

*Mr. Monaghan.* 2049. That is all?—That is all, at any time. May I say, I think this conduct of Mr. Barton's very strange.

18th Oct., 1878.

2050. *The Chairman.*] How?—I complain that, during the time he was holding forth in the theatre, making a speech there, he imputed things to me which I have never had a chance of denying. He imputed things to me indirectly. No person could mistake what was meant, but they were not sufficiently direct to enable me to take proceedings in a Court of law, else I should have had him in the Supreme Court before this. They were charges of cruelty against a person lately in the force, and in a position of authority. That could only mean me. I say that such a charge was totally unfounded, and it was unfair that such imputation should be cast upon me.

2051. *Mr. Swanson.*] You say you felt this to be a charge against you?—I do.

2052. Well, will you explain how the injury to your character can be remedied in the lobbies? Do you think that is the proper place in which to get it put right?—I think I have as much right in the lobbies as Farrell, or Mr. Barton, or his son. Farrell is there now.

2053. Are you aware that Farrell has not been here unless sent for?—No, I am not aware of that.

2054. Will you explain how your character can be defended in the lobbies?—I do not know about being defended, but I am here in case I should be wanted.

*Mr. E. L. Barton.*

Mr. ELLIOTT L'ESTRANGE BARTON, being duly sworn, was re-examined.

18th Oct., 1878.

2055. *The Chairman.*] Have you any evidence to give with regard to alleged intimidation of witnesses?—Yes. The morning before Kells was called he was waiting in the lobby, and I saw Monaghan and another policeman talking to him for some time. The Committee adjourned without calling Kells. I know Monaghan was talking to him about his evidence, as I afterwards met Kells, and asked him were the police talking to him about his evidence. He said, "Yes," and that he had told Monaghan what he had to say about a man's wrists being bruised by handcuffs in the lockup, and that Monaghan had suggested it might have been done by a rope, and not by handcuffs. Besides Kells, I have seen Monaghan talking to other witnesses in the lobby, every time I have been up here almost.

*Inspector Atchison.*

TUESDAY, 22ND OCTOBER, 1878.

Inspector ATCHISON, being duly sworn, was re-examined.

22nd Oct., 1878.

2056. *The Chairman.*] There was evidence given us the other day by Mr. McIntyre, baker, of Tory Street, and we have called you to tell you what evidence he gave us, and to ask you whether you wish to make any statement about it. He complains that a man forged his name?—I know the case well.

2057. He complains that you refused to prosecute this man; and that, even after, at his instigation, a warrant was issued, you refused to execute it, and he had to arrest the man himself, and the man was convicted?—Yes, he was.

2058. He says he had to prosecute to a conviction himself—had, at his own expense, to employ a lawyer. We have called you to ask you whether you wish to make any statement with regard to the matter?—I do. It is about two years ago, I think. McIntyre came to me one morning and said, "I have a case of forgery." I said, "All right, where is it?" and he showed me a notice of a dishonoured bill with his name attached to it. He said, "It is a forgery; I never signed any bill." I said, "Have you paid it?" He said, "No." Then I found it was some loan office which had discounted the bill, and I said that no steps could be taken until I had before me the original document, so as to see if there had been any forgery. I thought he was labouring under some misapprehension. He seemed to be greatly excited, and I said, "Before you run yourself into litigation, you had better consult a solicitor." I asked, "Have you got the original document?" He replied he had not; and I asked him how he could expect me to get it, or take steps without that information. If there had been any forgery, then the person who had suffered—the money-lender, in this instance—should be the person to take steps in the matter.

2059. Did he not tell you the money-lender would not prosecute?—No. I thought at the time he had got a wrong idea in his head, and I was anxious to prevent him running himself into litigation, and therefore I suggested he should consult a solicitor. Afterwards he pointed the man out, and I had him arrested. He went to Mr. Buckley; and I hear he had great difficulty in getting Harris to come forward and assist to prosecute.

2060. Is it not the duty of the police to look after the matter of getting up prosecutions?—I tried, but could not get anything from him.

2061. From whom?—From McIntyre.

2062. Did he not tell you who had the document?—No.

2063. Did you advise him that, as he had lost no money, he had better let the thing alone?—I said, "Would it not be better for Harris to prosecute?"

2064. When the warrant was issued did you refuse to execute it?—Certainly not. The man was about the Courthouse, and he was arrested. Cook, I may say, was a perfect stranger to me.

2065. Did you tell Mr. Crawford that, as McIntyre would not take your advice, you washed your hands of the whole matter?—I do not know. I cannot say that I did. I know the man was pointed out somewhere near the place, and I called a constable and told him to take the man in charge. I did not want to see McIntyre run his head against a brick wall.

2066. But the man has been convicted?—Yes; after a good deal of trouble Mr. Buckley got the original document from the loan office. The loan agents have an objection to come into Court, because they know that, before they discount a bill, it is a very easy thing to find out if the signatures are genuine. It would have been easy for him to have gone up and asked McIntyre, "Is this your signature?"

2067. Of course it is a very serious thing for a man to have his name forged. This man tells us