

express their high appreciation of the manner in which the police-work of Nelson had been carried out since Sergeant Mackay has been in charge at Nelson, and they trusted the sergeant would not be removed unless the inquiry disclosed offences against him which justified his removal." They feared this for the reason that a young man, the son of a well-known Nelson resident, had boasted in a publichouse that he would get the sergeant removed.

*Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones* : They came to you in the midst of your inquiry.

*Commissioner Tunbridge* : Yes.

343. *Mr. Maginnity*.] Now, Inspector, with regard to Regulation No. 63, I suppose you will admit that it, at any rate, is a regulation for the guidance of the police?—All regulations are supposed to be.

344. But you told us a little while ago that the regulations were not altogether reliable?—I did not.

345. Then, you went next door to it, at any rate?—No, I did not.

*Mr. Lawry* : Just to clear up that point let me ask the Commissioner one question : Is it a recognised fact by you that your regulations under the law have the force of law?

*Commissioner Tunbridge* : Undoubtedly so.

346. *Mr. Maginnity*.] There has been some misunderstanding. I understood that the Inspector thought the regulations had not the force of law. Now, Inspector, you did not altogether agree with the findings of the Commissioner; you said that in one or two instances they did not go far enough. Regulation No. 63 is as follows : "Cases of breach of police discipline will be dealt with by the Inspector, unless he elects under section 12 of the Police Act to cause them to be taken before a Commissioner or any two Justices of the Peace. Offences against the public or where Magistrates have clear jurisdiction will be always submitted to a local Magistrate or Bench of Magistrates unconnected with the Force." Now, you had the whole of this matter in your own fingers if you had liked : is that not so?—Yes.

347. And you would not undertake the responsibility?—I would not say that. If I was afterwards instructed to do so and given plenty of time I would; but I would prefer that somebody else should do it.

348. As a matter of fact, the Commissioner undertook the holding of the inquiry?—He did.

349. You were represented by being there personally?—I was instructed to be there, and I was there; and while I was there the Commissioner instructed me to ask the questions.

350. You were not restricted from eliciting any information you wanted?—I would not say that, because I was restricted more or less in some instances.

351. May the Committee accept it from your own statement now that outside of these charges the only complaints that were made to you were made by two people named Coles, a man named Atmore, whom you did not see?—He did not make a complaint at all. His name was given to me as a man who had been assaulted.

352. The only people you had any conversation at all with with regard to the conduct of the police were these two Coleses?—Nonsense.

353. Who else, then?—A number of other people.

354. Did any of them charge these constables with assault?—No; but they told me of assaults that had been committed. One woman who was keeping an hotel told me that she heard—she did not know—of a number of assaults that had been committed.

355. And that is all you have got to warrant you in saying that Burrell and Durbridge are not a fair average sample of the Police Force?—No, it is not.

356. Well, then, what else have you?—The hotelkeeper at the Bush Tavern told me that he heard frequently of assaults committed by them.

357. By whom?—By the single constables.

358. Did you follow that information up? Could he not tell you any of the people?—I did not go into that with him, because I was in a hurry to get away. One man spoke to me of calling a public meeting in connection with the conduct of the police.

359. Who was that?—I cannot remember his name. I saw him on the way up to the Reservoir.

360. One man suggested that a public meeting should be called owing to the conduct of the police?—Yes.

361. It is most important that we should have the name of that man, because I should like to see him here before the Committee?—He told me it was simply what he heard.

362. He thought a public meeting should be called on something he heard?—Yes; it was not simply something he heard, but the number of things he heard.

363. Did he tell you how many?—He did not. I went to ask him with reference to a particular charge, and he told me he knew nothing about it, and he told me that a man said to him that a public meeting ought to be called.

364. Did this man specify any single charge when he said that another man had said that a public meeting ought to be called?—He said that he heard of a number of assaults committed by the constables, &c.

365. Did he mention a particular assault?—I did not ask him, because he did not know of the matter I came to see him about, and I did not take his statement at all.

366. You had asked other people about the various delinquencies?—A number of people whose names were given to me and who I was told might know, or did know, and so forth.

367. Upon the statement, then, of this man that there had been a number of assaults committed you said, in reply to Mr. Hall, that the two constables were not of equal character?—No. I said that taking the matter as a whole. It is not the single statement of that man. A number of people told me the same. I was in the park one day, and two people whom I never saw before told me of the conduct of the police. Quite a number of others did also.