

1373. Why did the Society not prosecute him?—It proceeded against him as far as the laws of the Order went. We expelled him the Order; but, before it is settled definitively, he may, within three months, appeal against the expulsion. That three months has not yet expired, but nearly so. *Mr. A. L. Sutton.*  
4th Oct., 1878.

1374. Has he appealed, so far?—No; he has given no notice of appeal whatever.

1375. Was anything said in the Lodge or out of the Lodge about the burning of documents?—That was in connection with the district. I got one balance-sheet half burned, and I have it now in my possession.

1376. How did you get possession of it?—I got it out of the office where the fire had occurred. It was the balance-sheet of last quarter, and I wanted it in order to bring over the balance of last quarter into the next quarter. One side of the paper was almost burned away, but I just managed to see what the balances were.

1377. How did you get possession of it?—I went to him and demanded it of him in my capacity as Secretary. I wrote to him, as well, about the matter. I had very great difficulty in getting documents from him: indeed, I have not got them all now. He would give me one or two things at a time, and promised to turn up others that I have wanted; but he has not yet turned all up that are wanting.

1378. Did he ever say anything to you about the fire?—No; I never asked him about that because it was well known all over the place.

1379. What was well known all over the place?—The circumstances of the fire in his place.

1380. What were the circumstances?—Well, it looked very suspicious in the mind of a great many people.

1381. Do you know why he was not prosecuted in connection with the fire?—No. To my mind he ought to have been prosecuted; but it was hushed up.

1382. Who hushed it up?—I cannot say; the affair was got over somehow.

1383. Have you any idea who hushed it up?—I cannot say; it evidently was worked. To my mind he ought to have been prosecuted.

1384. *Mr. Swanson.*] Did you make any report to the Police that the cash was correct?—No. I did not know how far the cash was wrong. It takes a long time to find out these sort of things. We have not found out all yet, and very likely we shall find more. He has always paid the money when deficiencies have been discovered.

1385. Did you ever state to the Police that they need not trouble about it, because the money was all right?—No.

1386. Did the Inspector ever ask you any question about the money?—No; nobody in the police ever came to me, that I recollect.

1387. Do you know whether they asked any other officer?—I do not. They would come to me; all information should come through me, as secretary of the lodge.

1388. The police never communicated with you on the subject?—No; the police never came to me. Quinn was also district secretary; and I may say that, at the very time that this place was burned down, there was a district meeting, and he had to find a large cheque to make up deficiencies in the district funds. The police may have gone afterwards to the district secretary—a man named Knapp.

1389. *Hon. Mr. Fox.*] Is it not the case that the very night on which this fire occurred Quinn was to have been at a meeting, and to have rendered certain accounts as district secretary?—Well, the meeting was close on. I do not know whether it was that night; but there was a district meeting about that time, and the delegates had assembled, and he did not meet them. He ought to have been there, but he would not meet them, because he was tipsy. I believe he had no balance-sheet prepared for the district, and that they had to adjourn the meeting for about a month, so as to look into the district accounts; and a temporary secretary was appointed for that purpose.

1390. Did you ever hear that a sum of £300 was short?—I did not hear that the precise sum of £300 was short.

THOMAS CHARLES COLEMAN, Nightwatchman at the Club, being duly sworn, was examined.

1391. Do you remember a man named Vitey being arrested by the police?—Yes; I was present when he was arrested, but not when the offence for which he was arrested took place.

1392. What was he arrested for?—It was said that he had used insulting language to some females in the street.

1393. Who was Vitey?—He was a tall Frenchman.

1394. Can you state the date on which this occurred?—No, I cannot; but remember that it was on a Sunday evening about half-past 10—it was on the 23rd April.

1395. Well, what occurred?—I was passing down near Mr. Moss's shop on Lambton Quay one Sunday evening, after I had done in the kitchen (I was at that time cook in the police lock-up). I heard a row and looked round and saw one or two men running along Grey Street. I ran also. When I got to the Pier I found these men—Vitey was on the ground, and that McWilliams was over him, endeavouring to get him to the station. He called me to give him some help. Vitey was trying to get up, and said it was cowardly to hit a man when he was down.

1396. Was not McWilliams hitting him?—He did not hit him in my presence. We took him along as far as the New Zealand Shipping Company's Office, and tried to put the handcuffs on, but we could not. McWilliams called me a bloody fool, and said I must go and get more help: that I had better go to the station for help. There were a number around now, and they began to hiss us.

1397. Why?—I suppose it was because of the manner in which McWilliams was treating the man.

1398. Was he unnecessarily rough?—He was a big man, and Vitey said if he was allowed to stand he would go anywhere he was wanted to go. The constable said no; he knew him of old, and he was not going to let him up.

1399. What did McWilliams endeavour to do then with the man?—He was dragging him along by the back of the neck.

1400. What did you do?—Well, I helped McWilliams as much as possible; but I did not wish to

*Mr. T. C. Coleman.*

4th Oct., 1878.