

is therefore their home for the time being in addition to being the police-station. But the open manner they went about the matter clearly shows they did not consider they were doing much wrong. The taking of females into a police-station late at night cannot, however, be tolerated, as, if it were, abuses would soon arise or improper motives would be imputed. Therefore the constables are each reprimanded and cautioned to be more careful in future?"—Yes.

206. Do you take exception to that ruling?—I think it was too lenient; I do indeed.

207. Notwithstanding that there was no question of immorality?—No immorality was proved; that is all I say.

208. I do take exception, Mr. Chairman, to the way Inspector Macdonell puts this. I had to go on the evidence, and his remarks about not proving go to show that, notwithstanding that he produced all the evidence he possibly could——?—I did nothing of the kind.

209. You were given a free hand, were you not?—No; my remarks in the sergeant's case apply to this. There was no proper investigation beforehand, as a smart police officer would make, so that all these people could not make up anything.

210. But you were there?—Yes.

211. And you were to blame?—Excuse me. As suggested I think it will be found in my reports that I did not complete the inquiries, and I sent them forward with the view of having a thorough inquiry and the sending of a neutral man.

212. But was it not well known to these men that you were making inquiries?—Yes; some inquiries, but not all.

213. Then, how would it have been possible for another person to have gone there then and carried out inquiries unknown to the men when they already knew of your own action?—They knew nothing of this particular case, as far as I know. They knew that I was inquiring into certain things—about some of the assaults, Durbridge's supposed connection with the girl, the Bush Tavern case, and one of Kemp's cases. Those are all that they knew of, so far as I know.

214. You stated in one of your reports, "*Re* Constables Burrell and Durbridge having two young women (and not of the best repute) in the station at midnight"—"and not of the best repute"?—I did.

215. What evidence had you that these girls were not of the best repute?—I heard that they were not.

216. From whom?—Different people.

217. Name them?—Not unless I am compelled to. It is contrary to all police rules to disclose the source of evidence.

218. Then, I will name them. Was it Constable Williams?—He was one.

219. The self-convicted falsehood-teller?—He is not the only falsehood-teller in these cases.

220. The Committee, of course, will know the reliance that can be placed on Constable Williams's statement?—The Committee surely can judge for themselves without your repeating that.

221. You put in your report "and not of the best repute"?—That is true.

222. Were not these two girls in situations at the time?—I believe so—that one was a barmaid and the other something else.

223. Not a barmaid; was she not a housemaid?—I was told she was a barmaid.

224. At any rate, they were both in respectable situations, as far as you know?—I did not know that.

225. They were both in situations?—I did not know whether they were or not when I wrote the report.

226. Did not the evidence show that they were both in situations?—The evidence did; but that was subsequent to my report.

227. Do you still maintain that these girls were not of the best repute?—I do not say whether they were or not.

228. Have you any reason now to believe that these girls were anything other than of good character?—I am doubtful of one of them, at any rate.

229. Still doubtful?—I am.

230. But you have no evidence to prove that they are other than of good character?—No; simply what I heard.

231. And you put that in your report?—For your information.

232. On the statement of Constable Williams?—Not alone.

233. Partly?—Yes.

234. Was Constable Bird the other one?—No, I do not think so.

235. Now, charge No. 2 against Constable Burrell is, "Improperly leaving his beat without just cause, and going to the Nelson Police-station about 2.30 a.m., 14th instant"; and my finding is as follows: "Although, strictly speaking, this charge was not proved, inasmuch as the Inspector could not say who the men were, or even if they were policemen at all, whom he saw enter and leave the station on the night in question; still, the constable admits he left his beat and went to the station to get some tea. This appears to have been the practice at Nelson long before Sergeant Mackay went there (see Constable McGrath's evidence), and apparently the constable took it for granted he could do so without running the risk of punishment. I am of opinion the constable remained on the station much longer than sufficient time to get his tea, during which period his beat was left unattended, and I therefore severely reprimanded and cautioned him on this charge. The punishment would have been more severe had not the constable up to this time had a clean defaulters' sheet." What is your opinion of that finding?—I think it is reasonable.

236. Notwithstanding that you told Mr. Hall-Jones yesterday that you thought a man who left his beat, and so on, ought not to be kept in the force?—I would not say that in a particular case; it would depend on the man's character.