

70. You are familiar with Regulation No. 2, are you not?—I have not the book here, but I have no doubt looked at the regulation.

71. Surely you are familiar with it, because it regulates your duty a great deal as an Inspector in the Force. Here is the book. [Regulations handed to witness]?—Yes, I know the regulation.

72. I will read the regulation: "An Inspector in charge of a district may inflict a fine not exceeding £1, or loss of seniority six steps, upon any constable guilty of misconduct," and so it goes on; but that is the point I wish to call attention to. You did not hold any inquiry under that regulation?—No.

73. You had power to do so?—Yes.

74. Then, perhaps you will explain why you did not do so?—My reason for not doing so was that there were so many complaints made, and I knew, from a previous inquiry, that there was a certain amount of feeling in Nelson against me, which led me to think that somebody else—an outside Magistrate, or some independent person—should hold the inquiry.

75. Did you formulate any charges against the police officers at all?—No.

76. Do you not think it was your duty to have done so?—No, I did not think so, because I considered that there should be further investigation. I told you that on the night you arrived in Nelson.

77. Never mind what you told me; that is not admissible here. You say that the reason why you did not hold the inquiry yourself was because feeling was running very high in Nelson, and there were so many charges?—Yes; and from my experience of a former inquiry that was held there.

78. Perhaps you would like an opportunity to give a little more explanation about your experience of the former inquiry. Do you mean that it was not held properly, or that the result was not satisfactory, or what?—No, I do not say that. I say that an attempt was made then to raise certain feeling in the place. That apparently was very successful, and went on again on this occasion.

79. That was a matter in which you alone were concerned—I had nothing to do with it?—Excuse me, you formulated the charges, and directed me to go on with them. I reported facts to you as stated to me, and you ordered me to lay certain charges. I believe I said in a telegram that I did not think they would succeed, and was told that if a police officer was not sober he was drunk. The telegrams can be produced.

80. You were not satisfied with the result of that inquiry, were you?—I never said so. I was not satisfied that justice was done; but that remark refers to many cases in my experience.

81. Well, now, with regard to the present cases, I formulated charges out of the report you sent me relating to breaches of discipline, did I not?—Yes.

82. And I inquired into those charges in your presence?—Yes.

83. You called all the witnesses you desired?—Yes; I was requested to act as prosecutor.

84. And you did so?—Yes.

85. What I mean is this: was the inquiry an exhaustive one?—Well, I did not think so.

86. In what way was it not exhaustive?—In many ways.

87. Will you tell the Committee in what way it was not?—It is very disagreeable for me to do it.

88. We shall have to put up with that?—I consider that I was not always treated properly there.

89. By whom?—By you.

90. I expected that answer; but, pray, do not have any diffidence, as far as I am concerned, because I have no power to punish you, and——?—That will not influence me one way or the other.

91. Then, do not have any diffidence about answering questions, as far as I am concerned?—When I found some of the constables to be telling untruths you told me, "Well, they are not on oath, and you cannot have them up for perjury in any way."

92. Quote an instance?—Yes; in Constable Kemp's case.

93. In what particular instance there?—I found him out to be telling an untruth in connection with one of the charges when he was giving evidence. You made the same reply in another man's case; you said, "Never mind what they said before, it is what they say now."

94. I understand now what you are referring to. Kindly allow me to put it in this way: The statements that these witnesses made who gave evidence in the presence of the accused, you say, differed from the statements they made to you?—Yes; but there was more than that in reference to Constable Kemp.

95. You say that I objected to your producing statements alleged to have been made to you as evidence against these men?—No, not as evidence; but in order to contradict them.

96. You mean that I objected when you attempted to test the credibility of the witnesses by producing statements previously made to you?—Yes; and to contradict them on those statements.

97. Did you not admit that those statements that you had in your pocket-book were not statements of the people at all, but mere answers to questions you put to them?—That is the usual way. Is not that exactly what is being done here now?

98. Both parties are together now; they were not in those cases. Do you not distinguish the difference between something you write down which a person is alleged to have said to you, not in the presence of the accused, but an *ex parte* statement—do you not distinguish the difference between a statement made under those circumstances and one made in the presence of the accused person?—I do.

99. Is it not a fact that what I objected to was this: your producing as evidence against these men some answers you had succeeded in getting from persons in reply to questions you put to them, not in the presence of the persons who were accused?—I was not making up anything.