

that, when they were the original reports and statements you submitted at the time?—Do you say I had the originals?

110. You say so yourself?—One of them.

111. Are you able to say if any of these other documents are the originals?—One of them, I presume.

112. You are quite sure of that. We may take it that the report of the 28th April, 1883, which you have read, is the only original document?—Yes.

113. And these others are copies?—They may or they may not be. I always take a copy of my evidence exactly as submitted to my superior officers.

114. Was it not your duty to return this original document to the office?—Well, it might have got mixed up with the various papers, but not in the way of thieving it.

115. Are not these documents originals; are not these marks I would put in the margin to attract attention? Are these marks yours?—I cannot say. That might be some idea that struck me. I would underline them to make a note of any particular point I thought might be of advantage.

116. You say you kept copies of all these reports; did you keep a copy of this complaint of yours, dated the 25th March, 1883, against Sergeant Moore?—I believe I have a copy.

117. Have you got a copy?—I really cannot say at the present time. It is possible I have a copy somewhere.

118. You have not it at hand?—No.

119. You say you thought I had a “down” on you at the time you were discharged?—Well, I did not stand very friendly with you for reasons which are well known, and which I am in a position to prove.

120. What are they?—I had reported Inspector Hickson; and my action against Inspector Hickson followed me up to Christchurch. I was put there to be slaughtered.

121. You would scarcely believe that I wrote rather favourably of you at the time you refused duty?—It is possible that you did.

121A. I wrote in regard to you as follows: “The ex-constable is a man of very nervous excitable temperament. Since I took charge of the district he has been very often on the sick-list. It appears his wife has also been ailing for some time; and I understand he had a great deal of anxiety and trouble for months prior to his discharge. His long service, and his willingness and zeal at times in the discharge of his duties, covered many of his faults and peculiarities.” Does that surprise you now?—No, it does not.

122. You thought I would write that, although I had a “down” on you?—You wrote what was consistent and true; and I wish to thank you for the good opinion that you put at the bottom of that report.

123. Probably had you known I had written that you would never have brought up this charge?—I have not made the charge vindictively.

124. *Colonel Pitt.* Can you say roughly how many inquiries concerning yourself or concerning charges made by you have been held during the time you were in the Force or out of it?—The first inquiry was held in Queenstown, in 1883, and there was one at Waipawa.

125. Have these inquiries resulted in your favour or against you?—I never heard the result of the inquiry that took place before Inspector Broham in 1881. I was transferred to Christchurch, and got promotion the wrong way—namely, dismantled, and placed on the streets.

126. Who was the Crown Prosecutor in Mrs. Boyd’s case?—Mr. Duncan.

127. Well now, I want you to listen to what I say, and answer straight. I am quoting from some papers connected with you, and from a memorandum in Sir George Whitmore’s handwriting on the 19th June, 1886: “Lastly, at a trial Judge Johnston told the jury that if they acquitted the prisoner it amounted to stating that Constable Neale had committed wilful and corrupt perjury. They did so acquit the prisoner, and the Judge communicated with the department, and Neale was thereupon dismissed.” Is that true?—It is false.

128. Was it true that Judge Johnston told the jury what I read?—It is the first time I heard of it.

129. Is it the first time you have heard the Judge’s remarks?—Yes.

130. Do you know that he made this statement in regard to the jury?—I do not know.

131. *Mr. Tunbridge.* What was the object of withdrawing yourself from further duty in Christchurch?—After running these two cases conjointly, I was dissatisfied at seeing matters so barefacedly put on one side; my important witnesses being withheld, and no inquiry held by the Inspector in regard to Wood’s statement. There was also the stigma cast upon me by the man Stinson.

132. Was it in consequence of annoyance you felt, owing to these two cases not going the way you thought they would?—I found I had been entrapped. I found there was no earthly use stopping in the department, and that my capabilities, which I have proved since I left the department, were no use in the New Zealand Police Department, and that the sooner I severed my connection with them the better it would be for myself and the department.

133. Notwithstanding your disgust, and so on, you were very soon afterwards endeavouring to get back into the Police Force again?—In 1883, I petitioned the House, and my petition was shelved. The following year I corresponded with the late Mr. Turnbull, and Mr. W. C. Smith, in reference to presenting my petition the following year. A change of Government had taken place in 1883, and the Liberal Government came into power, and Mr. Turnbull was a great Liberal, and Mr. Smith also. I got a letter, which I have not here, informing me that it would be no earthly use my going any further into these cases; and the following year (1885) I came down for the purpose of presenting a petition again. Mr. W. C. Smith, having presented my petition in the first instance, consulted with me, and told me that he thought I had better get into the department again. I made