

form of physical exercise. He makes it quite clear that his whole squad was refusing duty and that fairly vigorous measures were necessary to restore order.

An operation at the hospital was successful, and Moormeister has since been a competitor in sports such as high-jump competition, and in gymnastics, and is recognized as a swimming champion.

Major Matheson has explained his part in transactions with Moormeister, and I am satisfied that he was in no way to blame for the accident which led to the rupture becoming worse, and that he has done no more than was necessary to bring Moormeister to a condition of discipline. I do not think it necessary to discuss in detail the very lengthy evidence relating to this case.

There are other men who make complaint as to this urine parade, but I cannot go at length into these cases. Major Matheson describes the disciplinary measures enforced in these and similar cases, consisting merely of physical drill. This was the more necessary, as at the urine parade, the details of which need not be narrated, there were manifest signs of insubordination. The whole story has been worked up to a state of exaggerated importance, and successive witnesses have in this connection, and otherwise, made an exaggerated grievance out of the physical drill. Major Matheson has said on more than one occasion that he subjected no man to any physical drill in which he did not take part himself.

W. Otting is a typical case of a man who complains at great length of being compelled to do physical exercise. His evidence was given at inordinate length. His description of the exercise, given in an aggrieved tone, describes nothing but what I consider quite proper disciplinary treatment—in fact, treatment suitable for schoolboys. He had been locked up for cheering the insubordinate men when they left by the steamer to go to the detention barracks. He complained that he was punished for this while a man who was with him was not; or, as it was more correctly put, “I was caught and he was not.” His grievance ended here so far as Somes Island was concerned. He never offended again, and has spent all these years on perfectly good terms with the Commandant and camp officials. It seems a pity that the case should have been brought up again after so long an interval of harmony.

At one period of his disciplinary treatment this man defied those about him to shoot him, but his is a case in which discipline has proved effectual. If others had taken their punishment in the same spirit this inquiry would have been much shorter. I do not think it was necessary to have brought him before me.

At a later stage he had to be sent to the Wellington Hospital for an operation for appendicitis, which was quite successful. He says that he was there treated with great kindness, but he objects to sentries standing at the door of the ward with rifles. More than one witness made this complaint, but it is ridiculous to expect me to interfere with military precautions of this sort. A good deal of time was wasted over this sort of criticism. This man was offended at hearing the way in which a nurse talked of the sinking of the “Lusitania,” then a recent event, and was glad to get back to the island. I should not have referred to this case but as an illustration of the way in which the complaints have been overloaded—so overloaded, in fact, that I have a difficulty in determining, among the mass of recorded matter, which calls for special reference.

Heinrich Petersen, better known in the camp by his *alias*, “Charles Johnson,” or his nickname, “German Charlie”: I only mention this man at this stage, without reference to chronological order, as illustrating a feature of this inquiry. I made known that I would not shut out any complaint. This man had put in his in writing. He complained of having lost some property. He also made complaints of ill treatment, principally against men who are not here to answer.

Orally he complained that Major Matheson had defamed him by speaking of him as a criminal. He is a hawker, and had in fact a string of convictions against him, including one for vagrancy, which Judges and Magistrates in this country consider a bad mark. I consider this man unworthy of credit, and would not act on his uncorroborated testimony. At a later date he returned to the hall and wished to open up some new story. This I declined to hear. Major Matheson says, “This man was permitted to go to Wellington on the 14th June, 1916. He was charged with behaving very violently and using filthy language. He was tried by