

14. When did you first complain about this?—I first petitioned Parliament in 1883.

15. *Colonel Pitt.*] Was this matter about Wood referred to in your petition to Parliament in 1883?—In my petition to the House in 1883 was one item, “suppressing a charge of murder at Christchurch.”

16. *The Chairman.*] Now, have you given us the whole of your allegation with respect to Inspector Pender’s conduct in this matter, so far as it is within your own personal knowledge; that is to say, he conducted the case, he had the list of witnesses, he had particulars of the evidence they were able to give and did not call them?—Yes.

17. You say you have a copy of that evidence?—Yes.

18. But we decline to receive it on the ground that the originals probably are in existence; do you wish the originals produced?—Decidedly I do.

19. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you take these statements referred to in the evidence from the witnesses themselves?—Yes.

20. *Inspector Pender.*] Where do you come from now?—Napier.

21. What are you doing there?—Keeping a boarding-house.

22. When did you come down?—Last Tuesday evening.

23. For the purpose of making this charge against me?—I presented a petition last session to the House, through Mr. R. D. D. McLean, M.H.R.

24. Will you swear you ever mentioned my name in that petition?—I applied for an inquiry before the Royal Commission if it was appointed. The Petitions Committee granted my application under certain conditions.

25. Was my name mentioned in the petition of 1883?—It was mentioned in 1883. I believe I said Inspector Pender, or the Inspector of Police, or the police, had suppressed evidence.

26. You came down for the purpose of bringing this charge against me?—I came down to have the whole of these matters investigated. I have been debarred by the Commission from doing so, and confined solely to one particular charge.

27. Then, you did not come down for the purpose of preferring a charge against me?—I came down expressly for the purpose of preferring a charge against you and others.

28. What motive have you in making a charge against me after fifteen years?—It is not a question of length of time. I have already made a charge against you in 1883. I think that was a short time after the matter occurred; so I have not kept it in reserve.

29. What motive have you in coming down and making a charge against me after a lapse of fifteen years?—Because I considered it was a public duty in the first instance. I would also like to mention, in connection with that question, that I also had a second consideration—that is, that I wanted justice to myself.

30. Did you consult with other people before you left Napier?—No; I consulted myself.

31. Nobody else?—No.

32. There is no one else prompting you?—None whatever. I never consulted a soul in connection with this matter.

33. Is there no one else prompting you to come down here and spend your time for the purpose of performing a public duty?—No; but I know what you want to know, and I will tell you what I did do. When I saw Mr. Taylor coming forward in the way he did, I wrote to him, because I considered it my duty to do so, and I informed him of the case. Mr. Taylor returned the papers to me.

34. Mr. Taylor would have nothing whatever to do with you?—He returned the papers and left the matter with me.

35. You have been very unfortunate while in the Police Force; I believe you were almost continually having rows and charging your officers and non-commissioned officers with crimes of all sorts; is that a fact?—No; if it was so, it was purely done in doing my duty.

36. You first commenced in Invercargill, and charged the Inspector and sergeant there with some offence?—Rather. We have got all the particulars of this case.

37. And they preferred eight charges of insubordination against you?—Oh, he was always drunk.

38. And you were fined £3 15s.?—By a bogus inquiry I was. The case was never gone into, and that was my reason for petitioning the House in 1882 to have my case investigated.

39. Then you came up to Christchurch and got at loggerheads with the sergeants?—No.

40. Did you not report all the sergeants, and say they were working against you?—No.

41. You charged Moore with all sorts of offences?—Yes; and I have a case against him if I could go into it.

42. You also charged me with withholding evidence?—Yes; and with false representation, and obstructing me in the execution of my duty.

43. And the case was dismissed when it came into the Court?—Yes; and owing to your actions it was dismissed.

44. Will you swear I had anything to do with it?—You did not prosecute in the case of a violent assault committed by Barrett, a hotelkeeper, against another man.

45. Did not the man sue Barrett in the civil Court, where it was investigated and dismissed?—Yes, because ten big Irishmen swore positively that Barrett never committed the assault, although Barrett admitted to me having done so, and other witnesses had seen him do it. The case came before Mr. Beetham, and Mr. Beetham cautioned Barrett in connection with his actions.

46. You swore just now you never made any complaint about the police at Christchurch?—I did not say that.

47. Did you write this: “Constable George Neale, No. 1553, respectfully requests Inspector Pender will forward this the constable’s application to the Commissioner of Constabulary, Wellington, for a police inquiry into the obstruction on the part of the police at Christchurch in the violent