

280. You say that any statements that you constantly assaulted people whom you had to arrest or interfere with is absolutely untrue?—I say it is absolutely untrue.

281. *Mr. Colvin.*] Is it possible for a constable to arrest a man who does not want to be arrested without being a little rough with him?—It is impossible. You must use the necessary force to arrest a man.

282. And I suppose a constable is only a human being himself?—Yes.

*Mr. Colvin.* And that if a man gives him a tap he is likely to resent it.

283. *The Chairman.*] Do you know a man by the name of Wilson Marmaduke Wilson?—I was inquiring into some stone-throwing there—

284. But do you know him?—No; I have not seen him myself.

285. Do you know Burns, Neave, Cox, and Simpson, or any of them?—I know all of them.

286. What is their general character?—Their general character is not much. They belong to the larrikin class of Waimea Road. I was inquiring into a stone-throwing case they were supposed to be guilty of.

287. You would say they were larrikins?—Yes, they are larrikins beyond any doubt.

288. You deny having used unnecessary violence or cruelty towards the young man Walker that you arrested over the Maungatapu?—I deny using any unnecessary violence, or anything of the sort, to the boy. We only used what force was necessary to secure his arrest.

289. Did you ask the lad from Canvastown what his name was?—I do not recollect that. I remember quite well asking him where he came from, because he said he came from Canvastown. I had never been over the range before.

290. Do you know if there is such a place?—I have not been there, but I believe there is.

291. *Mr. R. McKenzie.*] The man Remnant you describe as a "real bad egg"?—Yes.

292. Do you know anything against him?—I have already explained that on several occasions I have hunted the man away—

293. But is there anything in the police records of Nelson against him?—Not that I am aware of. I have not heard of him being charged with anything.

294. Is it customary with the Nelson police to take members of the public into custody and then let them go?—The man was not in custody. I took him under the light to see him and identify him.

295. Did you not say to him that he had to go to the station with you?—Yes.

296. Was not that taking him in charge?—No.

297. What was it, then?—It was taking the man to the light, to suit my own ends—to see who he was.

298. But did you not say that you let him go on the pleading of his wife?—Yes.

299. If you did not take him in charge how could you let him go?—I had the man with me at the time.

300. But you say that you let him go: how could you let him go if you did not have him in charge?—Then I say that we did have him in charge.

301. Well, then, I ask, is it customary with the Nelson police to take the public in charge and then let them go?—I have known of several occasions where men have been let go.

302. Do you know of anything against Cox, Neave, Burns, and Simpson?—Not more than that they are just street larrikins.

303. But you might apply the same terms to Mr. Maginnity and myself, we will say?—No; you have not been throwing stones, as these young men were.

304. Have you ever heard of any of them being charged with misconduct?—Yes; with stone-throwing, as I have already stated. I was inquiring into a stone-throwing case that they were accused of.

305. Were they punished for it?—No.

306. You could not prove it?—No.

307. Is this boy Burns one of the family of that name who live down at the Port?—I could not tell you.

308. What is his Christian name?—R. Burns.

309. In the case of Neave, you say that you could not prove the charge against him?—We could not prove the case against him of stone-throwing. But the boys were there before the window was broken, and immediately afterwards there were none of them about.

310. You have not been able to prove anything against them?—No.

311. So that they may be as respectable as any other boys in Nelson?—Yes.

312. I never heard of anything against Neave and Burns until you told us. I thought they were well-behaved lads?—I have had occasion to speak to them several times.

*Mr. Maginnity.* I proposed calling Mr. Graham as a witness, Mr. Chairman, and questioning him, but he will have the opportunity later on of giving evidence, and will know exactly upon what points his evidence will be desired—upon the general conduct of the police during the time over which the charges extend, and also with regard to one or two other matters, notably the character of the Postboy Hotel. We do not wish any reflection at all cast upon it from the mere accidental fact of the woman being there that night, because it is a perfectly respectable house. As I say, there are one or two other points on which Mr. Graham will be able to afford information to the Committee.