

42. Constable Williams was examined at the various inquiries held by me, was he not?—Yes.

43. After the pitiable exhibition he made of himself there, do you say you could place any reliance on what that man might say in the future?—Oh, yes, I would.

44. Did he, in the cases under examination, produce documents and memoranda which he stated he had made months before, but which were proved conclusively to have been made on the eve of the inquiry?

*Mr. Hall*: What cases were these?

*Commissioner Tunbridge*.] The cases against the other constables.

*Witness*: I am astonished at Commissioner Tunbridge saying that. I had the documents considerably before the inquiry, and sent them on to him.

45. *Commissioner Tunbridge*: I do not mean just before my inquiry, but when the matter cropped up?—I thought you meant your own inquiry.

46. I will put my question again. Did Constable Williams not produce reports and memoranda which he alleged—of course, he was not on oath, because I had no power to put him on oath—he had made at the time of the occurrences many months before, but which were practically proved to have been made at about the time when you first approached him to give your information?—I say, emphatically, No. They were proved to have been made, or additions to them, subsequent to the time he referred to. They showed on the face of them that they were not made on the eve of the inquiry. They might have been made the day after the occurrence for all I know.

47. I have here a memorandum-book of the constable's. Do you see this book, containing an entry dated the 18th July, 1901?—Yes.

48. When did we hold the inquiry—in March, 1902?—Yes.

49. That is eight months, is it not, afterwards?—About that.

50. Now, here is a report purporting to be made on what date?—18th July, 1901.

51. Will you look at the entry which precedes that report and read it, or I will read it if you like. The entry in the book preceding the one purporting to be made on the 18th July, 1901, reads as follows: "C. Remnant, driver for Neil and Hannah, Vanguard Street"?—Yes.

52. Do you remember instructing this man to go and find C. Remnant, driver for Neil and Hannah, the day before?—I am not sure whether I sent him then, or on the former occasion.

53. A day or two before?—Yes, but I think I sent him for the same man on a former occasion; but I would not be sure.

54. Not in July, 1901?—No, certainly not.

55. When you were there on a former occasion it was March, 1902?—No; it was February.

56. Do you wish the Committee to believe that the report dated the 18th July, 1901, entered in this book was made subsequent or prior to this "C. Remnant" entry?—I do not know when it was done. I think it possible, although I do not suggest it, that the entry was made afterwards. This might have been the entry.

57. I will read the entry preceding that: "Joseph. John Baker, of Tibby Street, did ride a bicycle on the footpath in Waimea Road at 12.10 midday on the 22nd January, 1902." That entry is there, is it not?—Yes; but I was not aware of that. I never saw it except with you at the inquiry, and this was not referred to then.

58. It was produced?—You put it as if doubting my veracity. I do not dispute anything in it.

59. Now, will you read the book back from that entry, or, if you like, I will. The preceding entry in the book is that Thomas Walker, Russell Street, Nelson, did ride a bicycle without a light on the 2—Yes.

60. Another entry is dated 10.30 p.m. on the 18th January, 1902; another on the 25th February, 1902; and another on the 21st January?—Yes.

61. Now, is it reasonable to suppose that this entry of the 18th July, 1901, was made in this book in the position in which you now see it in July, 1901, although all these entries occur earlier in the book?—No; but I was not aware of that before. I never saw the book except at the inquiry.

62. Is it not a fact that a constable did, as I say, produce this and other documents as having been made at the time, but which practically proved themselves to have been made long subsequently?—He certainly produced that, and did say so.

63. Have you any doubt at all?—No, I have no doubt at all.

64. Did not the constable admit it?—He did.

65. That he produced false documents?—That book and another memoranda, and, if I remember correctly, a report too.

66. Those are two police officers who were called as witnesses against Burrell, Durbridge, Kemp, McGrath, and Sergeant Mackay, are they not?—That is so.

67. Knowing what you now know, do you think it would be safe for me or this Committee to inflict punishment upon any person on their uncorroborated statements?—No.

68. I will go back to the charges, which have not been properly explained. You were placed at a disadvantage yesterday, and I wish to put you right in that respect?—I have no desire to say anything but what is true. I must say, however, that I was not aware of the contents of that book before. I know that the constable admitted that an entry which he maintained was made long before was made subsequent to that; but I did not see anything before or after the one entry. Of course, I concluded that it was so when he admitted it. I might say that he was bowled out by you.

69. You did not succeed in bowling him out?—No; but probably the reason for that was that I did not hold the inquiry. Another man was also found to have made a false statement, and that was Sergeant Mackay, and nothing was said about it.