

(No. 124.)



1891.

PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA.

CASE OF CONSTABLE ALFRED JOHN JACKSON :

REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEE, WITH MINUTES OF
THE PROCEEDINGS, EVIDENCE, AND APPENDIX.

Brought up by Mr. Mulcahy, September 25, 1891, and ordered by the House of
Assembly to be printed.



SELECT COMMITTEE appointed, on the 11th September, 1891, to inquire into the humble Petition of ALFRED JOHN JACKSON, Constable in the Territorial Police Force of Tasmania, praying for inquiry into alleged injustice in connection with his Discharge from the said Force.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.

MR. GILL.
MR. S. J. SUTTON.
MR. MURRAY.
MR. LETTE.

COL. ST. HILL.
MR. HIDDLESTONE.
MR. MULCAHY. (*Mover.*)

DAYS OF MEETING.

Friday, 18th September; Wednesday, 23rd September.

WITNESSES EXAMINED.

Alfred John Jackson, Alexander Riddoch, W. J. Bellette, James Anderson, Charles Foster, Alfred Crisp, Laurence Reynolds, Robert Hempseed, W. Curtis Sculthorpe, Bernard Shaw, Edward Wright Plane, Oscar Hedberg, Matthew Higgins.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1891.

The Committee met at 10:30 A.M.

Present.—Mr. S. J. Sutton, Mr. Gill, Mr. Henry, Mr. Lette, Colonel St. Hill, Mr. Murray, Mr. Mulcahy.

Mr. Mulcahy was voted to the Chair.

Resolved, That the Petitioner, Mr. John Jackson, *ex* Constable of the Territorial Police Force of Tasmania, and Mr. Bernard Shaw, Inspector of Police, Tasmania, be allowed to be severally represented by Counsel.

Counsel were accordingly admitted.

The Chairman laid the Petition of Constable Jackson on the Table.—Appendix A.

Mr. Perkins, Counsel for Petitioner, put in the following papers:—

Memo. to Constable Jackson.

Letter from Mr. H. Robertson to Constable Jackson.

Letter extract from Hobart *Mercury*, headed "Extraordinary Vigilance," signed by Robert Palmer.

Correspondence: letters from F. Stops, A. J. Jackson, and Bernard Shaw.

Government Notice, No. 137.

Correspondence *re* delinquencies of Constable Jackson. Constable Jackson's testimonials as to character.

Alfred John Jackson was called in and having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Robert Hempseed was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. W. Curtis Sculthorpe was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Walter James Bellette was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Bellette withdrew.

Mr. Bernard Shaw, Superintendent of Police, was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Shaw produced the Police Regulations.

Mr. Shaw withdrew.

The Committee adjourned at 12:50 P.M. until 2:30 P.M.

The Committee re-assembled at 2:30 P.M.

The Chairman tabled Report of Tasmanian Territorial Police—Subject: Obstructing footpath outside railway premises.

Chairman tabled Report Tasmanian Territorial Police: Assault on P.C. Jackson at South Glenorchy, on 18th inst.

Sergeant Plane was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Sergeant Plane withdrew.

Mr. James Andrew was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Andrew withdrew.

Mr. C. Forster was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Forster withdrew.

Mr. Alfred Crisp, M.H.A., attended, and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, gave evidence before the Committee.

Mr. Crisp withdrew.

Counsel (Mr. Dobbie) again addressed the Committee on behalf of the Commissioner of Police.

Superintendent Hedberg was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Reynolds, Police Clerk, was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Reynolds withdrew.

Sergeant Higgins, of the Territorial Police, was called in and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Sergeant Higgins withdrew.

Mr. Bernard Shaw, Commissioner of Police, was recalled and, having made the Parliamentary declaration, examined.

Mr. Shaw withdrew.

The Committee adjourned at 3:50 P.M. till 10:30 A.M. on Wednesday, the 23rd September.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1891.

The Committee met at 10:50 A.M.

Present.—Mr. Lette, Mr. S. J. Sutton, Mr. Murray, Mr. Mulcahy (Chairman).

The Minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

The Chairman laid the following Documents on the Table:—

Letter from J. H. Cook, Sub-Inspector of Police, to the Superintendent of Police, New Town and Queenborough.

Letter from O. E. Hedberg, Superintendent of Police, Hobart, to Bernard Shaw, Commissioner of Police.

Letter from Bernard Shaw, Commissioner of Police, to the Hon. the Attorney-General.

The Committee then considered the evidence received.

The Draft Report was then considered.

The Committee adjourned at 11:55 A.M. until 3:40 P.M.

The Committee re-assembled at 3:40 P.M.

Present.—Mr. Gill, Mr. Murray, Col. St. Hill, Mr. Lette, Mr. S. J. Sutton, Mr. Hiddlestone, Mr. Mulcahy (Chairman).

The Draft Report was tabled, read, and considered paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 read and agreed to.

Paragraph 2 struck out, and the following new paragraph inserted in lieu thereof:—

- (2.) Your Committee are of opinion that, although Constable Jackson has been shown to be a well-conducted man, and has not been charged with any serious dereliction of duty whilst in the Police Force, still, from the evidence placed before them, they are unable to recommend that the course adopted by the Police authorities in declining to retain him as a member of the Force be interfered with. (Col. St. Hill).

Paragraph 3 read and agreed to.

Report, as amended, agreed to.

Resolved, That the Chairman be instructed to present the Report to the House at its next Meeting.

Resolved, That the Committee do record their appreciation of the skill, rapidity, and accuracy with which Mr. Harry Nicholls has fulfilled his duties as shorthand writer to the Committee.

The Committee adjourned *sine die*.

R E P O R T.

Your Committee have the honor to report to your Honorable House :—

- (1.) That they have given their most careful consideration to the subject committed to them for investigation, and that they have obtained and duly weighed all evidence, oral and documentary, available.
- (2.) That your Committee are of opinion that, although Constable Jackson has been shown to be a well-conducted man, and has not been charged with any serious dereliction of duty whilst in the Police Force, still, from the evidence placed before them, they are unable to recommend that the course adopted by the Police Authorities in declining to retain him as a member of the Force be interfered with.
- (3.) That your Committee regret that the advisableness of resigning was not suggested to Constable Jackson, when his superior officers came to the opinion that it was undesirable he should remain any longer in the Police Force.

EDWARD MULCAHY, *Chairman.*

*Committee Room, House of Assembly,
24th September, 1891.*

EVIDENCE.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1891.

ALFRED JOHN JACKSON, *called and examined.*

1. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Alfred John Jackson.
2. You were a constable in the Territorial Police Force? Yes.
3. Are you still connected with that Force? No, I am under suspension.
4. You produce, in connection with your suspension, a letter dated 11th August, from the Commissioner of Police, one dated 14th August, from you to the Attorney-General, and one dated August 18th, from the Attorney-General to you? Yes.
5. When did you join the Territorial Police Force? On the 14th September, 1890.
6. Since then have you been actively employed in your duties? Yes.
7. Was any fault found with you up to the occasion of your being suspended? There was one occasion when I had gone to the Police Court with Sub-Inspector Cook and Constable Filby, in the case of a man named Johnson, who was charged with camping in the Domain. After the case was over, I came with Cook and Filby as far as Collins-street, and Cook told me to go on duty on the Glebe. I came along Collins-street to Park-street, and at the corner of that street and Liverpool-street I met a New Zealand police officer, who asked me to give him some information about the police force here, which I did. The train was then due, and I had to go to the station. When I got back to the office I was asked why I had not obeyed Mr. Cook's order, and I explained that having met the New Zealand police officer, and been asked by him to give him information, I had not time to go on the Glebe. I got a reprimand from Superintendent Hedberg, stating that if such a thing occurred again I would be severely dealt with. There was another case, in which a Mr. M'Shane reported a larceny from the wood and coal yards to me, which I reported to my superior officer as soon as I could get the required information. I got a report back stating that I was to show cause for not having sent the report in sooner, and I replied that I thought it was advisable to withhold the report until I was able to get full information.
8. Have you received instructions to give information to whoever may ask you for it? Yes, I have always been told by Superintendent Hedberg and other officers to reply to everyone, and give information whenever it is necessary.
9. Will you explain the circumstances which led to your dismissal? Yes. There were some new By-laws made in connection with the Domain, and one of them I read to mean that no one was allowed to lie on the grass, as well as on the seats. Under that impression I spoke to a Mr. Robertson of the *Mercury* Office, and requested him to get up from off the grass. I sent a report in to my superior officer in reference to the case, and the next day I had word by telephone to say that Superintendent Hedberg wanted to see me at his private house. I had to wait for a long time, but finally met him on the beach at Sandy Bay. He asked me the reason I had done as I did, and I replied that I had made a mistake. He said I had made the police look like "damned fools," and it would mean my dismissal. On the 13th of the month I received a message to say that Superintendent Hedberg wanted to see me at 2 o'clock. I went to his office, and after waiting half an hour I knocked at Sub-Inspector Cook's door. When I went in, Cook said Superintendent Hedberg had requested him to read a copy of a notice to me. That notice was my discharge.
10. What did you say? I told Cook the only thing was that I had two children, and intended to see further into the matter.
11. To whom did you apply next? I went to the Attorney-General to see if there was anything against my character. He said that I should write for an enquiry, and I wrote accordingly, and then the reply I got was that I had been allowed to resign, and not discharged. I then sent a petition through Mr. Perkins to the House of Assembly, and Superintendent Hedberg came down and said that I was suspended for petitioning the House before my time was up; and I made reply that I did not think it was right on my part to wait until I was out of the Police Force to petition the House. I have been under suspension since then.
12. How did you speak to those people on the grass in the Domain? Very civilly.
13. Have you received a letter from a person named H. Robertson? Yes; that is the person I spoke to. (Letter produced).
14. Have any of your fellow-constables ever ordered anyone off the grass? Some little time previously I saw Constable Filby order two to get off the grass.
15. Is he an older officer than you? Yes.
16. Is that the circumstance that a letter dated "Fitzroy, Melbourne, August 13th," appeared in the paper about? Yes. (Letter produced.)

17. It does not relate to you at all? No.
18. Are these the regulations under which you acted? Yes. (Regulations produced and marked E).
19. During the time that you were a constable were you employed as messenger at Mr. Shaw's office? Yes, for about 4 months.
20. Did you perform your duties there satisfactorily? To the best of my belief, I did.
21. And there was no grumbling or complaining on your part? No.
22. Were those duties outside the duty of a constable? Those I performed for Mr. Shaw were not; but those I performed for Superintendent Hedberg were.
23. What were those latter duties? Taking horses to be shod, going for a tin trunk, and going for a dog-cart to Dr. Hardy's.
24. You made no complaint about those duties? No.
25. Did any one find fault with you in connection with them? Yes, Mrs. Hedberg did.
26. On what grounds? On account of delay in getting a horse shod, one Saturday.
27. Will you tell us the circumstances of that case? One Friday, when Superintendent Hedberg was going away on a yachting trip, he told me to take his horse the next day to be shod. Between 10 and 11 A.M. I took the horse, and had to wait until half-past one to get it shod, on account of there being 7 or 8 horses there before me. At half-past one Constable Dore was sent to see where I was with the horse. When I got back Mrs. Hedberg asked me what I meant by it, saying I would not dare to do it if Superintendent Hedberg was there. I was supposed to be on duty for Mr. Shaw.
28. You performed all these duties willingly? Yes.
29. After this were you relieved from the office of messenger? I asked to be allowed to return to duty, as I got disgusted with the position, having to go on so many private messages. After waiting about three weeks I was allowed to return to duty.
30. Where were you put on? In the Glebe, Domain, and Railway Station, at night.
31. How long were you on night duty? While Quamby was in the hospital, about 8 weeks. I tried to change my duty to 7 till 5, but I was told that if I liked to take it from 2 till 10 I could do so. I preferred to remain as I was. Several times I have had my duty changed to allow Constable Filby time to go and paint the police boat, which took him nearly three weeks.
32. With regard to your competency, do you hold any medals for good behaviour? Yes, two. One is for services rendered in New South Wales to the Fire Brigade, and another is for bravery in connection with the Bijou Theatre fire.
33. Do you hold testimonials to show your general efficiency? Yes. (Testimonials produced).
34. And in addition to them you can call personal testimony? Yes.
35. Will you tell the Committee the services you have been engaged in while in the Police Force? I was instrumental in arresting the man Woods on the Glenorchy race-course, and a woman named Mary Condon for being drunk and disorderly in the Domain; I had a case against one George Watt, which case was dismissed, I not being allowed to call two witnesses I had, and a case of a man named Warren, for stealing boots.
36. Were you engaged at the Mount Stuart fire? I was.
37. Has any charge been made against you but the one upon which you were discharged? I was never before Mr. Shaw yet.
38. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—Are you clear that that is the only charge that has been made against you? Yes, except on the occasions I have already stated.
39. Were you never reprimanded? I was, by Superintendent Hedberg.
40. And he is your superior officer? Yes.
41. Who else would reprimand you but him? Mr. Shaw.
42. Do you expect, as a constable, that the Commissioner of Police would be the person to reprimand you? Yes, if I had done anything serious.
43. Is not Superintendent Hedberg Superintendent of the District in which you were employed, and in charge of all the constables? Yes.
44. Then the only person to reprimand you is Superintendent Hedberg? Yes.
45. Shortly after you joined the Force, did you make a report that a fireman had assaulted you at a fire at Mezger's Bone Mill? I mentioned the matter to Sub-Inspector Cook to get his opinion as to what I should do, and it was on his suggestion that I sent the report in. (Report produced).
46. Was the complaint made in your report investigated? Yes.
47. And the result was that you were reprimanded for what took place? I do not remember being reprimanded. The reason I could not call any witnesses was that I was new to the Force at the time; if I had had the knowledge I possess now, I would have looked round for witnesses, and could have cleared myself.
48. Were you at any time in charge of the buildings at the Territorial Police Offices? Yes, for about four months.
49. And you would have access to the offices and papers? Yes.
50. Did you know that the report you sent in on that occasion is not with the papers? I do not; the last I saw of that report was when I sent it in.

51. And you are certain that you do not recollect being reprimanded in connection with the charge of assault against that fireman? Yes.
52. Do you deny being reprimanded on that occasion? I do not remember it.
53. You have spoken of a case against a man named Watt: your report on that occasion was dated 17th June, 1891? Yes. (Report produced.)
54. In consequence of that report, what was done? Watt was tried at the Police Court, before Messrs. Tarleton and Crisp.
55. And what was the result? The case was dismissed. It was held that I had misapprehended words that were used. Watt said to some girls "that they were big enough to go into the Domain;" but said in the Police Court that he meant they were big enough to go out to the football matches.
56. That is your explanation of why the case was dismissed? Yes.
57. And what is your explanation of M'Shane's case? About July this year M'Shane came to me about five, or ten minutes to five, and said that his office had been broken into, and several articles stolen; and he suspected a man named Donnelly. I did not get the required information until noon next day, when I forwarded it to the Police Office, and got a note asking me why it was not sent sooner; I replied, that not having the full information, I thought it advisable not to send in the report until I had fully enquired into the case.
58. And that is the last that you had to do with it? Yes.
59. Do you know anything of the larceny of wood at the Railway Station on the 24th July? What Michael Gleeson told me of it.
60. You have not mentioned that matter; did you report it? Yes, to Mr. Cook, from information I received from Mr. Gleeson.
61. Did you make enquiries into the matter subsequently? Yes.
62. What became of it? It was placed in the hands of Constable Ward for investigation.
63. Who were suspected of stealing the wood? Two men named Goodrick and Flynn.
64. Did you go to these people to enquire about it? No.
65. Of whom did you enquire? Of a man named Petrie, a Railway employee. Constable Ward was sent with me to investigate the case.
66. Was not Petrie one of the suspected persons? Yes, but I did not find it out until afterwards.
67. Did you make this enquiry from Petrie before or after you reported the matter? Afterwards.
68. Who did you report it to? To Mr. Cook.
69. Did you make any enquiries before investigating the case with Constable Ward? I did my best to enquire from one and another.
70. Were you instructed to do that? I cannot say that I was not.
71. Is it not a fact that you made enquiries, which gave the people concerned notice of what was going on, without being instructed? I do not remember it at all.
72. Will you say you were instructed? I acted in conjunction with Constable Ward.
73. Were the enquiries you make from Petrie made without instructions? I wanted to find out what sort of a man Goodrick was.
74. Did you make enquiries from Petrie before you investigated the matter with Constable Ward, and before being instructed to do so? Yes.
75. And nothing came of the matter? It was taken out of my hands.
76. Do you not know that nothing came of it? No.
77. I suppose you know, as a constable, that if you are going to secure convictions you want caution and discretion in what you are doing? Yes.
78. Were you not on the 23rd July reported to Mr. Cook for disobedience of orders? Yes.
79. Is that the matter you have already referred to? Yes.
80. You were instructed to go to the Glebe? Yes.
81. At what time? About 30 minutes past 10.
82. Were you to go there on duty? Yes.
83. What time was it when you returned to head quarters? About 11:30.
84. Where were you when you received instructions to go to the Glebe? About the corner of Collins and Campbell streets.
85. What was it that caused you to disobey your orders? I met one of the New Zealand police officers at the corner of Liverpool and Park streets, and he asked information of me relative to the difference between the Municipal and Territorial Police Forces. When I had given him the information a train was nearly due, and I had to go to the railway station.
86. How long did this conversation occupy? About 20 minutes.
87. Did you think that was part of your duty as a constable? I did not think the time went by so quickly. I have been always told by my superior officers to give any information a stranger may require from me.
88. You were twenty minutes talking? Yes, but on part of my beat.
89. What did you do during the balance of the hour? I had to go to the railway station and wait

for the train. There were several cabmen there, and I have always been told to go to the station when there were any cabmen about there. I had not time to go on the Glebe.

90. That, then, is your explanation of disobeying your superior's orders? Yes.

91. Have you ever been spoken to by Sub-Inspector Cook, or Superintendent Hedberg for loitering and gossiping on your beat? I have.

92. Were you not acting messenger from the 15th November to the 21st November? Yes.

93. And you were appointed messenger on the 22nd November until 12th February this year? Yes.

94. And was it not part of your duty to go messages? Not for Superintendent Hedberg.

95. Did you go on private messages for him? Yes, after office hours, and sometimes in office hours; such as taking the horse to be shod.

96. Whose horse was it? Mr. Hedberg's.

97. Was it not the horse he used in police duty? Yes, and privately as well. He used to take it out in a dog-cart.

98. How do you distinguish between police and private business in taking the horse to be shod? It was sometimes used by Mrs. Hedberg.

99. How often were you sent on these messages? A good few times; I cannot say exactly how often. Two or three times I have taken the horse up to get Dr. Hardy's dog-cart.

100. Can you mention any other occasions? I was sent on any messages that might be wanted in the house.

101. Then you were a sort of a general private messenger for Mr. Hedberg? I used to go private messages for him. If anything was wanted, and I was there, I was sent.

102. Did not you go on street duty again on 12th February? Yes.

103. When did you go on night duty? The duty book will show that. It was during the time Quamby was in the hospital. When I asked for a change I was told to take from 2 till 10, but I preferred to continue on night duty. I wanted a change to from 7 till 5.

104. How long had you been on night duty when you asked for a change? 5 or 6 weeks.

105. And you preferred to continue that instead of taking the hours offered? Yes; my health was shaken, and I did not like to go into the hospital.

106. Was not a constable constantly required to watch Quamby? Yes.

107. And did not that account for your being kept on night duty? Our usual duty is one week on and one week off; and some men were brought in from New Town to do the watching.

108. Is that George Watt you referred to now under arrest for assaulting Mr. George Lovett? Yes, it is the same man.

109. With regard to the larceny of timber at the railway station, who was it complained to you first? Michael Gleeson, the man in charge of the weigh-bridge.

110. Did you set to work to make enquiries on that? Yes.

111. You did not know Petrie was a suspected person? Not at the time.

112. *By Mr. Sutton.*—You say you went messages for Superintendent Hedberg? Yes.

113. During office hours? Sometimes in office hours, and sometimes after the office was closed at 4.30. I had to get up at 6 in the morning and bring a prisoner down by 7 o'clock. This prisoner was employed by Superintendent Hedberg in grooming his horses and chopping his wood, and sometimes by Mr. Shaw.

114. Did you ever know any other messenger do the same duties that you were asked to perform? Yes; and he told me I would not be there three months.

115. Is Superintendent Hedberg allowed forage for his horse? I believe so.

116. Is the house Superintendent Hedberg lives in a Government building or otherwise? The house he lived in when I was there as messenger was a Government building.

117. *By Mr. Gill.*—Is it usual for constables to go for instructions to enquire into every little case in which they hear of anything going wrong? No, they are supposed to use their own discretion. You cannot always get an officer handy. I have known cases in which Cook and Hedberg have been both away.

118. *By Mr. Murray.*—Who was it made the complaint against you for ordering a man off the grass in the Domain? A man named Robertson, in the *Mercury* office. I stated in my report that some of these men lay on the grass, and made use of insulting language to passers-by.

119. Do you know Robertson's reason for lodging the complaint? The reason he gave was that he was afraid there would be a prosecution against him in connection with it on account of my taking his name.

120. *By Mr. Sutton.*—How came Robertson to write that letter—did you ask him to do so? I asked him to state whether he was insulted or not, just to clear myself.

121. *By the Chairman.*—When you got information regarding the larceny of wood, did you immediately report the matter? I reported it at 2 o'clock the same day, as near as I can remember.

122. How long was it after you made the report that you saw Petrie? Three or four days.

123. While employed on messages and duties you considered outside the sphere of police duty, did you ever object in any way? No.

124. You never made any objection? No.
125. How many times were you reprimanded for loitering? Perhaps 4 or 5 times.
126. Should not such complaints be recorded as against you? I should think so.
127. I presume that when you misconduct yourself there must be some record kept of it which can be produced? Yes.
128. You state that you were kept on night duty to allow another constable to paint a boat: how do you know that? I was changed from time to time.
129. Was Filby employed on the boat during hours for which he was paid for being on duty? Yes, he was painting the police boat, and another small boat.
130. *By Mr. Murray.*—At the time of your appointment as constable was any objection made by any of the heads of the Police Department? No, not that I know of.
131. *By the Chairman.*—Regarding the assault at the fire, your version is that you were assaulted? Yes.
132. Is that strictly true? Yes.
133. You are sure you did not assault Maher? Yes.
134. You went with the intention of assisting? Yes, I was sent out on duty to the fire, and as I found it still spreading I asked Sergeant Higgins to allow me to lend a hand. I was anxious to help, and I went forward to where I saw a fireman with a smoking-cap on trying to couple a hose, and assisted him. When I stooped down Maher pushed me on my back. I reported the matter to Mr. Cook, to get his opinion upon it.
135. *By Mr. Gill.*—Are you a fireman? Yes.
136. And you understand the duty? Yes.
137. You say you loitered? Yes.
138. In what way? In standing about talking to people. Sometimes people come up and ask information relating to the city, and it is often hard to shake them off when you are on your beat.
139. That would be considered loitering? Yes.
140. *By Mr. Sutton.*—You wear one of your medals, and not the other? Yes.
141. Does Superintendent Hedberg prohibit you wearing it? Yes, he said I might have won it in a football match.
142. *By Colonel St. Hill.*—Is not one for bravery, and the other a presentation by your friends? Yes.
143. *By Mr. Sutton.*—He does not object to your wearing one? No.

ROBERT HEMPSEED, *called and examined.*

144. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Robert Hempseed.
145. You are a resident of the Glebe? Yes.
146. Do you know Alfred Jackson? Yes.
147. How long have you known him? For more than six months.
148. Have you had opportunities of seeing him often? I have met him frequently at different times of the night and day.
149. How has he performed his duties? I always thought that he performed them very well, and I always found him very civil and obliging when I wanted to ask him any question. I may say that I always looked upon him as a credit to the Force

ALEXANDER RIDDOCH, *called and examined.*

150. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Alexander Riddoch.
151. You are a Justice of the Peace? Yes.
152. And a resident of the Glebe? Yes.
153. Do you know Constable Jackson, who was on duty in the Glebe? Yes.
154. How long have you known him on the Glebe? For nearly twelve months.
155. Can you tell the Committee how he has performed his duties as constable during that time? To the best of my belief he is a very zealous officer, very quiet, and attentive, apparently, to his duties.
156. Do you remember being on the City Police Court Bench on the 25th June last, when a man named Thomas Warren was charged with assaulting Jackson in the execution of his duty? Yes, I was on the Bench at the time.
157. Do you remember the Bench complimenting the constable on the manner in which he gave his evidence, and the way in which he behaved? They certainly complimented him upon his zeal. I had occasion to meet Jackson in connection with a proposal to form a fire brigade on the Glebe, and I was very favourably impressed with his intelligence in that matter.
158. He is an intelligent officer? He seems to be so.

WILLIAM CURTIS SCULTHORPE, *called and examined.*

159. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? William Curtis Sculthorpe
 160. You are a resident of the Glebe? Yes.
 161. Do you know Constable Jackson? Yes, well.
 162. For how long? Ever since he has been on duty in the Glebe. I am Superintendent of Works in the Glebe, and saw him frequently.
 163. How did he perform his duties? Very well indeed.
 164. And he seems to be well liked by everyone? Yes.
 165. Did you ever see him loitering about, or doing anything that you could find fault with? No. He is steady and sober.

WALTER JAMES BELLETTE, *called and examined.*

166. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Walter James Bellette.
 167. You are Superintendent of Police at Glenorchy? Yes.
 168. Do you know Constable Jackson? Yes.
 169. Have you had any opportunities of seeing how he performed his duties? Yes.
 170. Do you remember the arrest of a very violent man named Woods on the race-course? Yes.
 171. Do you remember how many constables it took to escort him to the station? Several.
 172. How did Jackson behave? He behaved so well that I was more than usually pleased. He acted with great determination and gallantry, although he was abused and struck, and knocked about.
 173. Did you consider him an efficient officer? Yes, I was greatly pleased with him.
 174. *By the Chairman.*—Do you know anything more of Jackson? No.

BERNARD SHAW, *called and examined.*

175. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Bernard Shaw.
 176. You are Commissioner of Police? Yes.
 177. Do you remember Jackson being engaged as messenger in your office? Yes.
 178. Do you keep a Police Record? It is in the office.
 179. Who would keep that? Mr. Patterson, the Chief Clerk. It is a record of each man's appointment and discharge.
 180. And any charges against him? The records of reprimands and that sort of thing are in the correspondence on the different files; trifling matters are not always recorded.
 181. You would not record cases of loitering? I don't think so.
 182. They would be trifling matters? Yes, comparatively so.
 183. It is only serious offences that would be recorded? Yes, such as a man being fined or dismissed.
 184. There is no charge of being fined against Jackson? No.
 185. When he asked for an enquiry, was the request put before you? He did not ask for an enquiry, or if he did, it did not come before me.
 186. Did he not ask Superintendent Hedberg? I do not know that.
 187. He has had no enquiry? No; as far as I am aware he never wanted one.
 188. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—What is the proper course for an officer to take when he wants an enquiry? I would like to point out that there is a great distinction between dismissal and discharge. A constable can only be dismissed on some very serious charge. When he is discharged there is nothing to enquire about?
 189. To whom should the application for an enquiry be made? It should be made to me.
 190. And no such application reached you? No, not in any shape.
 191. *By Mr. Lette.*—Should such an application go from the Superintendent to you? It might or it might not.
 192. *By Col. St. Hill.*—It would be a matter for you only to decide? Yes; if I decided there should be no enquiry, he might ask me to submit it to the Ministerial head of the Department.
 193. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—But the preliminary step was never taken? No, it was not.
 194. What is the difference between dismissal and discharge? Under the Police Regulations a constable may be discharged by the Commissioner for unfitness for the office of constable; and he may be dismissed by the Attorney-General, who is the Ministerial head of the Department, or under his authority.
 195. Was Jackson dismissed or discharged? He received a month's notice that he would be discharged.
 196. Do you produce the Police Regulations for the information of the Committee? Yes.

197. What is the authority of the Commissioner in regard to removing constables? Under the Regulations, the Commissioner has authority to discharge a constable if he considers that he is inefficient. In one Regulation, on page 6, it says that as none but zealous and efficient officers and men can be retained in the service, it will be the duty of the Commissioner to remove from it any member of the Force who is guilty of neglect, remission of duty, or disobedience of orders. Again, on page 9, it states that any police constable is liable to be discharged for unfitness or negligence, and that the Commissioner or Municipal Council may dismiss any constable without assigning him any reason. Again, on page 11, it says that the Commissioner may suspend or dismiss any man who is remiss or negligent in the discharge of his duty, or who is otherwise unfit for the service.

198. Have you ever exercised your power under those Regulations? I have not.

199. What is your practice? My practice is to represent all the circumstances in a memorandum to the Ministerial head of the Department, and recommend the discharge if I consider the constable or officer to be unfit for his duty.

200. Was that practice followed in this instance? It was.

201. When the complaint was made of Jackson ordering men off the grass, did you recommend his discharge in consequence of his previous record? Yes, in consequence of the repeated complaints that had reached me of his incapacity and unfitness for the position of constable. When I found that he had ordered some people to get up off the grass it was the last straw, and I considered the time had arrived when he should be got rid of as unfit for the responsible position of constable.

202. It is not correct, then, to say that the discharge of this constable was in consequence of the one act of ordering a person to get up off the grass? Certainly not; it was due to numerous instances showing his unfitness for the position, that being the last.

203. How was the question of his ordering men off the grass brought under your notice? I first heard of it by reading it in the newspaper.

204. You heard Constable Jackson's evidence in regard to his employment as messenger. What would be his duties as messenger? It certainly would be his duty to take Superintendent Hedberg's horse to be shod if he ordered him to do so. It is a horse he is required to keep and use in the discharge of his public duty.

205. *By Colonel St. Hill.*—Does Superintendent Hedberg draw forage allowance for that horse? Yes.

206. And was the house he was living in at the time that Jackson was employed as messenger a Government building? Yes, it was.

207. *By Mr. Perkins.*—Would it be his duty to get that horse for Mrs. Hedberg? If the horse required to be shod, it was his duty to take it to be shod.

208. Would it be his duty to go for a cart for Mrs. Hedberg? That would entirely depend upon the circumstances.

209. Would it be his duty to go to Dr. Hardy's to borrow a cart for Mrs. Hedberg? No, certainly it would not be his duty.

210. Your attention was first called to Constable Jackson having ordered people to get up off the grass by seeing it in the newspaper? Yes, in the *Mercury*.

211. And then you got Jackson's report? I did not get it until after I had been spoken to by a member of the Domain Committee.

212. Did you get Jackson up before you and examine him? No.

213. You have never seen the man face to face? I certainly never enquired into the matter; it was not my duty to do so. It was the duty of the Superintendent to do that.

214. Yet you reported to the Attorney-General without having made a personal enquiry? Yes.

215. And you sent your recommendation in with the one-sided report of your inferior officer? No, with Jackson's own report.

216. What papers did you enclose to the Attorney-General with your recommendation? A memorandum from Superintendent Hedberg, forwarding Jackson's report, and drawing attention to repeated acts exhibiting his unfitness for his position, and recommending that he should be discharged.

217. Where is that memorandum? It is amongst the papers. I also attached a letter from the person who was ordered off the grass.

218. Jackson had never seen that? It was on his own report.

219. You say in your notice to him that the Attorney-General directs that he should be discharged? Yes.

220. And therefore, as far as appealing to you was concerned, you had taken it out of his power? Yes.

221. Then the Attorney-General would be the proper person to ask for an enquiry? I don't think so.

222. Not when the matter has gone out of your hands into those of the Attorney-General? I do not place that construction upon it.

223. Have all constables in the Force been treated in the same way that Jackson has been? Any constable who has exhibited his unfitness to the same extent that Jackson did has been discharged.

224. Did you see an article in the paper on 13th August last called "Extraordinary Vigilance"? I did.

225. Does not that relate to Constable Filby? I do not know.

226. You did not take the trouble to enquire? No, I did not. I did not take any notice of it. I never take notice of things I see in newspapers.

227. Yet you took notice of Jackson? Not on what the newspaper said about it.

228. Did you discharge Filby for the illegal arrest of a man named Peterson at the Railway Station? No, certainly not. In my opinion Filby did quite right, though the Bench dismissed the information.

229. Was not a petition sent in against Filby by cab proprietors for his conduct? I have heard so.

230. Did not the petition come to you? I do not remember it.

231. Was it not addressed to the Attorney-General as the head of the Department? I have not seen it, though I have heard of something of the kind.

232. You took no steps in regard to Filby? All the steps that were considered necessary were taken.

233. Has not Filby been cautioned more frequently than Jackson? Certainly not.

234. Has he ever been cautioned? I am not aware that he has. I do not know of any other case in which his conduct has been questioned besides that of Peterson's, and in that case my opinion is that his conduct was perfectly correct.

235. Robertson's was not published? No, we are not allowed to take notice of letters that are published in the newspaper.

236. After the evidence of the way in which Jackson has performed his duty, which you have heard, do you consider him unsuitable to the Police Force? Yes; his last act was only one of a number of cases.

237. Will you give us these cases? Yes. The first one of any importance occurred a few days after Jackson was appointed a constable. I am speaking from information received from the documents which came before me in my official capacity. Jackson reported that he was on duty at a fire at Glenorchy, and that he had been assaulted and rolled over in the dirt in his uniform by young Mr. Maher. He said he saw a fireman trying in vain to couple a hose and he went to help him, having asked permission to do so, and Maher came up and rolled him over while he was stooping down. I thought that it was a case that should be enquired into, and I submitted the report to the Attorney-General, and requested that it might be laid before the Fire Brigade Board in order that the action of the fireman might be enquired into. It was received back from the Chairman of the Board, who declined to interfere. I instructed Superintendent Hedberg, or expressed the opinion to him, that he ought to make enquiries and charge Maher with assault, if such had been committed. Superintendent Hedberg made enquiries, and found from very respectable persons who were present at the fire that Jackson had not been assaulted at all. It appears that he went up in a very rude and officious manner, and attempted to take the hose out of the fireman's hands, and Maher came up and put his hand up, and said, "Go away, leave the fireman to do his duty, and go and do yours," and then walked away. Instead of Jackson having been assaulted, the improper conduct was on his part. The Superintendent found that he could not charge Maher with assault, and no further proceedings were taken.

238. You did not see Sergeant Higgins, who gave Jackson permission to assist the fireman? I did not see anyone.

239. Will you mention another case? In another case Jackson charged a man named Watt with using insulting language somewhere about the railway station, and it came under my notice that the information had been dismissed, and the opinion was expressed to me that Jackson had acted in a foolish and indiscreet manner.

240. Don't you know that his witnesses were never called? He had an opportunity of calling them, I suppose. The case was tried before a court of competent jurisdiction, and dismissed.

241. Were there not two girls as witnesses who were not allowed to be called? I am simply telling you that the case was tried and dismissed.

242. Another case was in reference to the larceny of wood from the Railway Station? Yes. As far as I could gather from the documents put before me, and the reports made to me, it seems that Jackson received the report of the larceny, and went about in such an indiscreet and stupid way to collect information that he put the suspected thief on his guard, and the case had to be placed in the hands of a more discreet constable.

243. What became of it? There it ended; the mischief had been done, and it ended in a failure to get evidence.

244. Can you give us any more cases? There were numerous complaints of Jackson's loitering and gossiping on duty; and on one occasion in the Domain, when a review was held, instead of attending to his duty and keeping the people in the proper place, out of the way, he was gossiping. On two or three occasions the sergeant had to speak to him. He was reported to me over and over again.

245. By whom? By Superintendent Hedberg.

246. Is there any official record of that? I do not know. We do not record these trivial things. If he was charged with a serious offence and fined or dismissed there would be a record of it.

247. Do you always dismiss a man who is fined? Not always. He might be fined and retained in the service. We cannot fine him without taking him to a court of justice.

248. *By Mr. Murray.*—Is it part of the duty of a constable to act as servant to his superior officer in private matters? Certainly not.

249. *By the Chairman.*—You have heard Constable Jackson's reference to Mrs. Hedberg? Yes.

250. Was not that a circumstance which would give Jackson reasonable ground for complaint? It was his duty to take that horse to be shod. If he was an unreasonable time Mrs. Hedberg might have spoken to him.

251. Had she any right to threaten him with dismissal? I doubt very much whether she did. She certainly would not be justified in doing so.

252. Should a constable, when on duty, be expected to obey the orders of his superior officer's wife? No, certainly not.

253. Was the enquiry you told Superintendent Hedberg to make regarding the fire incident an official one? Yes; it was an official enquiry, preparatory to laying an information against Maher.

254. Was Jackson notified and given an opportunity of bringing evidence? No.

255. Should he not have been notified of it? I do not know that it would be necessary. The enquiry was made from persons on the ground, who saw what had occurred. It was on Jackson's report that the enquiry was based, and he had every opportunity of backing up his report.

256. Was he duly notified that he had the opportunity of backing up his report? He could have brought forward the evidence of anyone he could have procured, if he had thought fit. He knew the matter was being inquired into, and he had every opportunity of getting testimony.

257. *By Mr. Gill.*—Is there any particular channel through which a complaint from a constable should come? It depends on what it is. If it is a complaint affecting his next superior officer, he may make it to the Superintendent, and so on.

258. He need not make an ordinary complaint direct to yourself? He ought not to do so. It ought to come through his next superior officer.

259. So many complaints might be made which would not reach you? No, it is not likely that complaints would be made to the Superintendent which would not reach me.

JAMES ANDERSON, *called and examined.*

260. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? James Anderson.

261. You are a resident of the Glebe? Yes.

262. Do you know Constable Jackson? Yes.

263. For how long have you known him? For about eight months.

264. Have you had many opportunities of observing him? Yes, a great many.

265. What particular facilities have you had for doing so? I am a reporter on the *Tasmanian News*, but before that I was proof-reading in the *Mercury* office, and often went home at from one to three o'clock in the morning. I always found Jackson on the alert and attentive to his duties.

266. Did you ever see him loitering? No.

267. Are you speaking of the night-time only? No, of the day-time too.

268. Did you regard him as an efficient officer? I did.

EDWARD WRIGHT PLANE, *called and examined.*

269. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Edward Wright Plane.

270. You are a Sergeant in the City Police? Yes.

271. Do you know Constable Jackson? Yes.

272. Have you seen him in connection with Wood's case at the race-course? Yes.

273. Can you speak as to his efficiency as a constable? I think it was last Cup Day he was doing duty with me at the Elwick Races. There were two brothers named Woods on the race-course who were what we call "nasty" drunk, not controllable by reason or anything else. Jackson and other constables cautioned them, and then they got to fighting and kicking up a row, and Jackson arrested one of them. The other brother then set upon Jackson and scratched his face, and the whole crowd gathered round and rushed upon him.

274. Do you think he behaved well as a constable on that occasion? Very well, indeed.

275. Have you had opportunities of seeing him since? Not in actual arrests; no more than seeing him about as a constable. From his walk, manner, and style he seemed a capable and intelligent man.

276. Could you see any cause for complaint? No, there was none that I could see.

277. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—Was he in uniform at the race-course? Yes, he was sent out with other territorial men to do duty there. Mr. Bellette was in charge, and he sent his orders through me. That duty on the race-course is a very critical one.

278. *By the Chairman.*—As a sergeant of police is it your duty to observe the men under you? Yes.

279. Have you had any opportunities of observing Jackson as you would observe a constable in your own Force? Not many.

280. Have you ever seen him loitering? No.

281. *By Mr. Sutton.*—How long have you been in the Police? Eleven years.

282. Were you ever in the Territorial Police? No.

283. Supposing your Superintendent were to tell you to take a portmanteau to a certain place, would you do so? Most decidedly.

284. If he had a horse to be shod would you take it? Yes.

285. If these requests came too often would you object? I would not like to be made a stable-boy.

CHARLES FOSTER, *called and examined.*

286. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Charles Foster.
287. You were formerly an officer in the Territorial Police? Yes, I was there close on nine years.
288. Is loitering on the part of a constable considered a serious or a trivial offence? Most trivial.
289. Is it a common offence amongst constables? You cannot help it at times. People come and speak to you, wanting to know when a bus is going by, or some such matter, and if the officer has a dislike to you he makes a charge of loitering. It is a common occurrence when you are not liked by your officer. It is unavoidable.
290. Have you had any opportunities of observing how Jackson performed his duty? Yes. I saw him last Cup Day, and called his attention to a man creating a disturbance outside my booth. He ordered this man off, and afterwards apprehended him, and he conducted himself as a constable should do.
291. Did you ever see him guilty of any offence which would incapacitate him, or render him unfit for duty? No.
292. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—You were in the Police yourself? Yes.
293. And you were diamissed? Yes, without a proper hearing.
294. You were at one time at Weldborough? I was.
295. Were you not removed to Carnarvon for improper conduct? The Inspector said he was shifting me for the good of my health.
296. Was it not because you were mixed up in a dispute about a water-race? I was reported for that, but the reason given for my removal was as I have stated.
297. Where did you go to then? Saltwater River, Carnarvon.
298. Why were you removed from there? Through the influence of Mr. Fergusson, the spirit merchant.
299. Were you not mixed up in quarrels there, making charges against the postmasters? He was Fergusson's nephew, and Fergusson said to my face that he would shift me.
300. Where did you go then? To New Town.
301. And there you were discharged? Yes, without a proper hearing.
302. What was the complaint against you? None at all. I and two other constables complained of the tyrannical treatment we received from Sergt. Higgins, and after a lot of gross insults I was discharged.
303. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What was the reason of your discharge? When I went there Higgins believed I knew too much to go under him, and Superintendent Hedberg told him to capsize me and get rid of me, and get someone else in my place. This came to my ears and I felt sour, being persistently annoyed and watched, and faults were found with me. Extra duty was put on me, which I complained of, and the two other constables complained also. An inquiry was held, at which I was grossly insulted by Sergeant Higgins and Superintendent Hedberg.

ALFRED CRISP, *called and examined.*

304. *By Mr. Perkins.*—What is your name? Alfred Crisp.
305. You are a Member of the House of Assembly? Yes.
306. You are also a Justice of the Peace? Yes.
307. And as such were you engaged in a case at the Police Court, in which one Watt was charged with an offence in the Domain? Yes, I was on the bench with Mr. Tarleton.
308. Can you state how Constable Jackson behaved in that case and gave his evidence? I was very much taken with the way in which he gave his evidence, and his straightforward manner.
309. Was there not some doubt as to the nature of the words used, and the benefit of the doubt given to Watt? Yes.
310. Had not Jackson two witnesses who were not called? Yes; they were not called.
311. Have you had opportunities since of seeing how Jackson performs his duty? Yes, almost daily.
312. Can you speak as to his efficiency as a constable? He always performs his duties thoroughly well.
313. Have you ever seen any loitering or behaviour unbecoming to a constable? No, I have never seen anything of the kind.
314. *By the Chairman.*—Have you seen him often? Almost daily, while I have been driving backwards and forwards to and from my private house in the Glebe. I have also seen him at the railway station and other places.
315. *By Mr. Sutton.*—You have been Mayor, and head of the Municipal Police of Hobart? Yes.
316. Would you ask a policeman to take your portmanteau to any place for you? I would not like to do so. I never saw it done.
317. Supposing the urgency of the case demanded it? I might do so in an urgent case, but in any case I would not send a man on duty.
318. You would not think of sending a policeman to get your horse shod? Certainly not.
- This concluded the evidence on behalf of Alfred Jackson.

OSCAR HEDBERG, *called and examined.*

319. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—What is your name? Oscar Hedberg.
320. You are Superintendent of Police in charge of the Districts of New Town and Queenborough? Yes.
321. Do you know Alfred Jackson? Yes.
322. He was appointed a constable in the Territorial Police Force on the 4th September, 1890? Yes.
323. And then was messenger and acting messenger up to 12th February, 1891? As far as I remember.
324. What are the duties of a messenger? To go messages for the the Commissioner, the Superintendent, and the Sub-Inspector.
325. During the time that Jackson filled that post, was he confined to his proper duties? As far as I am aware he was.
326. Was he employed by you in your private affairs? No. He has gone to the forge with my horse once or twice, but I think that is part of a messenger's duty.
327. Is that horse used by you in your Police duties? Yes, and for private work as well.
328. Were there any other occasions besides that? Not that I am aware of.
329. If Jackson says that he was employed by you in your private affairs, is that correct? It is quite untrue.
330. Or by Mrs. Hedberg? That is quite untrue also.
331. He says that on one occasion he was sent for a tin trunk to Waterloo House: do you remember anything of that? No, I do not remember it.
332. And he says that he went several times to Dr. Hardy's for a cart? Not by my orders.
333. With the exception of taking the horse to the forge, which you say was part of his duty, did you employ him in any private capacity at all? No.
334. After he ceased to be a messenger was he employed in street duty? Yes.
335. And he complained of prolonged duty at night? I believe from memory he was on duty for some eight weeks at night, about the time of Mrs. Davidson's murder, when Quamby was in the Hospital. He was to be relieved, but he was willing to go on, and it was at his own request that he was left on night duty. We were three constables short. He never made any complaint about it to me.
336. Do you remember a report being made by Jackson in September of last year of his being assaulted by one Edward Maher? Yes.
337. Do you remember what was done? I referred the report to the Commissioner of Police for his information; and the Commissioner, from the correspondence I have seen on the subject since, sent it on to the Fire Brigade Board. They returned it, declining to interfere. I made enquiries into the matter and found that the constable's statement was untrue.
338. Who made the report upon the matter? Sergeant Higgins. I may state that when I looked for the papers with reference to Jackson in this matter, I found that they had been abstracted from the correspondence. I have had to get a fresh report from Sergeant Higgins and two witnesses.
339. Can you give any explanation in reference to the absence of the documents? I cannot.
340. Do you ordinarily find papers missing from the office in that way? No.
341. Had you reprimanded Jackson in connection with the alleged assault? I had.
342. Would that be communicated to Jackson? Yes, personally.
343. Were not some reports obtained from bystanders at the time in regard to the case? I instructed Sergeant Higgins to get them.
344. In June of the present year, do you remember Jackson making a report of one George Watt using insulting language in the Domain? Yes.
345. Proceedings were taken, but the case was dismissed? Yes.
346. During the time that Jackson has been a member of the Police Force have you had opportunities of observing him? Yes.
347. And what opinion have you formed as to his efficiency? He is not at all suitable for the Police Force.
348. Have you had occasion to reprimand him beyond the instance already referred to? Yes. I spoke to him twice myself for loitering and gossiping, and the Sub-Inspector reported him to me on several occasions.
349. After his ordering the men off the grass in the Domain, did you see Jackson? I sent for him.
350. What took place? Prior to my receiving the letter of Robertson's complaining about his conduct, Jackson reported the matter. He had warned these men off the grass, and the tenor of his report showed that he had found out afterwards that he had made a mistake. I told him that he was foolish to do so, and that a child would have known better. He said he had made a mistake, and it ended at that. The report was afterwards sent on to the Commissioner.
351. Have you seen a letter signed "Robert Palmer," and headed "Extraordinary Vigilance," in the *Mercury*? Yes.
352. Do you know anything of the circumstances to which that letter refers? Yes. Sub-Inspector Cook saw an old gentleman and his son driving across the grass in the Domain in a buggy, and he sent

Constable Filby to them to tell them that they were not allowed to drive on the grass, and they then came off. The old man was annoyed, and spoke roughly to the constable.

353. Driving upon the grass is prohibited by the Domain Regulations, is it not? Yes, it is.

354. It was not a case of sitting upon the grass? No.

355. *By Mr. Perkins.*—Does that rule apply on Regatta Day? The Regatta Committee have the Domain upon that day.

356. You say Jackson was never employed in your private affairs? Yes, I do say so.

357. Did you not send him to Lithgow's and Weaver's chemists' shops, Chase's fruit shop, and Moore's, the tailor? I may have done so, but I cannot remember it.

358. That would be in connection with your private affairs? It might be in connection with my private affairs. I might have asked him to call at those places. I think I was justified in doing so, and Jackson never objected. It is some time since he was messenger, and I cannot remember.

359. Were you not in the habit of sending him backwards and forwards to Farmilo's with a horse? I might have done so.

360. Were you not in the habit of sending the horse up by him to be put into Dr. Hardy's cart? I cannot remember it.

361. Might it not have happened? It might have been so, but whatever he did was done of his own free will.

362. Do you know that when he had been on night duty for eight weeks, he complained to Ward, who was acting in Sub-Inspector Cook's place, and offered to go on from 2 till 10, as he wanted to get away from the hospital? I cannot remember it.

363. Did he not want to get away from the Glebe altogether? I cannot recollect it.

364. Has he not asked for removal? When he was messenger there was some talk of forming a fire brigade at Sandy Bay, and he wanted to give up his messengership and be removed to Sandy Bay. I did not consider that he would be doing his duty if he was sent to Sandy Bay, as he would be always running after the fire brigade.

365. Do you charge Jackson with abstracting that report which you state is missing? No.

366. Had he access to where it was kept? He had.

367. Do you even suspect him? I will not say that I suspect him.

368. Then don't you think it is very unfair to bring the matter up here? I don't see that; the reports are gone.

369. Is there any entry of the reprimand he received in regard to the case those papers deal with? Yes, on the report that is abstracted.

370. Do you mean to say that you keep no record of offences committed by constables? There is the letter book.

371. Is there nothing beyond that? I cannot say from memory; I believe there is.

372. Is no written reprimand sent to the man who is reprimanded? No.

373. It was on your recommendation that Jackson was dismissed? He was not dismissed.

374. Do you know that he wished for an enquiry as to the reason of his discharge? Yes.

375. And he could not get it? I never stopped him.

376. Did you ever tell him what he was discharged for? Yes.

377. When? In my office.

378. In writing or verbally? Verbally.

379. And did he not ask for an enquiry then? No.

380. Did you not ask him to resign, and did not he refuse to do so? There was some trouble about it; he wanted leave or something.

381. Do you know that he has applied through the Attorney-General for an enquiry? Yes.

382. And has he received that satisfaction? I think he has been to the Commissioner's office. If I remember rightly, I told him myself that he was unfit for the service.

383. Is that the only reason you give him? Yes, and a very good one too, I think.

384. *By Col. St. Hill.*—How many horses have you? One.

385. That is the one you get forage for? Yes.

386. *By Mr. Gill.*—Is it the duty of a constable to apply directly to you for an enquiry? Yes, he should apply to me in writing, and I would forward the application to the Commissioner of Police.

387. Has Jackson ever made such an application? No.

388. *By Mr. Lette.*—In regard to the wood stolen from the station, is it usual for a constable under similar circumstances to act upon his own responsibility, or does he see the Superintendent? He should have come to me and made a report upon it, and I would have detailed an experienced man to investigate it.

389. In connection with this man Watt, did you prosecute in the Police Court. No, it was the Sub-Inspector, Mr. Cook.

390. *By the Chairman.*—Is there anything in the regulations requiring a report to be made before the constable proceeds in a matter? I do not think there is, but it is an acknowledged rule in the service that everything must be reported before a constable acts, except in cases of murder, the pursuit of a thief, or anything of that sort.

391. *By Mr. Sutton.*—Is it in the regulations that you can dismiss a man without a reason being given other than that he is not fit? I have not the power, but it is one of the Police Regulations.
392. *By the Chairman.*—Did you conduct the enquiry into the occurrence at the fire at New Town? Yes.
393. How did you conduct it? Through Sergeant Higgins.
394. You simply told Sergeant Higgins to enquire about it? Yes.
395. Did you acquaint Jackson of that? As well as I can remember, he knew all about it. The Sergeant made his report in writing.
396. Is there any system of conducting an enquiry in that way—do you tell the Sergeant to make a report about the matter? Yes.
397. Had Jackson any opportunity of bringing forward witnesses? He did not seem inclined to bring any.
398. Did you ever have occasion to reprimand Jackson for being too long away with the horse he had taken out to be shod? No.
399. Did Mrs. Hedberg ever speak to him on that account? I know nothing of that.
400. Do you think Mrs. Hedberg has any right to interfere with constables, either as constables or messengers? No, certainly not. I do not think that Mrs. Hedberg would do so.
401. Did Jackson make any complaint about the length of time he was on night duty? He made some complaint through Mr. Cook or Ward.

LAURENCE REYNOLDS, *called and examined.*

402. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—What is your name? Laurence Reynolds.
403. You are Bench Clerk at the City Police Court? Yes.
404. Do you remember the case of a young man named Watt being charged with using insulting language near the Queen's Domain? Yes.
405. Can you recall the circumstances of that case? Yes.
406. Did you form any opinion in connection with the action of Constable Jackson as the case was going on? Yes; I had a very good opportunity of doing so as the case went on, and I expressed my opinion after the case was disposed of. It was to the effect that the interference of the constable was un-called for and improper.
407. *By Mr. Perkins.*—Don't you know that two witnesses of Jackson's, who were waiting, were never called? I do not.
408. The case was conducted by Mr. Cook? Yes.
409. Did not you see the names of Mary Jones and Violet Williams on the information? Yes.
410. Were not the names put there that subpoenas might be issued for them? They might have been put on subsequently to the passing of the information, but I presume that they were put there to be called as witnesses.
411. The evidence taken was that of Jackson and a person named Stubb? Yes.
412. And Watt was defended by Mr. Evans, the solicitor? Yes.
413. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—Was Jackson called as a witness? Yes.

MATTHEW HIGGINS, *called and examined.*

414. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—What is your name? Matthew Higgins.
415. You are a Sergeant in the Territorial Police, and stationed at New Town? Yes.
416. Do you know Alfred Jackson? I do.
417. Do you remember the fire at New Town on 19th September last year? I do.
418. On that occasion Jackson asked permission to assist the firemen, which you gave him? Yes.
419. Do you remember him reporting that Edward Maher had assaulted him? He made no report to me at the time.
420. Do you know that there was such a report? There was one made afterwards.
421. And you were instructed to make enquiries? I was.
422. Did you do so? I did.
423. Did you enquire from persons named Fox and Midson, who saw what took place, and get a written statement from them? Yes.
424. Are these papers produced the statements made? Yes.
425. They are dated recently? Yes.
426. Did you obtain papers at the time? No, I did not.
427. Did you make enquiries at the time from these two persons? Yes.
428. What information did you obtain? That there was no assault upon Jackson. I brought Jackson face to face with Fox, who, in my presence, told him he was not assaulted.
429. Did you make a report of the result of your enquiries? I did.

430. Did you keep any copy of them? I had references to them in the books.

431. You made a written report at the time? I did.

432. Did you keep any copy of that report? I did not.

433. Can you say whether the report you made recently is a copy of the one you made in the first instance? Well, no.

434. Is the material in your books full enough? I do not think it is.

435. Did you see anything of this assault yourself? No.

436. And all you know about it is from making the enquiries? Yes. I was in charge of the fire, and had five other constables under me, and there was no assault reported to me. I enquired, and told the Superintendent that there were no grounds for laying an information.

437. *By Mr. Perkins.*—These five constables were not all at the spot where this altercation took place, were they? They were all about. There were some of the men close to Jackson.

438. Who were they? I think Ward was one.

439. Did not Fox say that Jackson was only pushed on his back? He did not.

440. Did any of the witnesses say so? No, none of them; I am positive of that.

441. Did not Jackson want you to go to some one else? No, he was satisfied, and said he was sorry that he ever made any report.

442. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—Have you had any opportunity of observing the efficiency or otherwise of Jackson? On the 24th May, at the Review, I had to caution him for standing and talking and letting the people pass him, once at the instance of Mr. Cook, and once I went myself.

443. *By Mr. Perkins.*—He was speaking to some one? Yes, and not keeping the people back.

444. You told him to be more diligent in keeping the people back—do you call that cautioning a man? I told him not to be gossiping with the public when he was on an important duty like that.

445. He did not cross your path? No, in no way whatever.

BERNARD SHAW, *recalled and examined.*

446. *By Mr. Dobbie.*—We have heard something as to a prisoner being employed at the head office. Can you inform the Committee as to that? For many years past, while the Police Station was near the Railway Station, a prisoner has been employed there to keep the grounds, which are rather extensive, in order. It was also his duty to keep the stable in order and look after the Superintendent's horse, and do any work required about the place. If there was not enough to keep him occupied, he was to do anything he was told to do. The instructions from the Sheriff were that he was not to be idle.

447. Have any other constables been discharged since you were Commissioner? Yes, several have been discharged as unfit for the office of constable; others have been allowed to resign; four or five have been discharged and then allowed to resign. They were men who would have been dismissed. It is tantamount to dismissal.

448. Did you carefully consider Jackson's case before you recommended his dismissal? Yes; I carefully looked into all the matters affecting his conduct since he has been a constable. I am always extremely careful in looking into every matter in a constable's case before I recommend him for dismissal or discharge. I went carefully into everything in Jackson's case, and I was convinced that he was an undesirable man, not because he was a bad character, but because he was totally unfit to exercise the responsible office of constable; in fact, he has proved it over and over again.

449. Is your opinion in any way altered by what you have heard here to-day? No. As one who has had a large experience of Police matters, before I became Commissioner of Police, I think that the way he gave his evidence to-day clearly shows that he is not fit to be a constable.

450. *By Mr. Perkins.*—Has he not given his evidence truthfully? No doubt he has; but that is what, to my mind, has shown he is unfit to be a constable. He has made several statements as to what he thinks and believes to be the correct proceeding for a constable, and I have no doubt that it is an exact account of what he thinks; but it shows at once that he has no clear perception of his duty.

451. Would you include chopping wood and blacking boots in the duty of the prisoner? No.

452. *By the Chairman.*—Is there any regulation defining what the conduct and demeanour of a superior officer shall be towards his subordinates? Yes.

453. Must he treat them with due respect and courtesy? Yes.

454. Has any complaint ever been made to you of want of proper demeanour on the part of Superintendent Hedberg? The only complaint I have had since I have been Commissioner of Police was from Foster, who gave evidence here to-day. He was twice removed for misconduct, and subsequent misconduct in the third place led to his discharge. He then complained that Superintendent Hedberg had been bullying him, or something to that effect, which statement I did not believe; it came too late to have any effect. It is the only instance in which anything of that kind took place.

455. Were there any serious charges against Jackson? No, only general unfitness.

456. In that case was there not any better or easier way of dismissing him than the way you did? He could have resigned.

457. Was he not discharged before he had the option of resigning given him? You cannot give a man the option of resigning; it is a request that must come from him. He was told that his services would be dispensed with at the end of one month, and if he said "Will you allow me to resign?" we would say "Certainly"; but he never asked to be allowed to resign. If he had asked he would have been granted permission to resign.

APPENDIX A.

*To the Honorable the Speaker and the Members of the House of Assembly,
in Parliament assembled.*

The humble Petition of Alfred John Jackson, Constable in the Territorial Police Force of Tasmania,

SHOWETH:

That your Petitioner is a Constable in the Territorial Police Force of Tasmania.

That on the thirteenth day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, your Petitioner received notice of his dismissal from the Force.

That no grounds have been preferred against your Petitioner for such dismissal.

That the only reason for such dismissal, so far as your Petitioner is aware, is that he acted over-zealously in the execution of his duty in requesting a person to remove who was lying on the grass in the Hobart Domain.

That your Petitioner has made application to the Honorable the Attorney-General for an inquiry into the cause of his dismissal, but has failed to obtain same.

That your Petitioner believes that if a full inquiry was made into this matter it would be found that there was no reasonable case for his dismissal, and that he would be able, if opportunity was afforded him, of disproving any charge brought against him.

Your Petitioner therefore prays that you will be pleased to direct that full and sufficient inquiry may be had and taken in this matter, and that, if he has been wrongly dismissed, he may be reinstated; and that such order may be made in the premises as to you may seem meet.

And your Petitioner will ever pray, &c.

A. J. JACKSON.