

Town Major, whom I expect is to be called, addressed to another officer, the officer IC Amenities Control Committee. Well, sir, what relevance can a letter written by one officer who is not yet before the Court, -- another officer whom I don't think is going to be before the Court. How can that be understood to be evidence against this officer? I should say that that is hearsay of the most obvious type. Of course, if the Town Major comes and produces that letter it may be a different thing but for a police officer to say, "Because I am the police officer investigating the case and I seized the letter and therefore because I am a officer, by some peculiar magic that gives the document, it at once becomes evidence against the accused." Obviously that cannot be so. Exhibit "C", -- these are all exhibits which the witness is to produce -- I don't think they are very harmful to the accused. I have looked at them but I am objecting to them being produced in this case. "Authority for occupation of premises". Now, of course, this was not signed by the accused. He knows nothing about it. It is not signed or identified with him. It may be that somebody from the Amenities Control Committee or the Town Major's office or somebody in whose custody it is, can identify it, but all this police officer can say is "I was in charge of the investigation and my investigation led me to this place where I seized this document and that is all I can tell you about it". Then there is the "Marching in State". There again they should surely be produced by the person whose duty it is to make the Marching in State, and that appears to be a Lieut. Singer, and there again, if produced in that way I can ask Lieut. Singer any questions I desire, but I cannot question this witness about these documents because, of course, he knows nothing about them. He doesn't know who made them or why they were made or their relation to the accused except that he seized them. That objection applies to every single exhibit which is produced by this witness. I have been right through them. It may be that my friend will be able to produce them by some other person. For instance, there may be receipts for these things which were signed either by the accused himself or by someone on his behalf. I make no objection if that person is called and it is put in that way and somebody identifies it as being the accused's signature. But obviously I have taken this letter because it seems the most astonishing one (referring to Exhibit "F" of the Summary of Evidence). How can a letter written by Capt. Bradshaw to the accused, which the accused never saw until it was shown as an Exhibit in the case, -- how can that be evidence in the case? It cannot be. Why, sir, if that be so then one could seize any letter written by any officer to the accused and say, "These are evidence against the accused". In some peculiar way they become so". That I think, sir, is the strongest case. But there is one here, Exhibit "E", "Marching out State" which is signed for Brigadier Lister by Capt. Bradshaw, another officer. Now, that may be evidence against the accused if it is produced by Capt. Bradshaw who says, "I signed it for the Brigadier following his instructions. Then, of course, it would become evidence. But this witness cannot say that. He can only say, "I found this document in the particular Town Major's office". Now, sir, to put it in a