the military system as a

- whole, whether as applied to this or any other country.

 50. Then that applies to voluntary system too?—Yes.

 51. Mr. Russell.] When the rations were cut down to half, was the food sufficient to maintain a healthy, active young man in physical condition?—No. I asked Lieutenant MacDonald, "Do you consider this food sufficient? it is not sufficient for growing boys"; and he turned to the sergeant-major and said, "As soon as you see these men begin to go down fetch the doctor."
- 52. When you received full rations were you satisfied so far as your physical conditions was concerned ?-Oh, yes.

53. You received enough then?—Yes.
54. When you were actually brought before Mr. Bailey, the Stipendiary Magistrate, was the charge the same charge for which Lieutenant MacDonald had previously sentenced you?-No, I have only been brought up before a Magistrate once; that was for refusal to drill; the offence of refusing to carry coal was not brought up before a Magistrate.

55. The actual charges?—Were that we disobeyed the commands of Bombardier Moir by

refusing to drill and clean armaments.

- 56. In that case you were brought before the civil authority for an offence committed before the law. When the Court started did you or anybody on your behalf ask the Magistrate for an adjournment of the case in order that you might get a counsel?—Yes.
 - 57. The Magistrate's reply was this: that you did not want legal advice as you were guilty? −Yes.
- 58. Then he refused you the ordinary right of being represented by counsel before the trial took place?—Yes.

59. Then the evidence was called: was the evidence on oath?—Yes, I think so.

- 60. Then, did the Magistrate subsequently, after he had sentenced you, say you could obtain a solicitor?—Yes; he said, "You can get a solicitor by writing."
- 61. Was that meant for any future sentence or for any particular charge?-Well, there was no offence standing against us then.
 - 62. Then he meant, in future?—I should say so. 63. What notice did you get?—None whatever.

64. Marched straight into the Court?—Yes; that is, twelve of us.

65. Suppose war was declared between Britain and another Power and New Zealand was in danger and the Militia were called out under the authority of the Defence Act, and that every