FRIDAY, 27TH MAY, 1898.

The Commission sat at 10 o'clock a.m. Present: Messrs. Wardell, Poynton, and Colonel Pitt.

The minutes of the previous meeting read and confirmed.
Colonel Hume, Mr. Tunbridge, and Mr. T. E. Taylor, M.H.R., were in attendance.

Charge of Mr. Taylor against Inspector Emerson:—Mr. Cresswell, solicitor, appeared for Inspector Emerson. The following witnesses attended, and each being sworn, gave evidence, which was taken down by the reporter, viz.: John Nesbitt, wool-buyer, Gisborne; evidence, which was taken down by the reporter, viz.: John Nesbitt, wool-buyer, Gisborne; George Heslop, J.P., farmer, Woodville; William Wood Fullbrook, gardener, Napier; James Taylor, J.P., farmer, Woodville; James Buckman Elms Herd, foreman, fellmongery, Toamoana; Francis J.P., farmer, Woodville; James Buckman Elms Herd, foreman, fellmongery, Toamoana; Francis J.P., farmer, Woodville; Forbes, hotel employé, Napier: Horace, Baker, surveyor and Logan, solicitor, Napier; Frederick Forbes, hotel employé, Napier; Horace Baker, surveyor and land agent, Napier; William James Grundy, draper, Napier; John Ferguson Jardine, commission agent, Napier; Charles Philip Lound, Secretary Working-men's Club, Napier; Patrick Black, Sergeant of Police, Gisborne.

General Efficiency of the Force: -Patrick Black, Sergeant of Police, Gisborne, attended, was

sworn, and gave evidence, which was taken down by the reporter.

Charge of Mr. Taylor against Inspector Emerson: - The following witnesses attended, and each being sworn gave evidence, which was taken down by the reporter, viz: Agnes Patton Moore, formerly Fullbrook, Napier; Thomas Charles Moore, medical practitioner, Napier; Annie Parkinson, widow, Napier; James Smith, mounted police-constable, Gisborne.

Complaint of Harry Bryans Thompson against Constable Brosnahan:—When the charge was called on Constable Brosnahan was in attendance, but there being no appearance of the complainant, the complaint lapsed. Constable Brosnahan asked the Commission to examine certain papers under which the license was held, and which would explain his position

At 5.15 p.m. the Commission adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. to-morrow.

SATURDAY, 28TH MAY, 1898.

The Commission sat at 10 o'clock a.m.

Present: Messrs. Wardell, Poynton, and Colonel Pitt.

The minutes of the previous meeting read and confirmed. Colonel Hume, Mr. Tunbridge, and Mr. T. E. Taylor, M.H.R., in attendance.

Complaint:—Harry Bryans Thompson appeared, and, in answer to a question by the Chairman, desired that the whole of his charges be inquired into. The Chairman informed him that the Commission decided that the only one that came within the scope of the Commission was the charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan, of allowing the Railway Refreshment-room at Charge preferred against Constable Brosnahan and Charge to him that this was no breach of the law, as the terms of the contract under which the licensee had the rooms permitted it. Mr. Thompson then desired to make charges against Mr. Tunbridge, Commissioner of Police, which the Commission refused to accept, as they had not been lodged within the required time, viz., twenty-four hours after the opening of the Commission at Napier.

Charge of Mr. T. E. Taylor against Inspector Emerson: -The following witnesses attended, onarge of Mr. 1. E. Laylor against Inspector Emerson:—Ine ionowing witnesses attended, and, each being sworn, gave evidence, which was taken down by the reporter—viz., William James Grundy (recalled), Charles Philip Lound (recalled), Mary Elizabeth Tanner, wife of William Tanner, Napier; Henry John Holder, president, Working-men's Club, Napier; Charles Philip Tound (recalled); Frederick Badley, merchant, Dannevirke; and Simon Lindsay Flyger, baker, Napier.

At 12 o'clock noon the Commission adjourned until Monday next.

Monday, 30th May, 1898.

The Commission sat at 10 o'clock a.m.

Present: Messrs. Wardell, Poynton, and Colonel Pitt.

The minutes of the previous meeting read and confirmed.
Colonel Hume, Mr. Tunbridge, and Mr. T. E. Taylor, M.H.R., were in attendance.

Complaint of Mr. T. E. Taylor against Inspector Emerson:—The following witnesses attended, Complaint of Mr. T. E. Taylor against Inspector Emerson:—The following witnesses attended, and, each being sworn, gave evidence, which was taken down by the reporter: Arthur James Cotterill, solicitor, Napier; John Ferguson Jardine, commission agent, Napier; George Henry Cwan, Mayor of Napier; Thomas Harvey, police-constable, Napier; James Siddells, sergeant of Swan, Mayor of Napier; Thomas Reidy, carpenter, Napier; Anne Panton, wife of James Panton, police, Dannevirke: Thomas Reidy, carpenter, Napier; Anne Panton, wife of James Panton, baker, Napier; Barrett Rutledge, constable, Taradale; Alfred James Mitchell, sergeant of police, Napier; Russell Beecham, commission agent, Napier; Alfred Thornton Danvers, veterinary surgeon, Hastings

During the examination of Thomas Reidy, carpenter, the witness refused to answer certain questions put to him by the Chairman, and, after being duly cautioned of the consequence of such refusal, and the witness still refusing to answer the questions put to him, the Commission ordered the said Thomas Reidy to forfeit the sum of £10, and directed Edward William Kane, the secretary to the Commission, to proceed to recover the same in manner by law provided.