

reasonably account for the parties to the marriage having entered the church by the back way rather than by the front way, solely for the purpose of avoiding him, seeing that he had threatened to do them harm. I also explained to Mr. Stuck at that interview that with such material as was then available it would be simply absurd for me to do as he desired—have a charge preferred, and a criminal charge at that—against the dean: that we could not reasonably hope for a conviction without evidence to sustain the charge. I now say that Mr. Stuck, in reply to that, said—I am not giving his exact words, but the gist of it—that it did not concern him so much as that he was determined to show the dean up. I then replied, “Very well; I am not going to be a party to assist you to show any person up,” and suggested to him that if he was so determined to have proceedings taken all he had to do was to lay an information with the Clerk of the Court—the channel equally open to him as to the police. Mr. Stuck left the office very much displeased with me because I would not promise him I would have proceedings taken. He was very angry with me, and I took every care to explain my inability to comply with his request. I took special pains to satisfy him that it was not a case of want of will, but that it would be absurd to do so in the absence of reasonable evidence. He called at the station a third time at the interval of a day or two in order to again ask me if I could reconsider the matter and take action against the dean. He was very determined and persistent that, whether evidence was forthcoming or not, proceedings must be taken against the dean. I said I had done all I could for him, and that I would not take any action, and if he was not satisfied with me why did he not go to a solicitor? In great anger he left the office, and I have reason to believe the next day or two saw the late Mr. Macdonald, explained the whole matter to him, told him what I said, and that Mr. Macdonald said, “Doubtless the Inspector has given you good advice; if evidence is not forthcoming, how can you hope to sustain the charge?” Later on I received a letter from the Commissioner, addressed to the Minister of Justice, signed by Mr. Stuck, setting forth fully his complaint, which was minuted to me for inquiry and report. The whole of the file in the office was attached to the correspondence, and returned to the Commissioner. I heard nothing more about it. Mr. Stuck has told the Court he received a reply. The train that left here at 10.10 in the morning connects with the train leaving Gore at 1.3 in the afternoon, and the mere fact of persons travelling by the train from Gore at 1.3 affords little or no evidence as to the train they left Invercargill by: it might have been either by the 7 or 10.10 train. I explained this to Mr. Stuck when he suggested I should see the guard in charge of the Gore-Lumsden train, and showed that it would be idle to get a statement from him. I say now, without the slightest fear of contradiction, I did everything I could to try and satisfy Mr. Stuck, but unless I was prepared to lay an information of a criminal nature against the dean I failed to do so.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Was any statement obtained from the dean?—Yes, I have a copy here. It is to the effect that the marriage took place about 8 o'clock.

2. And that was corroborated by the two witnesses and the contracting parties?—Yes. One point I omitted to mention. Mr. Stuck emphatically says he saw me enter the gate of the presbytery on some occasion while inquiries were in progress. I say on oath (though I do not accuse him of deliberately trying to mislead the Court) that until within the last three months I have never been in the presbytery in my life.

3. *Mr. Stuck.*] Why was not Mrs. Boyle examined? She will not deny it if brought before the Court?—The detective had full power to make inquiry. His instructions were to make a full inquiry, and when I received the statement of Mr. Boyle and the two witnesses I did not think it necessary to get hers as well.

*Witness:* I desire to supplement the evidence I gave yesterday. With regard to clerical staffs, I do not wish any inconsistency to appear in the evidence I gave. In regard to the Commissioner's office, I am of opinion (it is not a matter of complaint, but I am making a suggestion) that the service would benefit as a whole if the staff in that office ceased to have police rank. I think whilst grades are to be admitted on the clerical staff necessarily the result is that these men must be competing with men outside engaged in general police duty. My opinion is that this competition is unfair to the men doing every-day uniform duty, and I would suggest that a clerical staff should be provided for by a grade of its own, separate and distinct from the other branches of the police. For instance, though I said I thought all district clerks should be sergeants, I explained my opinion by saying that if one district clerk is to have the rank of sergeant then all should, as the duties performed by each are on the same lines. But I would suggest in preference to that that they should be put outside the pale of the grades and ranks of the service, and so avoid being brought into competition with other members of the Force. A man who has been a number of years doing clerical duty only could not at a moment's notice be sent into the street to compete with men engaged on police work all the time. With regard to Chief Detectives being eligible for promotion to higher grades, I gave the opinion yesterday that they should be, and I still think so; but I wish to qualify it to this extent: The duty performed by Chief Detectives is very different from that of the ordinary police, and they have a different experience as regards the supervision of men from uniform sergeants and station sergeants. Far more care, therefore, is necessary in the selection of a Chief Detective for the grade of Sub-Inspector than in the selection of a station sergeant for the same position.

4. *The Commissioner.*] The crux of the matter is as regards the question of discipline. A man who has been many years in the detective branch of the service must prove to be sufficiently a disciplinarian to qualify for the higher rank—effective discipline is absolutely necessary in the interests of the Force?—Yes, in dealing with his qualifications I include particularly the element of discipline; and I say the same in regard to the Commissioner's office. It is subversive of discipline for a Sub-Inspector to occupy the position of the Commissioner during his absence.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How many of the present Inspectors have been district clerks at one time?—Three, so far as I know. Inspectors Ellison, Wilson, and myself.