

116. You were the prosecutor, of course?—I was made prosecutor.

117. The punishment—a caution—may not seem very much; but does not a caution mean that there is a record placed on the defaulters' sheet of the person concerned?—Well, I always saw it done unless instructions were given to the contrary.

118. As a matter of fact, it is recorded here on the sergeant's defaulters' sheet [produced]?—Yes.

119. There it is: "Convicted of charge, and cautioned to be more careful in future"?—Yes.

120. In the case of a man of Sergeant Mackay's experience and record, including two instances of saving life, do you not consider that a caution entered on the sheet, which stands for all time against him, is a somewhat serious matter for him?—Yes, I do. The only point on which I differ from you on the matter is your view of not reporting the occurrence. If I were dealing with it I would make it stronger, but otherwise I have no fault to find with your decision in the matter. I would have made it a little stronger.

121. You do not mean the punishment?—No.

122. You mean the finding?—Yes. It was absolutely wrong, in my opinion, for him not to report.

123. You think the punishment is commensurate with the offence?—Yes. I would say that it was a fairly mild punishment. I would say it was mild under the circumstances, but a fair punishment.

124. You do not make any complaint that the punishment was not fairly commensurate to the offence?—No.

125. You know that Remnant himself had been convicted at the instance of Constable Burrell?—Yes; of leaving his cart unattended.

126. He had been hauled up and convicted?—Yes; he complained that another man who did the same thing was not prosecuted at all.

127. But is it not a fact that Remnant had been hauled up by one of the constables?—Yes.

128. Then, under these circumstances it is only fair to assume—and you, as a police officer, will know that this is so—that the man was not very kindly disposed towards the police?—Yes, towards a particular man; and especially if it were true that the same constable overlooked a similar offence committed by another person at the same time. I do not know whether it is true or not, but it would influence a man no doubt.

129. You remember the evidence of a person whose name cropped up in connection with the assault on Remnant—a person named Symes?—Yes.

130. Did you hear Mrs. Symes say, with reference to her husband, "My husband and I are separated through him taking drink and him ill-using me"?—Yes, something to that effect.

131. Men who take drink and ill-use their wives are not, as a rule, I suppose, very favourably inclined towards the police?—Not if the police have had to interfere with them.

132. But generally?—I have seen some cases where perhaps the wives may have been at fault for all I know, although I have no reason to think so in this case.

133. I am endeavouring to show the Committee the class of people upon whose evidence I had to rely at the inquiry. Now, charge No. 3 against Sergeant Mackay—this is with regard to the girls going to the police-station at midnight, and therefore it is relevant—is as follows: "Omitting to report the fact that Constables Durbridge and Burrell had improperly taken two single females named ——— and ——— into the single men's mess-room at the Nelson Police-station about midnight on the 18th July last"?—Yes.

134. My finding is as follows: "There is no dispute as to the facts of this case, full particulars of which are set forth in the evidence hereto annexed. Constables Durbridge and Burrell took the young women on to the station to have supper. The females are respectable, and there is no suggestion whatever that anything of an immoral nature took place or was intended, but the action of the constables was no doubt most indiscreet and liable to be misconstrued. In view of a wrong construction being placed on the constables' action the sergeant should have entered the matter in the diary and reported it to the Inspector. He is reprimanded and cautioned to be more careful in future"?—Yes.

135. Do you disagree with that finding?—I look upon that as a very serious offence. I look at it in this way: Had there not been very great laxity in that station the girls would not have been brought there. I think that possibly there was more behind than came out. I look upon it as a very serious matter, having girls there at that time of the night, or at any time. I would not have young women going to the single men's quarters at all, even in the daytime.

136. To the pure all things are pure?—I do not know. There is such a thing as virtuous indignation, you know.

137. You believed, when you submitted your reports, that the girls had been taken on to the station for immoral purposes, did you not?—I thought it probable that that was so.

138. You thought so?—I was suspicious.

139. Was not the police-station the home of these two single men—Burrell and Durbridge?—Yes.

140. They had no other place to take their friends?—No.

141. Was it not proved in evidence that Constable Durbridge had obtained leave from the sergeant to attend a Catholic social?—That was stated.

142. Did you doubt it?—I do not know. I would not accept all that they said, because I really believed, and believe still, that there was a combination in that station to support one another.

143. Did you not call Constable Williams to give evidence—in fact, was not his almost the only evidence tendered against these men besides their own admissions?—Yes.

144. Did not Constable Williams admit that there was a Catholic social on the night in question?—Undoubtedly. I knew that there was a Catholic social all right.