

1909.
NEW ZEALAND.

POLICE FORCE OF NEW ZEALAND

(REPORT AND EVIDENCE OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE).

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.

CONTENTS

COMMISSION	Page
REPORT	ii
MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS	v
INDEX TO MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	lvi
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	lxvi
EXHIBITS	1
MAP SHOWING BOUNDARIES OF THAMES POLICE DISTRICT.									503

WELLINGTON.
BY AUTHORITY: JOHN MACKAY, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.
1909.

COMMISSION.

PLUNKET, GOVERNOR.

By his Deputy, JAMES PRENDERGAST.

To all to whom these presents shall come, and to Helyar Wedderburn Bishop, Esquire, a Stipendiary Magistrate: Greeting.

WHEREAS allegations and statements have been lately made from time to time respecting the administration, efficiency, and control of the Police Force of the Dominion: And whereas, in view of the public importance of the matter both as regards the public and the members of the Police Force, it is expedient that full inquiry should be made into the several matters hereinafter mentioned:

Now, therefore, I, William Lee, Baron Plunket, the Governor of the Dominion of New Zealand, in pursuance and exercise of the powers conferred by "The Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1908," and of every power and authority enabling me in this behalf, and by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the said Dominion, do hereby appoint you, the said

HELYAR WEDDERBURN BISHOP,

to be the Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the several matters and things hereinafter mentioned and referred to, that is to say,—

1. The general organization, control, and enrolment of the Police Force of the Dominion as it now exists in its several branches, and the discipline and efficiency thereof, and in what respect the said Force or any part thereof could be better recruited, organized, controlled, or made more efficient.

2. As to the efficiency, conduct, sobriety, and morality of the members of the said Force or any of them.

3. As to whether any political or other improper interference exists in connection with the said Force; and, if so, to what extent, and whether such interference has any influence in the administration of the said Force.

4. As to the methods of promotion of members of the said Force, and the reasons governing the selection of members of the Force for promotion.

And you are hereby directed to inquire into the said several matters aforesaid, at such place or places in the Dominion as you may think fit, by all lawful ways and means, subject to the terms of these presents.

And, for the purpose of such inquiry, you are hereby empowered to summon and have before you and examine on oath or otherwise, as may be allowed by law, all witnesses or other persons whom you may judge capable of affording you any information upon or in respect of the said several matters of inquiry hereinbefore mentioned, or any matter or thing arising thereout or connected therewith:

And also to have before you and examine any books, writings, records, or documents whatsoever which you shall deem necessary for your information in these premises:

Provided that no inquiry shall be held by you into any matter or thing which has already been investigated and determined before any judicial or other lawfully constituted tribunal, or where any member of the Police Force has been dismissed from the service, or whose services have been dispensed with in consequence of his misconduct or for any other reason:

Provided also that, if any allegation or statement is made before you which relates to or affects the personal conduct of an individual member or members of the said Police Force, you shall not enter upon any inquiry in respect thereof

until the person so affected has had at least twenty-four hours' notice in writing of such allegation or statement, giving such particulars of time, place, and circumstances thereof as you shall deem sufficient, full opportunity being afforded to any such person to cross-examine any witness giving evidence against him, and to call any evidence in reply which he may think fit.

And I do also require you, not later than the thirty-first day of August, one thousand nine hundred and nine, or as much sooner as the same can conveniently be done (using all diligence), to report to me under your hand and seal your proceedings herein, and your opinion touching the several premises.

And I do further declare that this commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that, subject to these presents, you, the said Commission, shall and may from time to time proceed in the subject-matters thereof as you shall judge expedient, and that your powers and functions hereunder shall continue in full force, notwithstanding that the inquiry hereby directed may not be formally adjourned.

And, lastly, it is declared these presents are subject to the provisions of "The Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1908."

Given under the hand of His Excellency the Right Honourable William Lee, Baron Plunket, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His Majesty's Dominion of New Zealand and its Dependencies; and issued under the Seal of the said Dominion, at Wellington, this twenty-ninth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nine.

Issued in Executive Council.

J. F. ANDREWS,
Acting Clerk of the Executive Council.

J. G. FINDLAY.
[Seal.]

EXTENDING PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE POLICE COMMISSION SHALL REPORT.

PLUNKET, Governor.

To all to whom these presents shall come, and to Helyar Wedderburn Bishop, Esquire, a Stipendiary Magistrate: Greeting.

WHEREAS by instrument bearing date the twenty-ninth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and nine, and issued under "The Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1908," you, the said Helyar Wedderburn Bishop, were appointed a Commission to inquire into the administration, efficiency, and control of the Police Force of the Dominion: And whereas by the said instrument you were required to report to me under your hand the result of your inquiries not later than the thirty-first day of August, one thousand nine hundred and nine: And whereas it is expedient that the date aforesaid should be extended as hereinafter provided:

Know ye therefore that I, William Lee, Baron Plunket, the Governor of the Dominion of New Zealand, in pursuance and exercise of the powers and authorities enabling me in this behalf, and acting by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the said Dominion, do hereby extend the period within which you shall, using all diligence, transmit to me as by the said instrument provided your report and recommendations as aforesaid to the thirtieth

day of September next; and with the like advice and consent, and in further pursuance and exercise of the said powers and authorities, I do hereby confirm the said instrument except as altered by these presents.

Given under the hand of His Excellency the Right Honourable William Lee, Baron Plunket, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His Majesty's Dominion of New Zealand and its Dependencies; and issued under the Seal of the said Dominion, at Wellington, this twentieth day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nine.

Approved in Executive Council.

J. G. FINDLAY.

J. F. ANDREWS,
Clerk of the Executive Council.

FURTHER EXTENDING PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE POLICE COMMISSION SHALL REPORT.

PLUNKET, Governor.

To all to whom these presents shall come, and to Helyar Wedderburn Bishop, Esquire, a Stipendiary Magistrate: Greeting.

WHEREAS by instrument bearing date the twenty-ninth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and nine, and issued under "The Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1908," you, the said Helyar Wedderburn Bishop, were appointed a Commission to inquire into the administration, efficiency, and control of the Police Force of the Dominion: And whereas by the said instrument you were required to report to me under your hand the result of your inquiries not later than the thirty-first day of August, one thousand nine hundred and nine: And whereas by an instrument bearing date the twentieth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and nine, the time within which you were required to report to me under your hand the result of your inquiries was extended to the thirtieth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and nine: And whereas it is expedient to further extend the time within which you shall report as aforesaid:

Know ye therefore that I, William Lee, Baron Plunket, the Governor of the Dominion of New Zealand, in pursuance and exercise of the powers and authorities enabling me in this behalf, and acting by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the said Dominion, do hereby extend the period within which you shall, using all diligence, transmit to me as by the said instrument provided your report and recommendations as aforesaid to the thirty-first day of October next; and with the like advice and consent, and in further pursuance and exercise of the said powers and authorities, I do hereby confirm the said instrument except as altered by these presents.

Given under the hand of His Excellency the Right Honourable William Lee, Baron Plunket, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His Majesty's Dominion of New Zealand and its Dependencies; and issued under the Seal of the said Dominion, at Wellington, this twentieth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nine.

Approved in the Executive Council.

JOHN G. FINDLAY.

J. F. ANDREWS,
Clerk of the Executive Council.

REPORT.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable William Lee, Baron Plunket,
Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael
and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order,
Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His Majesty's Do-
minion of New Zealand and its Dependencies.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY.

I, the Commissioner appointed by Your Excellency's Letters Patent of the 29th June, 1909, which Letters Patent were extended on the 20th August, and still further extended on the 20th September, and by which I was directed to inquire into the following matters and things, that is to say,—

- (1.) The general organization, control, and enrolment of the Police Force of the Dominion as it now exists in its several branches, and the discipline and efficiency thereof, and in what respect the said Force, or any part thereof, could be better recruited, organized, controlled, or made more efficient;
- (2.) As to the efficiency, conduct, sobriety, and morality of the members of the said Force or any of them;
- (3.) As to whether any political or other improper interference exists in connection with the said Force; and, if so, to what extent, and whether such interference has any influence in the administration of the said Force;
- (4.) As to the methods of promotion of members of the said Force, and the reasons governing the selection of members of the said Force for promotion,—

have to report as follows :—

To enable me to amply cover the ground set out in the order of reference, I found it necessary to visit a large number of places throughout the Dominion, and to examine a great number of witnesses. To make my inquiry as thorough and far-reaching as possible, I deemed it necessary to examine as witnesses all the Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, station sergeants, Chief Detectives, and sergeants. A large number of constables and detectives were also examined, but these all came forward as voluntary witnesses, either as delegates for the local members of the Force, or to put forward matters affecting themselves personally or the general welfare of the Force. I found it quite impossible to complete my inquiry within the period originally fixed by Your Excellency. I therefore found it necessary to apply for an extension. The second extension was rendered necessary by my desire to afford all possible opportunity to Mr. Dinnie, the Commissioner of Police, to justify his control of the Force since he assumed office. He asked for, and urged the need for, a fortnight's time in which to prepare a statement covering such matters as he deemed desirable. I considered it advisable to afford him every facility, and therefore granted the adjournment asked for. It caused unexpected delay in my work. The statement he ultimately made appears in full in the evidence.

The preamble to the order of reference in the commission issued by Your Excellency sets out as follows :—

“Whereas allegations and statements have been lately made from time to time respecting the administration, efficiency, and control of the Police Force of the Dominion: And whereas, in view of the public importance of the matter both as regards the public and members of the Police Force, it is expedient that full inquiry shall be made,” &c.

Keeping this in view, and recognising the importance of giving the fullest publicity to everything brought before me, I afforded all facilities to members of the Press and to the public to attend my sittings; and, to give parties everywhere ample opportunity of bringing any matters they desired under my notice, I caused the arrangements for my sittings to be advertised in the leading newspapers in most of the places I visited. The fullest opportunity was also afforded to the Commissioner of Police and others interested to cross-examine all witnesses.

It was, of course, unavoidable that the opportunity was taken full advantage of by a number of persons to air all sorts of grievances that could scarcely be considered as coming within the scope of the Commission. A number of people, too, made complaints of a more or less serious nature, many of them utterly groundless, against individual members of the Force of all ranks. Any complaints that seemed to me to justify such treatment, after I had decided that they could not properly be dealt with by me, I arranged to be inquired into departmentally. It was inevitable that I should occasionally have to take evidence that appeared to the casual observer to be somewhat irrelevant; but it was difficult often, until a complainant's statement was heard, to decide whether it did or did not come within the scope of the fairly wide order of reference. It was often more desirable to listen patiently to complaints and dispose of them in a few words than to peremptorily refuse to hear the parties. The worst that can be said of my procedure is that it has added to the bulk of the evidence that I have to submit to Your Excellency. By some of the police witnesses the bogey of sectarianism has been raised, more or less specifically, as was the case before the Police Commission of 1898. One occasionally hears echoes of this sort of stuff, but the cry as a rule emanates from those who either have chronic grievances or who are always seeking to account for something personal to themselves that they will always attribute to any cause rather than to their own defects and inefficiencies. I can only say that, so far as I am capable of forming an opinion, I do not believe there is the slightest ground for assuming that a man's religion is in any degree a factor in his relation to the Force. Having said this, I thus dismiss an element which I always discourage, and which I shall make no further reference to.

“The general organization, control, and enrolment of the Police Force of the Dominion as it now exists in its several branches, and the discipline and efficiency thereof, and in what respect the said Force, or any part thereof, could be better recruited, organized, controlled, or made more efficient.”

The Force is organized under “The Police Force Act, 1908” (consolidated). Section 2 of this Act empowers Your Excellency to cause from time to time a sufficient number of fit and able men to be embodied as a Police Force, who shall be sworn to act as constables in and throughout New Zealand for preserving the peace and preventing crime, and apprehending offenders against the peace.

Section 3 states that Your Excellency may also from time to time appoint such Commissioners, Inspectors, and Sub-Inspectors or other officers as you deem expedient for the general superintendence and management of the said Force.

Section 10 gives power to any Commissioner to suspend or dismiss any constable whom he thinks remiss or negligent in the execution of his duty, or otherwise unfit for the same. Power is also given by this section to any Inspector to suspend a constable similarly until the decision of a Commissioner is known.

Section 11 gives power to make regulations generally for the government of the Force.

I may remark here that the main regulations made under the corresponding section of “The Police Force Act, 1886,” were made on the 7th January, 1887. They have been slightly added to and amended from time to time since then, but in the main they still stand as then drafted. Many of the regulations are entirely obsolete, useless, and ineffective, and in some instances positively absurd as applied to the present day. For several years past there has been an urgent

need for revision, and such need has been recognised and admitted by the Commissioner; but nothing has been done, and I may say at once that I can see no excuse for leaving neglected such an important matter for so long a time. I understand that new regulations will shortly be gazetted.

It is thus seen that the practical control of the Force is with Your Excellency, acting by the Minister in charge of the Department. The Commissioner possesses certain powers under the Act and the regulations, and exercises a limited authority in certain departmental matters.

The system of enrolment is settled by section 59 of the regulations. This states that vacancies in the Force will be filled from candidates selected by the Commissioner, subject to the approval of the Minister. Candidates have to produce a certificate or other satisfactory evidence that they have passed the Fifth Standard examination prescribed under the Education Act, or some other examination of at least equal grade. They must be of unexceptionable moral character, of which satisfactory testimonials will be required. They must be not less than twenty-one and not more than thirty years of age. An exception up to forty years of age is made in favour of members of the Permanent Militia who joined that Force before the 1st December, 1898. They must be not less than 5 ft. 9 in. in height, with 38 in. chest-measurement. They have to pass a medical examination. If selected they have to undergo two months' training in the Training Depot, where they are required to undergo a further departmental examination, and can be discharged if not fit. Men who have previously served in the New Zealand or any other Police Force may, in the discretion of the Commissioner, be enrolled in the service and exempted from depot training if not more than forty years of age.

The Training Depot at the present time has accommodation for sixteen recruits. The instructor is Sergeant Dart. He has qualified as a solicitor of the Supreme Court, and he gives his whole time to the instruction of the recruits. In addition to drill and general police training, he gives instruction in the provisions of those statutes which specially pertain to the work that a constable is called upon to perform. Sergeant Dart takes great interest in his work, is specially qualified to discharge his duties with advantage, and, so far as I have had the opportunity of judging, shows excellent results. He does not live on the premises. There are no facilities available, either by gymnasium or otherwise, for any degree of physical training that one might regard as almost indispensable in the making of a properly efficient constable. The probationers receive instruction in ambulance work and first aid. Each man while in the depot is paid 6s. per day, no distinction in this respect being made between married and single men. Every recruit has to live in the depot, and the average cost of messing is 2s. 3d. per man per day, thus leaving a margin merely of 3s. 9d. per day. This, of course, makes it next door to impossible that married men can join the Force, and yet these are the men that I would encourage in every way. The more young married men who can be induced to join the better for the Force. This I feel very strongly.

During the night, when Sergeant Dart leaves the depot, oversight is exercised by the sergeant at Wellington South, who is then practically in charge. I cannot say whether this system is entirely satisfactory. I am inclined to think that closer supervision in a properly defined way will be necessary. At present there is no settled arrangement, and what is done is merely by a mutual understanding between Sergeants Dart and Mathieson. I think that the Commissioner should have controlled this in a proper and systematic way. The present position contains an element of weakness, and therefore of danger.

It may be convenient here to refer to what is done in respect to applicants for enrolment.

In the appendix will be found the document which has to be filled in and signed by every applicant. On the receipt of this, and on proof of the necessary formalities having been complied with, inquiries are made respecting the applicant, dating back to the time of his leaving school, and through the whole course of his various employments. Speaking generally, the inquiries would appear to be thorough and far-reaching, and, in the case of most New-Zealand-

born applicants, to be sufficient to insure that only men of good record would secure enrolment. There are, however, weak spots in the system, and these I shall show later on. It is not long ago since several instances of very grave misconduct on the part of certain members of the Force became public property, and attention was directed to these in such a manner that it is not to be wondered at that people began to ask how it was possible that men who had been shown capable of such gross misbehaviour had ever obtained admission to the Force. It has created a feeling of unrest and want of confidence in the Force, but there is no reason to doubt that stricter supervision in the future will render extremely unlikely any such instances as we have had in the past.

Mr. Arnold, M.P., who was the first to direct public attention, from his place in Parliament, to the whole matter, was good enough to attend the sittings of the Commission in Dunedin, and he afforded me very great assistance in the direction of enabling me to trace certain cases which he referred to. Mr. Arnold's conduct and motives were broadly impugned by the Commissioner of Police during the proceedings before me. I see no reason to doubt that Mr. Arnold was prompted by the best motives, and only acted as he did in the best interests of the Force. He gave me several instances of men admitted into the Force without proper inquiry being made as to their character and antecedents, and who had afterwards to be got rid of. I will deal with the cases as given by him.

The first case, referred to by Mr. Arnold as No. 1, was that of a man who was dismissed from the Force for being concerned in an assault case.

I find from the official file that this man was enrolled on the 27th November, 1907, and apparently on the strength only of certain certificates that he produced of good conduct in—

- (1.) West Surrey Regiment, January, 1900, to September, 1901;
- (2.) London Police, October, 1901, to March, 1903;
- (3.) Cape Police, Kimberley, June, 1903, to May, 1905; and
- (4.) De Beers Mines Company (Limited), May, 1905, to September, 1907.

He must have been enrolled very shortly after his arrival in New Zealand, and there was absolutely nothing known of him beyond what was contained in the certificates, and these were of the usual very stereotyped form that we know from experience are very often given to a man without very much justification. This has even been the case with men leaving our own Force, as will be shown hereafter. I think it distinctly dangerous to enrol men without some better knowledge of their antecedents. The next case will emphasize this.

No. 2 is the following :—

This is a man who left England in company with his wife's sister. He came to New Zealand and joined the Police Force. His deserted wife made inquiries, and it was discovered that he was living at the Lower Hutt with his wife's sister, by whom he had two children.

This case calls for some remark, and is not at all disposed of by the Commissioner's explanation.

He was enrolled into the Police Force on the 11th June, 1908, under the name of James Holbrook, his birthplace being stated by himself as Bath, England, and the date 26th December, 1876. He stated that he left London for New Zealand on the 14th January, 1904, and arrived in New Zealand on the 1st March, 1904. He gave all these particulars on his form of application to be enrolled. He further stated that in addition to other services he had been a trooper in the Cape Colony Special Police, and that he left Cape Colony for London in November, 1902. After he arrived in New Zealand he was employed by the Wellington and Manawatu Railway Company, and later was in the service of the New Zealand Government Railways. Inquiries as usual were made as to his conduct in New Zealand, with satisfactory results. Every candidate for enrolment is required to produce a certificate of birth or other satisfactory proof of age. This was not done in this instance. Applicant gave the date of his birth as 26th December, 1876. On the 18th June, 1908, a week after his enrolment, he was instructed to obtain his birth-certificate, but nothing was done to

insist upon it, and on the 11th March, 1909, a further request for its production was made. On the 16th March the constable stated, "I respectfully report I have wrote to England for my birth-certificate. I received a reply back stating they could not trace it, and asked for fuller information, which I have sent.—J. HOLBROOK, Constable No. 1436." In view of the real facts as afterwards shown, this was a palpable lie; but, as he had been allowed nine months' grace to get it, and had been in the Force during the whole time, he evidently thought that nothing more would be heard of it.

But here comes the extraordinary part of the story. In 1906 a letter was received by the police from a woman in England, and to show the exact position I shall quote this letter in full:—

"34 Kingsdown Parade, Cotham, Bristol, March 28th, 1906.

"DEAR SIR,—

"I am taking the liberty of writing to ask you if you could help me in my great trouble.

"I was married three years ago, and, two months after, my husband deserted me and left England with another woman. With the help of the Great Western Railway and steamship companies, I have traced them to Wellington, New Zealand.

"They sailed under the name of Weight, his name being James Halbrook. I have enclosed photo. He is about 5 ft. 10 in., rather high square shoulders, brown curly hair. At the time of the South African war he was in the Mounted Police. The woman he has with him is about twenty-seven years of age, dark, and tall. Her name is Hilda Hayman.

"I am a fatherless girl and have to earn my own living, and, as I cannot afford to pay for advice, thought perhaps you could assist me in tracing him.

"Hoping I am not asking too great a favour, I should be grateful if you would do your best for me. They sailed in the 'Ionic,' Jan. 14th, 1904, from Tilbury Docks, London.

"Thanking you in anticipation of a reply, I remain, dear sir,

"Yours respectfully,

"LOUISA HALBROOK."

Accompanying the letter was a cabinet-size photograph, showing very distinctive features, and the face shown much larger and plainer than usual.

Inquiries were at once set on foot as for a "missing friend." On the 7th July, 1906, the usual "missing-friend" notice was published in the *Police Gazette*, giving the particulars as supplied by the wife. This was some two years before the man's enrolment.

About the 10th May, 1909, about eleven months after his enrolment, Inspector Ellison wrote a memorandum to the Commissioner of Police informing him that Constable James Holbrook, 1436, was identical with the "missing friend" James Halbrook, *alias* Weight, and that he had admitted the truth of all the statements made by his wife. The Commissioner minuted this, "INSPECTOR ELLISON,—Please call upon Constable Holbrook to tender his resignation at once, as we cannot retain the services of such men in the Department.—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 11/5/09." The man then tendered his resignation and left. He received a refund of half his contributions to the Police Provident Fund, amounting to £3 18s. 2d.

It must strike any one reading these particulars as remarkably strange that the man should have secured admission to the Police Force in spite of the Department, and practically every constable in the Dominion, being aware of the description of the "missing friend." The same Christian name, the similar surname, the personal description, the distinctive photograph, the exact date of leaving London, the service in the Cape Mounted Police, the failure to produce birth-certificate—it seems perfectly extraordinary to me that none of these points of identification ever struck any one, if the inquiries as to candidates are as thorough and searching as I am asked to believe.

It only remains to be added that on his resignation this man of deceit, and wife-deserter, received the following testimonial:—

ii—H. 16B.

"1st June, 1909.—This is to certify that Mr. James Holbrook served in the New Zealand Police Force as a constable from the 11th June, 1908, to the 24th May, 1909, during which time his conduct was satisfactory.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police."

This is the sort of certificate on the strength of which a man would be admitted into another Force, in the same way as the Commissioner admitted, say, No. 1, previously referred to, on discharges issued outside of the Dominion.

No. 3 case was the following :—

This constable was sworn in on the 18th June, 1907. He had had a considerable quantity of previous service in the British army and in the Birmingham Police. On the 25th December, 1908, he was fined 5s. for neglect of duty, and on the 28th of the same month he was fined £1, dismissed, and transferred from Auckland to Wellington for assaulting a fellow-constable at Alexandra Park Racecourse. On the 26th February, 1909, while in Wellington, he tendered his resignation from the Force, and this was accepted as from the 28th. Across the face of his defaulters sheet, which contains a record of his two convictions, was written the following : "Discharge handed to ex-Constable R. personally. Character, *Good*. 1/3/09." This is signed by Sub-Inspector Wright. I am bound here to say that they must have very different ideas in the Commissioner's office to mine as to what constitutes "*bad*" conduct on the part of a constable. There is attached to the file a letter from a constable in Invercargill, dated the 26th February, 1909, forwarding a letter addressed to him by a man in Auckland accusing Constable R. of decoying his wife away from her home and children, and asking for assistance to get evidence on which to prosecute the constable. The Invercargill constable said that he had no desire to be mixed up in the matter, and wished it to be left in the hands of the Commissioner. This letter was minuted as follows : "INSPECTOR CULLEN,—Please have Mr. B. informed that the police cannot assist him in this matter. Constable R. was discharged on resignation, 28th ultimo.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police. 1st March, 1909." The Commissioner, in his sworn evidence before me, in replying to Mr. Arnold's statement, said, "It was after he left the Force *and the Dominion* that information was received by the police that a married woman had left with him." Looking to the fact that the Commissioner himself minuted the husband's letter on the 1st March, 1909, and that his Chief Clerk puts into writing the fact that he personally handed to the constable his discharge on the 1st March, 1909, presumably in the Commissioner's offices, it is an extraordinary statement for the Commissioner to make that the man had left the Dominion before the police knew of the "married woman" episode. In his evidence before me Mr. Arnold gave an outline of this case, substantially correctly, and said that the police might not have known the fact of this man's relations with this married woman while he was in the Force. There is no evidence that they did know. What Mr. Arnold might have said in his place in the House does not concern me in this connection.

No. 4 case was referred to in his evidence by Mr. Arnold as follows : "This man was working on the tramways. He was dismissed from the tramway service in one of our New Zealand cities for making immoral suggestions to lady passengers, and he joined the Police Force."

I have looked fully into this case, and I cannot blame the police for what has occurred. It is the tramway authorities who are entirely at fault for suppressing information as to this man's antecedents—such information as the Commissioner admits would have had the effect, if he had known it, of preventing the enrolment of this man in the Police Force. His record of service in the employ of the Wellington Corporation as a conductor showed that he had been dealt with on ten different occasions, five of these being for insolence to passengers. He was allowed to resign instead of being dismissed, and his resignation took effect as from the 5th December, 1907. He was accepted as a probationer on the 23rd March, 1908, and was sworn in on the 1st April, 1908. The man had a number of very satisfactory discharges from various employments and testimonials as to character, and a certificate by Mr. Richardson, M.I.E.E., Tramways and Electrical Engineer, certifying that this man had resigned from his position *as he found the work was not congenial*. This, in the

face of the since-admitted fact that the man was going to be dismissed, is, to say the least of it, extraordinary. The fullest possible inquiries appear to have been made by the police, and Sergeant Murphy was specially sent to interview Mr. Richardson. The sergeant reported as follows: "I respectfully beg to report that I have interviewed Mr. Richardson, and he states that the attached testimonial was signed by him, and he speaks very highly of ———." In the face of this I fail to see that insufficient inquiries were made.

The fifth case mentioned by Mr. Arnold was that of a man referred to by him in the following terms: "A person was in the Glasgow Police Force. He was dismissed from there for an assault on his sergeant. He came to New Zealand and joined here."

This is quite correct, and I will state the facts. He was sworn in on the 30th October, 1905. He stated in his application form that he had formerly been in the Lanarkshire Police. Two constables doing duty in Wellington said that they had served with him in the Lanarkshire Police, and had every reason to believe that he bore a good character. On the 30th October, 1905, the day on which he was sworn in, the Commissioner addressed a letter to the Chief Constable, Banff, Scotland, asking for information about the man. The reply was dated the 18th December, 1905, and came from the Glasgow Police under cover of a letter from the Chief Constable of Banffshire, and stated that he had joined that Force on the 8th May, 1901, and was dismissed on the 6th September, 1904. He was remitted to the Sheriff on a charge of theft on the 8th August, 1904. On the 6th September, 1904, he failed to answer to his bail, and a warrant was issued for his apprehension. The Commissioner had the man before him, when he admitted the allegations, and was thereupon dismissed on the 25th January, 1906. The two constables who had vouched for him were called upon to resign, and left the Force.

I do not consider that there was any justification for enrolling this man before the inquiries about him had been completed by the receipt of information from Scotland. Inquiries are worth nothing unless they are complete.

No. 6.—This is the case of the Australian criminal of which so much has been said. This man applied for admission to the Force on the 19th March, 1908. He arrived in New Zealand from New South Wales on the 27th February, 1908. He was sent to the Training Depot on the 20th March, 1908, and sworn in as a constable on the 14th May, 1908. Prior to his enrolment no inquiries whatever appear to have been made as to his antecedents beyond the examination of certain quasi-testimonials that he produced, amongst these being one from a man called Lunny, who described himself as general manager of the Lunny property, the applicant also having described himself as overseer and caretaker of the Lunny sisters' estates. These Lunny sisters since turn out to be the two maiden aunts of the man, and their property brings them in some £15 per annum. On the 3rd April, 1908, the Commissioner addressed a letter to the Inspector-General of Police, Sydney, New South Wales, asking that inquiries be made as to this man's character. A reply was not received until the 17th July, 1908, giving his criminal antecedents. But, before this arrived, he had been identified as the original of the photograph of a New South Wales criminal of the same name. Detective Cassells, in looking over a book of photographs, accidentally noticed this one, and on the 18th June, 1908, he reported the fact. The man was dismissed on the 20th June. The only excuse made by the Commissioner for enrolling this man before the inquiries were completed is that he wanted a man to make up a batch of ten to go into the depot. I see no sufficient reason in this for taking a man that he was not sure of. No risk should be taken in a matter of this sort. It brings scandal on the Force and causes adverse comment. The Commissioner appears to have attached considerable importance to a recommendation by Mr. Wilford, M.P. But all that I can see that Mr. Wilford did was to say that he knew some of the man's family, and they were respectable.

No. 7 is a man, also from Australia, who, Mr. Arnold states, was admitted into the Force, and was called upon to resign for misconduct.

This man was enrolled into the New Zealand Police Force on the 20th March, 1908, on the strength of his previous service in the South Australian Eighth Contingent and in the South Australian Police Force. His discharges showed his character to have been good. As he only left the South Australian Force on the 31st January, 1908, and joined here on the 30th March, 1908, it is apparent that he could only have been a very short time in New Zealand. Absolutely nothing was known about him beyond the discharges, and we have seen what these have proved to be worth in other cases. On the 22nd November, 1908, he was fined 10s. for being off his beat and in the Albert Hotel without lawful excuse between 2.25 a.m. and 3.10 a.m. The next entry on his defaulters sheet shows that on the 27th March, 1909, he was called upon to resign and allowed twelve days' annual leave to 13th April, 1909, for "neglect of duty in failing and refusing to render assistance to several of his comrades who were engaged in bringing a resisting prisoner along the street, surrounded by a riotous and obstructing crowd." I do not consider that Mr. Arnold's statement is in any way "a gross misrepresentation of the facts," as it is described by the Commissioner. On the contrary, I believe it to be substantially correct, for that is the distinct impression left on my mind after closely reading all the evidence given at the inquiry and the reports of the constables. Inspector Ellison said of him, "I have several times noticed him inattentive, slovenly on his beat, and given to gossiping, and have checked him without good result. I consider he is one of the most useless men in the station as a policeman, and one who will do no duty that he can avoid."

In spite of all this, there is an entry on his defaulters sheet by Sub-Inspector Wright, "Discharge handed to ex-Constable Hood 12/5/09. 'Generally good.'" This can only be described as perfectly astonishing in the face of the man's record.

A number of men have been referred to by Mr. Arnold in his evidence as having been enrolled into the Police Force with little or no inquiry into their previous history. He supplied me with their names. I have gone through the files, and find that all these men were admitted on the strength of previous police service outside of New Zealand. So far as I am able to judge, there is no reason to doubt that they will turn out well. I have pointed out elsewhere the extreme danger of relying exclusively on *written* testimonials and discharges, especially in the case of men who come to the Dominion from overseas. I think that in all cases the preference should be given to either New-Zealand-born applicants or to those who have been here since youth. The desire to get men of previous police service, so as to dispense with training in the depot, has resulted most mischievously.

The case of a man who was dismissed from the Force on account of having been convicted in the Magistrate's Court on two charges of assault in the streets of Wellington, on one of which he was fined £5, and on the other sentenced to twenty-one days' imprisonment, has been mentioned to show (1) that strict discretion is not always used in considering the suitability of an applicant, and (2) that a man is retained after he has proved his unfitness for the position of a constable.

The man, on applying for enrolment, referred the Commissioner to a certain constable who he said knew him well and could speak as to his character. This constable reported on the 20th April, 1905, "His behaviour in company is rather silly, shouting loudly and making silly remarks, leads me to think he will not make a very intelligent officer." The Commissioner returned this to the constable with the following minute: "This report is not sufficiently explicit. For what period does Constable R. speak of? Is the Mayor of S.'s recommendation for eleven years a satisfactory one?—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 26/4/05." Constable R. then reported again, "I have seen the Mayor of S., and he informed me that he gave attached certificate with a view of getting G. into the Railway workshops as a carpenter. He can only say he is a fairly good carpenter *from what he had heard*. I knew G. from 1898 to 1903. Although I do not class him as a larrikin, he was very noisy on the street, giving me the impression he was

a brainless young man." This is dated the 30th April, 1905. The next thing is a very strong recommendation by Mr. W. Symes, M.H.R., addressed to the Minister, and asking his most favourable consideration. Mr. Symes said, "It affords me pleasure to recommend Mr. G., late a constituent of mine, but now of Christchurch, who has made an application for appointment in the Police Force. I have known G. and his family for years: he bears an excellent character; he is healthy, athletic, steady, and an honourable and straightforward young man, and will do credit to the Force." This bears the date 29th May, 1905. This apparently did not have the desired effect, for on the 19th January, 1906, I find another letter from Mr. Symes addressed to the Minister, "I beg to enclose herewith a renewal of Mr. G.'s application for a position in the Police Force. I have the utmost confidence in recommending the applicant, having known him for years past: he is a reliable and trustworthy young fellow, thoroughly honest and energetic, and will make a good officer. I therefore specially recommend him to your favourable consideration." He was accepted as a probationer on the 24th July, 1906, and was sworn in as a constable on the 25th October, 1906. Various inquiries were made from different employers, and the answers were all favourable; but the periods of knowledge were all short, and such knowledge as was possessed was manifestly more of the man as a workman than anything else. Not one of the reports compared with that of Constable R. as to knowledge and opportunity for judging and length of acquaintance. I doubt very much if he would ever have been accepted if it had not been for the backing he received from a member of Parliament.

For some time the man kept out of trouble; but in Auckland, on the 21st February, 1908, he was fined by Inspector Cullen for entering the room of the Waterside Workers' Union and examining papers therein without permission, also using improper language while in said office; and on the 18th July, 1908, he was fined, dismissed, and transferred to Wellington for grossly insubordinate conduct towards a sergeant, and wilfully refusing to obey the sergeant's orders when on duty at Alexandra Park. Inspector Cullen considered this instance so flagrant that it might have had very serious results, and he thought that the man richly deserved to be dismissed. Instead of that he is brought to Wellington, where he finally behaves in such a gross manner as to bring utter disgrace upon the whole of the Police Force, and to cause people to wonder how such men ever obtained admission to it. These facts require no further comment. It is also another of the evil results of transferring a man for misconduct, which I refer to elsewhere.

I have considered the circumstances under which a man was admitted into the Police Force who was afterwards dismissed on account of having been convicted of an assault in the streets of Wellington on the 10th May, 1909. I find that this man was accepted as a probationer on the 4th July, 1907, and was sworn in as a constable on the 28th August, 1907. He had previously been in the Permanent Artillery, and I find that his defaulters sheet while in that Force shows that on the 21st February, 1907, he was fined for inattention at drill and insolence to a non-commissioned officer. I cannot understand why a man who has shown insubordination in one Force should be supposed to be fit for another Force so shortly afterwards, whatever his credentials from friends might be.

To show the danger of taking men into the Police Force on the strength of certificates of service outside of the Dominion, and the bad effect it has on our Force, I would refer to the case of a man who was sworn in on the 10th March, 1908. Two months later he was fined by the Commissioner for being under the influence of liquor at 9 a.m. on Sunday, 24th May, 1908, when coming off duty at Wellington. He was then, apparently, according to the practice that I find occasion to so utterly condemn, transferred to Invercargill, for I find that he is dealt with there by his Inspector on the 21st October, 1908, for two serious breaches of duty. Then, on the 21st January, 1909, he pleads guilty to a charge of "Being on night duty, did leave his beat, and was found in his bed asleep and under the influence of liquor." For this he is dismissed from the service. And all this in a little over nine months.

One of the worst cases that I have come across in connection with laxity in admitting men to the Police Force is that of a man named J. D., who was admitted as a probationer on the 15th November, 1905, and sworn in on the 22nd December, 1905. There is an extensive file relating to this case, and I have gone carefully through it, and the profound impression is left upon my mind that, had it not been for the pressure brought by a then member of Parliament, the man would never have been accepted. There are no less than three letters on the file from Mr. R. M. Houston, M.H.R., dated 15th April, 1903, 1st October, 1903, and 20th September, 1905, strongly recommending the man for selection. The inquiries about him were never satisfactory and were never properly completed, and almost every statement that the man made about himself was a lie, and he even went to the length of producing documents on behalf of himself that belonged to another man of the same name. He was finally allowed to resign as from the 13th April, 1907. It turned out that he had deserted his wife and family in England, and was a thorough bad lot. During the inquiries that were made before he was admitted to the Force, a constable reported that he had frequently seen him under the influence of liquor, and that once, when he was on a spree, he had an intimate connection with a certain forged cheque. Another constable reported that he was in debt in the district in which he lived, that he was of drunken habits, and very quarrelsome whilst drunk. One man said he was absolutely "no class," and totally unsuited for the Police Force. It is true that other people in various reports spoke of his good qualities; but, judiciously reviewing the whole case, I can see no excuse whatever for having admitted the man into the Police Force. I can only conclude, as I have said, that "political influence" was the deciding factor. The man, on the 16th November, 1908, actually had the impudence to officially apply for permission to get married in Dunedin, although he was known in the Department as a married man, having so stated in his application form. He finally left the Dominion with a woman. The Commissioner described him in his final minute on the papers as an unprincipled scamp.

I have gone through the files of a great number of applicants for admission to the Police Force with a view to satisfy myself as to the nature of the inquiries made. There have been so many instances lately of men after admission proving themselves to be perfect blackguards, and quite unfit for the position of constables, that it cannot be wondered at that one should be rather sceptical as to the real value of the preliminary inquiries made, even although they might appear *prima facie* to be most complete. I have dealt in detail with those cases where there was no doubt in my mind as to the admissions being due to errors of judgment. But I am profoundly impressed by the fact that, even in those cases where everything had the appearance of being satisfactory, and where the lapse appeared unaccountable, many of the reports obtained which have been so favourable have been by people known to myself in some instances as utterly unreliable. And herein I think lies the weakness. It is not very satisfying, after the event, to be assured by the Commissioner that every undesirable, so soon as discovered, has promptly received his *cong  *.

Men entering the Force are dealt with as follows :—

The probationer at the present time goes into the depot, and remains there, being trained, for two months.

I recommend that the period be extended to three months, and that fortnightly reports be furnished by the Sergeant-Instructor as to the probationer's progress, character, and suitability for enrolment. Men with previous service should be required to go through the depot for such period, being not less than one month, as the Commissioner shall decide.

Each probationer while in the depot is paid at the rate of 6s. per diem, and, as I have already stated, out of this he has to pay 2s. 3d. per diem for messing.

I recommend that each single probationer continue to be paid at the same rate, and that each married probationer be paid at the rate of 7s. 6d. per diem. I consider that every encouragement should be given to married men to join, and under the existing conditions it is quite impossible for a married man to enter the depot, support his wife, and keep out of debt. I urge this as being a

matter of great moment. During the last two years, ending 30th June, 1909, out of 193 enrolled, only forty-four were married. I would like to see this number very materially augmented, as being best in the interests of the Force.

Every recruit on passing through the depot is forthwith enrolled as a constable, is sworn in, and is given a number.

I recommend that no recruit be finally enrolled until he has completed three months' probationary service on the streets. If ultimately enrolled, his seniority should be antedated to the date on which he left the depot. During the probationary period of three months, and afterwards, if enrolled, each man, married or single, should receive 8s. per diem. This should rise by increments of 6d. per diem every three years until the maximum of 9s. 6d. is reached, only senior constables, to whom I shall afterwards refer, receiving the new maximum of 10s. All constables now in the Force to be levelled up to fit in with this small increase. I consider that it is absolutely necessary, if the proper standard of recruits is to be kept up so as to keep the Force efficient, that there should be this slight increase in the pay of the constables. I am not recommending any all-round advance. I consider that other ranks are fairly well paid, and this is not the time to ask for any largely increased expenditure on the police or any other branch of the public service. The Commissioner has included in his evidence a proposal for certain increases which I understand that he has recommended to the Minister. These would involve an addition to the present expenditure of some £7,000. I should be very glad to see some material increase granted, but I wish above all things to be practical in my recommendations, and in these days of drastic retrenchment I cannot see my way to make proposals that are not entirely warranted by the circumstances.

To facilitate recruiting in the Police Force, I am of opinion that forms of application for enrolment should be supplied to every District Office in the Dominion, so that every intending applicant should be able without delay to obtain all necessary information and take all the initial steps necessary to be taken before the matter is finally dealt with by the Commissioner. For some extraordinary and unexplained reason these forms of application have not been supplied to the Inspectors for some years past. I think that every applicant ought to apply in person to an Inspector, who could then do everything necessary in the way of preliminaries—*i.e.*, have him measured, submit him for medical examination, examine his credentials, generally take stock of him, have the local inquiries made, and then pass the matter on to the Commissioner for him to deal with as he may think proper on the recommendation or otherwise of the Inspector. The Commissioner could still supplement his inquiries as he thought proper. The process I suggest would have the effect of doing away to a great extent with the possibility of the admission of men such as have been referred to in scathing terms by some of the commissioned officers in the different parts of the Dominion. In Dunedin Inspector O'Brien said that he had had constables sent to him whom he could not conscientiously recommend to a master chimney-sweep for appointment. Sub-Inspector Hendrey, in Auckland, said as follows: "We had one man that one would have thought had stepped out of the pages of a comic paper, and people used to laugh at him as he went along the street. I am sure, if that man had come before the Inspector, he would not have been approved of as a candidate." One may naturally wonder at and regret the ineffectiveness of a system that admits men that can be spoken of in these terms. If my suggestion is approved, the result will certainly be to improve the class of men.

At present the rule is that candidates must submit a certificate or other satisfactory evidence that they have passed the Fifth Standard examination prescribed under "The Education Act, 1908," or some other examination of at least equal grade. (If applicant has not passed the Fifth Standard, he must be examined by the headmaster of some Government school, and submit certificate from him that he is qualified to pass that standard.)

I do not think it desirable to generally lower the educational standard, but I do wish to allow a little more elasticity in the rule. I would propose

that the following words be substituted for those within brackets: “(If applicant has not passed the Fifth Standard, he must wait in person upon the Commissioner, with a view to satisfying him as to the extent of his education and his suitability for the Force.)” I have not the slightest doubt that many good and suitable men are discouraged from further proceeding with an application to join on account of the educational test. I also believe that many a man could satisfy the Commissioner as to his suitability for the Force, and as to his ability to make a good constable, and still fall short of the technical requirements of the Fifth Standard. It is certainly not leaving too much to the discretion of the Commissioner. Applicants could be dealt with by the Commissioner in any part of the Dominion in which he happened to be at the time.

I give here a return showing the number of applicants for employment in the New Zealand Police for the five years ending 31st August, 1909 :—

Number of applicants	1,175
Number appointed	303
Number rejected on account of—						
(1.) Physique	202	
(2.) Education	170	
(3.) Character	113	
(4.) Age	120	
					—	605
Declined appointment	34	
Applications withdrawn	41	
Gone; no address, and no reply...	59	
Pending inquiry	89	
On list	28	
In depot	16	
					—	267
Total	1,175

In his evidence Mr. Arnold said, dealing with the question of control and administration, “Here is a constable, whose name I will hand in to the Commission, who was stationed up North. He was charged with robbing a drunken man. The charge was made by another constable, and an inquiry was held. Whatever the Commissioner thought of it, the constable believed the case was proved right up to the hilt. The person who was supposed to have committed the robbery was promoted and transferred to a more important station down South. As, however, he preferred not to go South, he was sent further North. The person who made the charge was sent into the backblocks on the Main Trunk line, and when he protested against his treatment he was severely fined.” This statement is substantially correct, the only mistake being in saying that the man concerned was promoted. The reply by the Commissioner does not in any way dispose of what appears to me to be a most remarkable case that was dealt with in a very unsatisfactory manner. I have gone carefully through all the papers in connection with the case, and I am going to give the exact history of it. There can be no object to be gained now by giving the names of the parties concerned, so I shall suppress them.

In July, 1898, a man named A was enrolled by Commissioner Tunbridge into the Police Force. Two months later it came to Mr. Tunbridge’s knowledge that this man previous to enrolment had been a bookmaker and spieler; that he and a partner had been laying “tote” odds on certain races, and being unable to meet their liabilities had defaulted. Mr. Tunbridge evidently was satisfied on these points, because on the 7th October, 1898, he wrote the following minute: “Hon. the Minister of Justice.—There is no doubt this constable previously followed the occupation of a bookmaker, and laid totalisator odds, thus breaking the law. He made no mention of this in his application form. Had he done so I should not have brought his name forward for enrolment. Considering all things I think the constable would be better out of the Force, and, if properly advised, will resign.—J. B. TUNBRIDGE, Com’r.” His friends then appear to have interested themselves on his behalf, and Mr. Tunbridge decided to leave the question of his retirement in abeyance, and keep the man under supervision.

The next heard of him is in April, 1903, when he is charged by a fellow-constable with the theft of money from a drunken man. A charge in connection

with this was heard in the local Court, but the Magistrate was not satisfied, and dismissed the case. As the result of the whole matter, Inspector Ellison recommended the removal of this man to another district, as the public were not satisfied with the constable's conduct. He was then transferred.

Later on he was, with extraordinary lack of judgment, sent by the present Commissioner in charge of a station in the very district where he had been previously known as a bookmaker, and where he was brought in constant contact with the very people to whom he had defaulted years before. In October, 1907, the Commissioner makes reference to this in the following terms, by way of excuse: "It is unfortunate he was put in charge of this station, or any station in that vicinity, where his previous history was well known. I was quite ignorant of this when I approved of the Inspector's recommendation to put him in charge there." How the Commissioner was ignorant I cannot understand, for the whole history of the man's antecedents was set out in the file, and the district and places that he had favoured with his attention were particularly described and are on complete record.

In August and September, 1907, further charges were made against this man, who was described as the "police spieler" in the correspondence regarding them. The charges were various, from theft downwards. Inquiry was made into these charges by an Inspector, and a report made. A charge also of undue familiarity, by a married woman, was inquired into at the same time; but this, as is so frequently the case, resolved itself into one word against the other. The Commissioner, in dealing with the charges, expressed himself, *inter alia*, as follows: "Constable A's previous history (which is certainly not of the character which would now be accepted by the Department) is well known in that district, and he is not respected as a police constable ought to be. He is strictly cautioned." This was in October, 1907.

A serious charge of robbing a prisoner had been previously preferred against this same Constable A by Constable B. The inquiries into this, with other allegations, occupied some considerable time, and on the 19th October, 1907, the Commissioner wrote as follows, *inter alia*: "I must say, however, that in this charge the weight of evidence is against Constable A, and it is questionable in my mind whether or not he can be relied on and should be trusted with the charge of a station, as we cannot overlook his history previous to joining the service and since. It is apparent that his transfer must now be effected, especially in view of the public feeling against him in the district, and also the friction existing between him and Constable B and Constable C. Subject to approval, therefore, I will arrange for his transfer to a more suitable station where his previous history is unknown to the public."

A more extraordinary position for a Commissioner of Police to take up in respect to a constable whom he practically admits is utterly discredited, and whose honesty he himself seriously impugns, I cannot well imagine. And he calmly proposes to pass him on to a section of the public "*where his previous history is unknown.*"

But we have not done with him yet. He receives thirty-six days' leave so that he may visit Auckland and Rotorua. Orders are then issued for him to transfer to a station in the South, and Constable B is ordered to go to an inferior station in the North Island on the Main Trunk Railway. Constable A then wires that he is sorry that he cannot accept the proposed transfer, on the ground of his wife's and his own health. He is then told that he may go to a district in the North, but will not be in charge. He goes there for the time being, but evidently has no intention of remaining, for on the 28th January, 1908, he applied for three months' leave of absence *without pay* from the 1st May to the 31st July, and stated that he intended to resign from the New Zealand Police Force as from the latter date. He gave as his reason for this application that, as he would then complete ten years' service, he would be entitled to a refund of three-fourths of his contributions to the Police Provident Fund. The Commissioner minuted this, "I cannot approve of this application.—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 4/2/08." On the 5th April, 1908, Constable A renews his application,

and states that he wants the money to start a poultry-farm with. Meantime, in case of accident, Constable A addresses an ex-M.P. and solicits his interest with the Minister of Justice to secure the application being granted, and he ends his appeal with the following pregnant sentence: "*I may state I have been a staunch supporter of present Government party all my days.*" This from a constable who is supposed to have no politics is distinctly funny. However, Constable A is not fated to do without his poultry-farm, for the Commissioner minutes his last application, "The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—Taking into consideration this constable's conduct whilst in the service, and his previous history, I think his services can well be dispensed with, and recommend approval of his application.—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 10/4/08." The logic of this is not quite apparent, looking to the fact that the man ought to have been dismissed long since, but still the Minister approved it, and the next step was the payment to Constable A of £55 8s. 5d. as a refund of contributions from the Police Provident Fund.

And now everybody ought to have been quite happy, but, unfortunately, Constable B is to be made a scapegoat. Although his only fault has been the showing-up of Constable A as a disgrace to the Force, and perhaps the exhibition of a little personal feeling against him, and although a petition in his favour and testifying to his worth as a constable, signed by every resident in his district, is sent to the Minister, and although telegrams in his favour are sent by Sir Robert Stout, Hon. A. T. Ngata, and others, the inexorable fiat of the Commissioner has gone forth, and the man is transferred. As would be natural, the man vigorously protests against what he terms an injustice in being sent to a much inferior station, and asks for a public inquiry. He is severely reprimanded, and is fined £1, and has to transfer.

I have dealt with this case at length for two reasons—(1) to show that Mr. Arnold's statement was substantially true, and the Commissioner's reply not a fair statement of the real facts; and (2) because it is one of the most glaring instances that I have come across of inept administration. This sort of thing does a lot of harm. Its effect is not confined to one locality—the immediate locality of the surroundings: the facts are known and spoken of throughout the Force.

The evidence has disclosed the fact that the relations between the Commissioner and at least two of his senior Inspectors are, and have been for some time, of such a nature as to raise the presumption that, if allowed to continue, the efficiency and discipline of a certain section of the Force will inevitably suffer. These unsatisfactory relations found their echo, if I may so express it, amongst other members of different grades in the same centres.

At Dunedin Inspector O'Brien spoke with a considerable degree of bitterness of the Commissioner and all his works, and his attitude was reflected in that of several other members of the Force there of all ranks.

In his evidence in Auckland Inspector Cullen clearly showed that he does not see eye to eye with the Commissioner in matters of administration, and he spoke very freely on points that he thought affected the efficiency of the Force. Amongst other things he expressed very strong disapproval of the Headquarters Staff as at present constituted. But in this he said no more than others have said elsewhere.

The Commissioner, in giving his evidence in Wellington, specially referred to this in the following terms: "I am afraid that the Inspector at Auckland, in disparagingly referring to the Headquarters Staff, allowed his personal animus to overcome his better judgment. His relations with the Chief Magistrate and Police Surgeon of his district tend to confirm this." I at once took exception to this manner of referring to Inspector Cullen's evidence, given on oath as it was, and I pointed out what I considered to be the absence of connection between Inspector Cullen's opinion of the Headquarters Staff and his lack of friendly relations with Mr. Kettle, S.M., and Dr. Sharman. The reference seemed to me to be made for an improper purpose. Mr. Dinnie then said that

he considered that Inspector Cullen was vindictive, especially when he took a dislike to any one. He said that on this account he had considered Inspector Cullen's fitness to control a large district and body of men, and that it was not satisfactory. He further stated in effect that Inspector Cullen's evidence as to the staff was unreliable and untrue, and actuated by malice. Although I pointed out that, if this were true, it was tantamount to asserting the unfitness of the Inspector for his important office, and placed all the men under his control at the mercy of a vindictive man, especially as he, the Commissioner, had previously stated that he relied almost wholly on the Inspectors to recommend men for promotion, he did not seem to me to realise the seriousness of the allegation he was making against the Inspector, and how it might affect the whole question of the efficiency of his own administration. The evidence, as referred to, will be found on pp. 497 and 499. With a view to satisfy me of the truth of his allegation that the Inspector was vindictive, as the result of a dislike he had towards Sub-Inspector Wright, he handed me a small file of papers showing that in August, 1906, a very slight dispute had arisen between Mr. Cullen and Mr. Wright over the querying by the latter of the details of a very small voucher for the removal of nightsoil at a suburban station. Truly a very serious indictment! When men are lacking in a due sense of proportion, their judgment as a rule is seriously wanting.

I am not going further to refer to Inspector Cullen's relations with Mr. Kettle, S.M. The Commissioner has been fully aware of them for several years past. If he considered that they were likely to affect Mr. Cullen's efficiency and usefulness as a police officer, he should have taken action long since. He only refers to them now in connection with a matter personal to himself.

Matters at Oamaru in connection with police administration have been reported as not quite satisfactory, and I perused papers in connection with certain complaints there. On the 28th November, 1908, the Commissioner wrote as follows: "INSPECTOR GILLIES,—Unfortunately, since Sergeant Griffiths took charge of Oamaru we have had nothing but trouble, and I quite agree with you *that a complete change is absolutely essential*. Let Constables Nuttall and Murphy be transferred at once to Christchurch, and replace them by two constables from there. I will transfer the sergeant as soon as I can make the necessary arrangements, as this state of affairs cannot be allowed to exist." Comment on this is not necessary. The minute was written nearly a year ago, and the sergeant is still there.

My attention has been drawn to a condition of police matters at Blenheim that calls for prompt action. I have perused the file dealing with complaints made as to police administration in that town, and I am convinced that steps should at once be taken to put matters on a more satisfactory footing. The file dates back to December, 1906, when the Commissioner addressed a memorandum to Inspector Ellison stating that he had reliable information as to Sunday trading, and that it was "useless complaining to local police, who do not endeavour to trap the offenders. . . . I am not at all satisfied that the sergeant-major is sufficiently strong in this direction" (preventing Sunday trading). And then, on the 26th January, 1907, there is the following minute on a report by Inspector Ellison severely criticizing the sergeant-major: "INSPECTOR ELLISON,—I quite concur that the sergeant-major has not been paying proper attention to licensed houses in his district, and I am considering the necessity for his transfer.—W. DINNIE, Com'r." And so the condition of things, judging by the file, continues to steadily deteriorate, and no attempt at effecting any improvement in the only possible apparent way is made. Complaint after complaint is received, and prompt attention is promised. Owing to a great scandal that was caused by the death of a man who was burned in a cottage while drunk, Inspector Ellison, on the 17th October, 1907, addressed a further memorandum to the Commissioner dealing with the whole position of police matters at Blenheim, and expressing strong opinions as to the great laxity shown. On this the Commissioner writes a very long minute. I need only quote portions

of it: "The only remedy in respect of the present state of matters at Blenheim, more especially in regard to licensed premises, seems to me a change of local police control, and I will keep this in view when a favourable opportunity occurs." [It has apparently been kept in view for the last two years.] "The sergeant-major must clearly understand that by strict supervision over hotelkeepers he is rendering the trade a good service, and preventing 'no-license' being carried. The present laxity is simply playing into the hands of Prohibitionists, and neglecting his lawful duties.—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 21/10/07." A more extraordinary appeal by a Commissioner of Police to the well-known sympathies of his subordinate officer, the sergeant-major, could not well be imagined. Then we come down to the 13th July, 1909, when Inspector Ellison again addresses a memorandum to the Commissioner drawing attention to the alleged drinking habits of the sergeant-major, and to the absolute lack of energy on his part in dealing with certain houses in Blenheim that require special attention and supervision. The Inspector says that he fears that some serious trouble may arise at any time owing to that officer's convivial habits and general laxity. He says, "I consider an active, energetic sergeant of considerable ability is necessary at Blenheim in order to firmly enforce the Licensing Acts and some other laws, and maintain good discipline in the service there." The Commissioner minutes this thus: "INSPECTOR ELLISON,—This sergeant-major must be transferred from Blenheim. He has already had warning in respect to his conduct in the direction indicated. I hope to be in Wellington soon, and will arrange his transfer. Please show him this file, and he can report thereon if he chooses.—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 15/7/09." The sergeant-major then writes a long rigmale protest against being transferred, but not making any serious answer to the allegations by the Inspector. The Commissioner minutes this: "File for present. This sergeant is now nearly sixty-five years of age, and will soon be leaving the service.—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 16/8/09." I understand that he will not be sixty-five years of age until June next. As the Commissioner seems to me to be quite unable to realise the gravity of the position, I strongly recommend the Hon. the Minister to deal with the matter himself, and insist on action being taken. It would be far better to send the officer on leave of absence until his time expires than to allow the continuance of what I consider is a public scandal. For this purpose I am sending the file to the Hon. the Minister for his information.

A practice has grown up of late years which I very strongly deprecate as not conducive to true discipline and as tending to raise dissatisfaction. It is that of *offering* positions to men, whether on promotion or otherwise, and asking them if they will accept them. It is on record that a man has been asked if he will accept promotion to the rank of sergeant, and has refused, mainly on the ground that he was comfortably settled in a nice district, and that the emoluments of his position were far in advance of what he would receive as a sergeant. I hold strongly that a man in this case should be given no choice. The interests of the service must be the very first consideration. If the Commissioner once decides that Constable A is the very best man for the next promotion, he should inform Constable A, and instruct him to report himself accordingly. If Constable A is allowed to refuse the promotion, there is a distinct loss to the service. It is no answer to my contention to say that Constable B, Constable C, and Constable D are all equally good men, and that any one of them can with equal advantage take the place of Constable A. I do not say that it may not occasionally happen that even half a dozen men at one time may all be equally efficient, but the chances are that it is not so, and my experience has shown me this also. At any rate, I would say that discipline and efficiency must regulate the position, and it is certainly not discipline to go hat in hand to a man and ask him if he will please do this, that, or the other thing.

The same remarks apply to filling vacancies in stations and districts. It has become a common thing for the Commissioner to ask Inspectors if they have men who would be *willing* to go to this place or that place, just as if the Force were to be run for their convenience and pleasure.

A case was brought under my notice in which it became necessary to send a sergeant to a certain town, under a certain Inspector. The position was by no means an undesirable one, and had many advantages. To use the words of a witness, it was literally "hawked" about from one sergeant to another, and was *refused* by no less than three of them. The man who was finally sent there got no option, but was told to go, and he went, and had no cause to regret it. Presumably the sergeants who refused to go had made up their minds to hang on for certain districts which each had in his eye, and they took advantage of the weakness of the system to sacrifice the interests of the service to their own desires. It would not be hazarding too much to assert that each man finally got what he wanted. Whether the result was of the fullest advantage to the service is doubtful. The only exception I would allow in the rule would be on the score of health, either of the man or members of his family, and I would require the clearest evidence of this.

A similar instance to that of the sergeants I have found in respect to the filling of the vacant station at Seddonville. A telegram was sent, "Please ascertain if Constable L. would like charge of Seddonville Station." A reply came back, "Constable L. refuses Seddonville." Another one was then sent, "Please ascertain if Constable F. would like Seddonville." Constable F. said that he respectfully declined. Then yet another, "Please wire if Constable W. would like charge of Seddonville." But Constable W. declines. Then the Commissioner sends a memorandum, "Please ask the undermentioned constables, in the order named, if they would like charge of Seddonville Station. If one accepts, there will be no need to ask the others." One was at last found obliging enough to go.

I hope that in future the system of control will provide for something more conducive to discipline than what has obtained in the past.

Transfers of officers throughout the service, with the exception of the Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, and Chief Detectives, are far too frequent, and, in the instances which I have been able to inquire into, are made with insufficient regard to the interests of the service, and for very inadequate reasons. The cost of these transfers is very heavy, and I would suggest that a greater discretion be exercised in ordering them. In one case I found that a constable had been transferred no less than six times within two years. In some instances constables are transferred at their own request, for a variety of reasons, more or less imaginary, and occasionally at their own expense. One amusing case has been brought under my notice, where a certain constable apparently found it very hard to settle down for any time in any particular district. He seemed to be always agitating for a transfer. On one occasion he had a parent in a certain district whom he wished to take care of. Having got into a certain district, he wanted to get out of it because he had too many relations in it; and in a third district he found he could not do his duty properly because he was constantly coming across boon companions of his youth. He was finally fined for making false statements, and sent to a place where he has apparently found peace and an abiding resting-place.

Some of the sergeants have had more than their share of shifting about. Sergeant Mackenzie gives his own experiences on page 15 of the evidence. In January, 1898, he was promoted, and transferred to Queenstown Sub-district. In 1903 he was transferred to Gore, where he remained for sixteen months. From there he was transferred to Auckland, where he remained four months. He then went to Gisborne for eighteen months; and in June, 1906, he was transferred back to Gore, where he now is.

I quite recognise the fact that transfers may frequently be necessary in the interests of the service, and that in most instances the Commissioner must be the sole judge of the necessity; but transfers without apparent reason are irritating to officers, and create a feeling of insecurity which is bad for the efficiency of the Force. In many instances transfers have been ordered and never carried out; and the reasons do not appear clear. There are a great many instances to which strong exception might be taken. There has been no direct

evidence with regard to them, but certain reasons have caused me to call for the official files in connection with matters that did not appear clear to me. I have then found details of occurrences that seem to me to call for comment, mainly as showing the weakness of administration. One such occurrence had some extraordinary features, inasmuch as, although the evidence clearly proved very gross misconduct and drunkenness on the part of a certain officer, several constables were transferred who gave the information which led to the inquiry, on the ground that they had delayed the giving of such information, and then only gave it for ignoble motives; while the chief offender was allowed to remain at the station, and is still in the same locality, and has never been dealt with in any way for a very gross offence. And the position appears the more extraordinary because the Commissioner minuted the papers himself to the effect that the officer would be transferred. He evidently was satisfied that the allegations made were proved, and that transfer would be a sufficient method of dealing with the man. This is the case of a sergeant in Auckland who has been referred to more than once on account of certain alleged incidents in his career as a constable.

I attach great importance to the keeping-up of weekly classes for all men of less than two years' service, so that they may be thoroughly well grounded in all branches of police duty. These classes, if conducted on proper lines, should be a most valuable education to young constables. I am aware that it has been the practice to have such classes for some time, but I am by no means sure that the most is made of them. Attendance at such classes should be absolutely compulsory, and the commissioned officers should personally see that the work is carried out on right lines.

As it certainly touches the general question of organization, efficiency, control, and discipline, I propose to deal with the main police buildings as I have found them by personal inspection.

INVERCARGILL.

The police quarters here are very good, and will suffice for many years to come for such a small district.

DUNEDIN.

The accommodation here is very cramped, and an early effort ought to be made to increase it. I quite realise that the main difficulty is the procuring of a suitable site, but the question will have to be tackled sooner or later, and no time should be lost in considering the whole position. I found that only one room was at the disposal of the detective staff, and that the Chief Detective had to occupy this in company with all his subordinates. This is not conducive to discipline, and is very objectionable in many ways. The room, too, in use by the sergeants is far too small, and does not tend in any way to efficiency.

CHRISTCHURCH.

The quarters here are comparatively new, and are excellent in every way.

GREYMOUTH.

Nothing here calls for any remark. The requirements of this small district will be met for many years to come.

WELLINGTON.

At the Central Station on Lambton Quay the accommodation generally is very limited and very poor. The whole place is far too crowded for either convenience or proper sanitation. The men's sleeping-quarters, in the portion devoted to cubicles, are small, dark, and inconvenient. The place is a sort of rabbit-warren, and one shudders to think of what a dire calamity might happen if a fire unfortunately occurred. As the cubicles do not provide the necessary accommodation, some of the other rooms are used for sleeping-quarters. I was shown a room in which as many as nine men have slept. I consider this most

objectionable, and mainly on the score of decency. In another room I found that a sergeant and two constables were sleeping. On the score of discipline I consider this highly objectionable. I was greatly struck by the fact that there is no clothes-room and no drying-room in the barracks. These would appear an essential. A great portion of the room in each cubicle, small as it is, is occupied by the men's clothes. When the men come off duty on a wet night and have to hang their clothes up in these cubicles, one can imagine that the atmosphere would be highly insanitary. It is essential that proper accommodation should be provided in these respects. The office accommodation is good—quite as good as in any of the best stations. The cell-capacity is far below what is necessary in a city like this, growing so fast as it is. I found, to my astonishment, that there is only one cell for female prisoners. If there happened to be several of these in custody at one time, they would all have to be huddled together into the one small cell. It does not require much stretch of imagination to fancy what the result would be. The cells for male prisoners are in a way equally limited. Very frequently several prisoners are placed in one cell. I think this is abominable. The lack of ventilation on my visit was appalling. I consider that the Commissioner should have persistently drawn the attention of the Minister to a most objectionable state of matters, with a view to its being remedied.

At Mount Cook Station I found an equally crowded state of sleeping accommodation. In one room seven men were sleeping, and in another five. There was absolutely no ventilation except through the windows, and these had to be left open in all weathers. One of the main objections that I think can be urged against this indiscriminate herding together of constables in this manner is that no man has any privacy, and, being cut off, as it were, from all social life, he is not helped to live up to a refined standard of life. The effect on ill-disciplined minds must be most disastrous. It seems to me that the Department has a clear duty in this connection.

WANGANUI.

This comparatively small district has very suitable and sufficient headquarters. The place is excellently kept, and in capital order.

NAPIER.

This station calls for no remark. It will answer all the requirements for many years to come.

AUCKLAND.

This is, with Christchurch, the most convenient and best-equipped station. It is, of course, comparatively new, and has been built with a view to modern requirements. As I have said elsewhere, it is the only station that has been supplied with a gymnasium. The reason why Auckland should have been so exceptionally favoured is not quite clear.

The Newton Station and barracks, which have been recently erected, are excellent in all respects. The population of this portion of the City of Auckland has increased so enormously of late years that no less than four sergeants are stationed here, with a considerable number of men. The needs of the district in the way of accommodation have so far been amply provided for; but, if the city grows in the next ten years as it has grown in the past ten, one can quite imagine that still greater needs will have to be met and provided for.

Some of the small suburban stations, such as Eden Terrace, are greatly in want of attention; but these are departmental matters, and should be promptly dealt with.

THAMES.

The new station is much beyond the requirements of this small and inconveniently situated district. The new building, which is very solid and imposing, was evidently erected to provide suitably for the Inspector and staff of the district when it was newly constituted. Whether the result has justified the somewhat heavy expenditure is, I should think, more than doubtful.

The Dominion is divided into nine police districts, as follows :—

Auckland,	Wanganui,	Christchurch,
Thames,	Wellington,	Dunedin,
Napier,	Greymouth,	Invercargill.

The Force is distributed as shown in the return hereunder :—

Police Distri t.	Inspectors.	Sub-Inspectors	Station Sergeants.	Sergeant- major.	Sergeants.	Chief Detec- tives.	Detectives.	Constables.	Acting- Detectives.	Matrons.	District Constables.	Native Constables.	Police Surgeons.
Auckland ..	1	1	1	..	16	1	7	126	4	1	8	5	1
Thames ..	1	3	..	1	28	3	3	..
Napier ..	1	4	..	2	36	1	..	3	2	..
Wanganui..	1	1	8	..	3	62	1
Wellington	1	2	1	1	17	2	5	118	5	1	1	..	1
Greymouth	1	5	..	1	30
Christchurch	1	2	1	..	13	1	6	113	3	1	1	..	1
Dunedin ..	1	1	1	..	12	1	4	74	1	1	2	..	1
Invercargill	1	4	..	1	32	1

The Force is distributed in the districts as follows :—

Police District.	Inspectors.	At Head Station.							Number of Out-stations.	At Out-stations.							
		Sub-Inspectors.	Station Sergeants.	Sergeants.	Constables.	Chief Detectives.	Detectives.	Acting-Detectives.		Sub-Inspectors.	Sergeant-Major.	Sergeants.	Constables.	Detectives.	Acting-Detectives.	District Constables.	Native Constables.
Auckland ..	1	1	1	6	47	1	5	4	60	10	79	2	..	8	5
Thames ..	1	1	5	..	1	..	21	2	23	3	3
Napier ..	1	1	8	..	1	..	23	3	28	1	1	3	2
Wanganui ..	1	2	9	..	1	..	35	1	..	6	53	2	..	1	..
Wellington..	1	2	1	8	44	2	4	4	39	..	1	9	74	1	1	1	..
Greymouth	1	2	4	..	1	..	20	3	26
Christchurch	1	1	1	6	42	1	5	2	44	1	..	7	71	1	1	1	..
Dunedin ..	1	1	1	6	29	1	4	1	35	6	45	2	..
Invercargill	1	2	10	..	1	..	20	2	22	1	..

The enormous disparity in the size and importance of these districts strikes one at once. Invercargill, with 20 out-stations, and a total force of all ranks, including the Inspector, of 39 men; Greymouth, with 20 out-stations, and a total force of 37 men; Thames, with 21 out-stations, and a total force of 39 men; and so on until we get to the largest station, Auckland, with 60 out-stations, and a total force of 170; Wellington, with 39 out-stations, and 159 men; Christchurch, with 44 out-stations, and 141 men; Dunedin, with 35 out-stations, and 97 men; Wanganui, with 35 out-stations, and 56 men; and Napier, with 23 out-stations, and 48 men.

I cannot see the smallest reason, from a police point of view, for the existence of Invercargill as a separate district. With the greatly improved facilities for getting about the country, this district could be perfectly well worked and controlled from Dunedin.

Although Greymouth is a miserably small police district, its geographical situation is such as to almost justify its separate existence. When the Midland Railway is completed, the district will probably be quite as conveniently controlled from Christchurch.

I have not been able to gather that there was any necessity for the constitution of the Thames District. It has not been suggested that the efficiency of the control of the Auckland District suffered from its size. On that point Inspector Cullen has stated in his evidence that the work of which he was relieved,

in taking that portion of his district away from him, did not represent fifteen minutes a day. His evidence on the point will be found on page 353, commencing at paragraph 67. He was evidently never consulted on the matter, and he considers that the efficiency of administration has not been improved. However this may be, it seems to me that matters can scarcely be allowed to continue as they are, and if the Thames District is to remain it should be given some semblance of importance and justification for existence by being increased in size by taking further territory from Auckland. To assist the Government in dealing with a rearrangement, I attach a plan showing a proposed alteration as suggested by Inspector Kiely. I attach also his accompanying letter, as follows:—

“Thames, 8th September, 1909.

“To the Secretary, Police Commission, Wellington.

“I have the honour to submit to you, according to directions, a suggestion how this police district could be increased in size and importance, bringing it up nearly to that of Wanganui and West Coast. This could easily be done by taking in Ngaruawahia and all those stations between that place and Raurimu, thus giving an additional twelve stations to Thames and leaving sixty-four stations in the Auckland District. At present there is not a Supreme Court sittings held in Thames District, and it is rumoured that one is about to be established at Hamilton. The stations I suggest should be added are Cambridge, Hamilton, Kawhia, Kihikihi, Ngaruawahia, Ongarue, Otorohanga, Raglan, Raurimu, Taumarunui, Te Awamutu, Te Kuiti.

“J. M. KIELY, Inspector.”

This plan having been received by me after the Auckland and Thames sittings had concluded, I forwarded it with Inspector Kiely's memorandum to Inspector Cullen for his opinion. I have received from him the following reply:—

“Auckland, 29th September, 1909.

“To the Secretary, Police Commission, Wellington.

“With reference to the attached memorandum from Inspector Kiely, in which he makes a proposal for increasing the area of his district, and that his future headquarters should be at either Rotorua or Hamilton, I wish to point out that there are no buildings at either of these places that could be used as offices and store for the accommodation of the Inspector and his clerk; therefore a considerable sum of money would have to be spent in erecting office accommodation at whichever place was decided upon as the new headquarters station. As, however, a large sum of money has already been spent at Thames in providing the necessary district office accommodation, it is rather an extravagant proposal to transfer the headquarters to where further unnecessary expenditure would have to be incurred without any benefit whatever to the service.

“Whoever is responsible for the formation of the new Thames District had no knowledge of the lay of the country, or the routes by which the various stations therein could be reached from Thames, which leads me to the opinion that the idea of forming the new district originated in the Commissioner's office, and not with the late Minister of Justice. As showing how little the person responsible for the formation of the district knew of the stations in it, I may point out that whenever the Thames Inspector wants to visit Coromandel, Whitianga, &c., he must first come to Auckland, where he has to remain overnight, both going and returning from these stations, which can be reached from Auckland in less than half the time it takes from Thames, and at less than half the expense.

“The only stations in Thames District that can be reached more quickly from Thames than from Auckland are Paeroa, Te Aroha, Karangahake, Wai-kino, Waihi, and Katikati. All the coastal stations can be reached from here in less time than from Thames; and Rotorua, Te Whiti, and Taupo can be reached in the same time from Auckland as from Thames; while Tokaanu can now be reached from Auckland by Main Trunk express in eighteen hours, as against three days from Thames.

"The Thames, Coromandel, and Ohinemuri Stations have been always supervised from Auckland up till quite recently, and should be still supervised from that centre. During the time of the mining boom about fifteen years ago, when the population of those districts was twice what it is at present, it was not found necessary to have an Inspector in charge there, sergeants being found quite capable of attending to police-work there.

"The result of the new arrangements following the formation of the Thames District can be summed up as follows: Stations therein are more difficult to get at, and it costs more to inspect them from Thames than Auckland. Correspondence, of which there is a good deal, between Auckland and stations in the new district is much delayed owing to having to pass through Thames office, both going and returning, instead of going and returning direct as formerly. By having an Inspector and staff located at Thames to supervise a little over half the number of men that the station sergeant has to supervise in Auckland, an unnecessary expenditure of nearly £1,000 per annum has been incurred by the Department without the least benefit to the service, either by way of increasing the efficiency of the men in the new district or giving better supervision than they had before the new arrangements were made.

"An Inspector in charge of Thames District cannot find sufficient work to keep himself employed on an average of two hours per day.

"J. CULLEN, Inspector."

I agree to a very large extent with what Inspector Cullen says on the matter. If the Department finds it necessary to deal with the question in the near future, the information contained in the reference I have made will be found of value.

These small districts involve unnecessary expense in various directions—unnecessary because there is no counterbalancing advantage in increased efficiency.

As will be seen by a reference to page 96 of the evidence, it was practically agreed that I should recommend rearrangement of the Canterbury and Otago Police Districts. I therefore recommend that the Waitaki River be the boundary between these two districts. This only means that four stations—Oamaru, Kurow, Ngapara, and Hampden—would be taken from Canterbury and added to Otago. I make this recommendation entirely for geographical considerations and as a matter of convenience.

"As to the efficiency, conduct, sobriety, and morality of said Force or any of them."

Taking the Force as a whole, I believe it to be thoroughly efficient, and I deplore the fact that the exceptions have reflected so strongly on the whole. The criminal statistics show the efficiency most clearly, with the large percentage of detected crime. It speaks well for the good members of the Force that the results of their work are so thoroughly satisfactory. I have appended below a return dealing with this aspect since the date of the last Police Commission, in 1898:—

EFFICIENCY AS SHOWN BY CRIME RETURNS.

Year.	Total Number of Crimes reported in each Year.	Number of Persons summoned or apprehended.	Percentage of Persons summoned and arrested to Crimes reported.	Population of Dominion.	Proportion of Police to Population.
1898	16,378	14,730	89.90	768,910	1 to 1,435
1899	16,865	15,561	92.20	783,317	1 „ 1,414
1900	18,358	17,131	93.30	796,359	1 „ 1,359
1901	19,909	18,742	94.10	816,290	1 „ 1,381
1902	19,771	18,802	95.09	830,800	1 „ 1,375
1903	20,736	19,867	95.80	851,068	1 „ 1,388
1904	21,066	20,118	95.49	875,648	1 „ 1,398
1905	20,249	19,251	95.07	900,682	1 „ 1,375
1906	21,160	20,295	95.90	925,605	1 „ 1,387
1907	23,204	22,255	95.90	961,604	1 „ 1,375
1908	23,510	22,472	95.50	977,215	1 „ 1,331

The conduct generally of the men has been good. I have personally examined the defaulters sheet of every member of the Force, and, so far as these can be taken as a guide, the result is satisfactory. But, in addition to these, I have the sworn testimony of all the Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, and sergeants, and they say that the general conduct of the men is distinctly good. This is speaking of a Force of upwards of eight hundred men. But there are exceptions.

These exceptions have to be mostly referred to under the head of sobriety. I am convinced that a good deal of drinking goes on amongst the younger men in the Force. I also regret to say that there are a number of instances in which older members are clearly shown to be habitual drinkers, and these men, being so well known as they are, should be promptly dealt with. Inspector Cullen's evidence was somewhat disquieting as to the extent to which drinking goes on amongst some of his men in Auckland. He said that there had been more drunkenness during the past twelve months than during the previous three years. He said that at one time you could not go upstairs without tripping over empty beer-bottles in the passage. It was found necessary to take the extreme step of searching the men when coming off duty. The presumption was that the liquor was generally given to the men—for what purpose can only be presumed. Inspector Cullen's evidence was corroborated in all essential particulars by Sub-Inspector Hendrey, and he emphasized the difficulty of entirely preventing the drinking amongst the men.

All charges of drunkenness against constables and sergeants are dealt with by the Commissioner; and I am bound to say that I think he has dealt far too leniently with the great majority of cases; and this is a serious element in the difficulty of stopping the practice. I am strongly of the opinion that the effect of dealing too leniently with serious offences is to lower the ideal of duty of every man in the Force, and, if persisted in to any extent, will have most dire results on efficiency generally. Personally I consider drunkenness on the part of the men a most serious offence, dangerous to the individual, dangerous to the community. There should be no place in the New Zealand Police Force for men who are addicted to drink, or who have disgraced themselves, and their comrades, and the whole of the Police Force by being found drunk while on duty and in positions of great responsibility. I am aware that the Commissioner does not view the offence in the same way that I do, but I am strongly of opinion that the leniency shown, and the extraordinary inequality of treatment, are responsible to a large extent for the existence of what I consider a most dangerous element in the Force at the present time. There are a considerable number of men still in the Force who have been dealt with at various times for drunkenness by the present Commissioner. Since the Commission started two men have been called upon to resign on account of drinking habits, and one detective has been reduced to the ranks. To show what I mean by "inequality of treatment" and "extreme leniency," I will quote a few cases dealing with drunkenness alone and what flowed from it.

But before doing this I desire to quote the police regulation on the subject:—

"Drunkenness on duty will invariably be punished by dismissal or enforced resignation, according to previous character. Simple drunkenness will not be overlooked even on a first occasion. Under extenuating circumstances, recommended by the Inspector, this offence may on a first occasion be visited with a lesser punishment, but should the offence be repeated the member of the Force will be dismissed." (Reg. 62.)

It is most regrettable that the Commissioner should on certain occasions have deliberately ignored the clear language and intention of the regulations. The effect, in my opinion, has been disastrous as regards a small section of the Force.

- A. Drunkenness and assault: transferred to another station.
- B. Drunkenness on duty: fined 10s. and transferred. Drunkenness on duty again, seven months later: fined £1 and disgraced.
- C. Drunkenness on duty; (2) insulting a sergeant; (3) disobedience of orders: fined £1, 5s., and 5s. and cautioned.

- D. Being in a hotel on three different occasions when on duty, and being addicted to drink : reduced and transferred, and *cautioned for the last time*. (1) Accepting drink in a hotel when on duty; (2) entering a hotel on duty : fined £1 on each; conduct and fitness to be retained in the Police Force to be reported on at the end of three months. Drunk coming off duty : reduced in pay for twelve months, and strictly *cautioned for the last time*.
- E. Drunk while on duty : fined 5s. This man had a bad record, and had been punished for a variety of offences. Very shortly after being dealt with for drunkenness he was promoted to charge of a station, and an important part of his duty would consist in regulating a certain hotel about the conduct of which there had been a number of complaints.
- F. Drunk on duty : fined three days' pay and cautioned.
- G. Drunk, not on duty : fined 10s.
- H. Drunk in barracks at 1 a.m., and making a mess in lavatory-basin : fined £1.
- I. Drunk off duty : fined 10s.
- J. Drunk on duty : suspended, reinstated with loss of three days' pay, transferred, and cautioned.
- K. Drunkenness : transferred.
- L. Drunk on parade : fined 10s. and cautioned.
- M. Drunk in barracks when required for duty : fined £1 and cautioned.
- N. Drunk on duty : fined £1 and strictly cautioned. A month later was drunk when required for duty, and was fined £1 again and strictly cautioned.
- O. While on duty accepting liquor from hotel : fined £1. Five months later committed precisely same offence, and was fined £1 and strictly cautioned.
- P. Drunk on duty : fined £1.
- Q. Drunk on duty : fined £1.
- R. Drunk on duty : fined £1 and cautioned.
- S. Drunk on duty : fined 10s.
- T. Drunk when going on duty : fined £1 and cautioned that a repetition of such conduct would mean dismissal. Two years later was drunk while on duty, and was fined £1.
- U. Drunk when presenting himself for duty : fined 7s. 6d. and cautioned.
- V. Drunk on duty : fined £1 and cautioned.
- W. Drinking for four days, and acting in a disgraceful manner, while in possession of a warrant : strictly cautioned that any such neglect on his part in the future will be severely dealt with, and he will be transferred as soon as a vacancy occurs, and to lose four days' pay.
- X. Drunk on duty : fined 10s. and strictly cautioned.
- Y. Drunkenness : fined 10s. and transferred. Drunk, ten months later, at 9 a.m. : fined £1 and strictly cautioned for the last time.
- Z. This man was found drunk while supposed to be discharging very important and responsible duties. He was fined 10s., and has been since transferred to a district where the facilities for drinking are probably as great as in any other part of the Dominion. In the face of an extremely bad report on this man by his Inspector, this treatment by the Commissioner is absolutely extraordinary, and to my mind is destructive of true discipline and efficiency.

The other exceptions, which would come under the head of "General," are not in the main of a serious character, but it seems to me that the light and absurdly lenient treatment of offences that I would certainly deem serious is not in the best interests of discipline and efficiency. Apart from the lack of punitive effect on the individual, it affords a shocking bad example to the rest of the men, and helps to destroy a valuable incentive to good conduct. To illustrate what I mean I will take a few cases :—

- A. This constable attempted to travel by rail on a defaced old police pass when on leave. This involved an act of rank dishonesty. He was by no means a first offender. He admitted the offence, was fined 10s. and strictly cautioned, and warned that, unless he pays more attention to duty than hitherto, his services will be dispensed with.
- B. This man has been dealt with on the following charges : (1) Absent from beat; (2) failing to report himself; (3) making false report; (4) failing to work his beat; (5) gross neglect of duty on beat-work; (6) being off his beat and talking with prostitute; (7) absence from beat; (8) disobedience of orders. He was fined various small amounts for each offence, and is still in the Force. He was transferred to a district where the supervision and discipline were not likely to come in conflict with his little peculiarities, and as a consequence his sheet has been clean since his transfer, much to the relief, probably, of all concerned. It is a direct encouragement to similar peculiar treatment.
- C. A constable used insulting language to his Inspector of a most disgusting character : he was fined 10s. and transferred.
- D. This constable was charged with (1) neglect of duty on four occasions in disobeying instructions; (2) disobedience of orders, and making a false entry in diary-of-duty book; (3) disobedience of orders, and insubordination in not attending a certain place, and using abusive and insulting language to a sergeant; (4) disobedience to an order of the Sub-Inspector to attend at the Inspector's office. He was fined £1 on the four charges, and ordered to be transferred. This last order was never carried out, and the man is still in the district in which the offences were committed, although not now in charge of a district. He is not doing beat duty. This is the same man as is dealt with previously as C, under the head of "Drunkenness."
- E. This constable was dealt with for the following offences : (1) Insolence to a sergeant whilst on duty : fined 10s. (2) Disobeying a sergeant's orders : fined 5s. (3) Disobedience of orders by refusing to attend at the Sub-Inspector's office when instructed by the station sergeant : fined 5s. This same man is dealt with as E, under the head of "Drunkenness."

Punishment of an offender for a serious offence by transferring him to another district would as a rule appear almost grotesque where such does not result in loss of status or emolument. It merely shifts the responsibility; irritates and annoys the Inspectors, who protest loudly at having defaulters foisted on them, oftentimes, as stated, without being supplied with particulars of previous misconduct; causes local discontent; and puts the country to a large amount of unnecessary and unwarrantable expense. If it is thought desirable to retain a certain class of offenders in the Force, they should be kept in the same district to work out their own redemption, but under conditions that would make their cases an example to their comrades and a warning to themselves. I consider this transfer system to be an admission of weakness, and mischievous in its results.

During the three years from the 1st July, 1906, to the 30th June, 1909, the following return shows the number of transfers and their aggregate cost :—

1906-7	189 transfers, cost £2,379 19s. 3d.
1907-8	235 " " £2,814 2s. 6d.
1908-9	217 " " £2,865 0s. 4d.

As regards morality I am inclined to think that there is little to cavil at, and that the Force is generally composed of men who recognise the obligation that is on them to so conduct themselves as to reflect credit on all connected with them. It would be strange indeed if, amongst a large number of young men, one did not find instances of a certain degree of license. I have found very few indeed. So few indeed were they that it is quite unnecessary to refer to them in any detail.

It was said by Mr. Arnold that the conduct of the men in barracks in Wellington had occasionally been bad, and that "scenes" had been created. I have inquired into this matter, and the evidence obtainable only shows that there were disturbances on two occasions—one at midnight, which had to be quelled by the sergeant. A number of witnesses have testified to the general good conduct of the men in barracks, and, as the constables seem to feel the reflections cast upon them somewhat keenly, I am very glad to be able to say that, so far as the evidence goes, there is every reason to believe that the great majority of the men are a credit to the Force.

"As to whether any political or other improper interference exists in connection with the Force; and, if so, to what extent, and whether such interference has any influence in the administration of the said Force."

To enable me to form a judgment in respect of this, I have carefully examined all files of papers relating to cases where it appeared that there was any suspicion of influence being a factor in certain events that could not reasonably be accounted for in any other way. I have found a great number of letters from members of Parliament to Ministers, written on behalf of certain members of the Force, either to secure promotion or other advantage; I have found letters from members covering complaints from constituents and asking for inquiry, and expressing opinions adverse to certain members of the Force; I have found letters and petitions of all sorts and varieties: but no single case have I found in which there was positive proof of political influence having been the determining factor in any act done as regards an individual or locality. On the contrary, I have seen a large number of letters written by Ministers to members in response to a variety of solicitations, in which there is a most distinct independence of tone adopted in refusing to accede to requests—refusals, too, which were subsequently adhered to.

A large number of witnesses have testified to their belief that political and other influence is rampant. Very few have done more than express this belief, based on statements made by men who had boasted that they have been able to exercise it, or echoing the general cry, "Oh! every one knows it is used." A few have given instances of events which to their minds were quite unaccountable for except on the favourite hypothesis. Every instance quoted has been carefully probed, but without any positive result.

In addition to the ordinary police witnesses, I had the evidence of the Hon. Mr. McGowan, voluntarily given at the Auckland sitting. Mr. McGowan was Minister in Charge of the Police Department for some nine years. He admitted, of course, having been constantly approached by members on police matters generally, but stated emphatically that such had no influence on himself or his actions.

But I think that the most mischievous direction in which political influence has operated has been in inducing the enrolment of men into the Force without sufficient inquiry. I have not the slightest doubt that the word of the member has gone very far in many cases. I am equally sure that in very few instances has the member had sufficient personal knowledge of the applicant to justify his action.

A great number of "confidential" letters are doubtless written to Ministers on matters affecting the Force, and what the effect of these is it is quite impossible to say. They are not filed, as a rule, in the usual way, and one cannot trace them or their effect. In the same way, of course, members have boundless opportunities of speaking to the Minister, or even to the Commissioner, on matters affecting the Force, and presumably with a view to influencing action in a certain direction. It would be simply amazing if this did not have some slight effect. I am not prepared to say that the administration of the Force has suffered to any appreciable extent through political influence, but the knowledge and feeling that such, if judiciously used, may be successful has a very mischievous effect. Some constables have approached members in the most open way to advance their interests. One man admitted to me that he had solicited

the good offices of no less than three members of Parliament to assist him to secure promotion to the rank of sergeant. He told in mournful tones, and apparently making somewhat of a grievance of it, that it had done him no good. At any rate, he is still a constable, and likely to remain so.

A constable told me lately on oath that he was informed by one high in authority that the reason he had not been advanced was that he had not enough friends in high places. One can scarcely believe that the constable heard aright, but, still, it shows the feeling. A member of Parliament must necessarily be accessible to all his constituents, and policemen have votes. This seems to me to sum up the position. It is, however, a fact that a man, simply because he has a vote, considers that he has an absolute claim upon his member to advance his interests if called upon. Every self-respecting man resents such a position. As two members recently remarked to me, "The average member is regarded by his constituents either as a sort of general agent to carry out their behests, or else as a walking Labour Bureau, to get billets for all and sundry."

Mr. C. H. Poole, M.P., in giving evidence at Auckland, remarked that the appeal to political influence is becoming commonplace in this country. Day by day and week by week members of Parliament have matters relating to different Departments brought under their notice. Sometimes they are approached by people who have grievances which ought to be redressed, and others are looking for particular political favours. With "influence" so prevalent it would, he said, be phenomenal if the Police Force escaped. He went on to say that political influence is rife all through the country, and he dealt with the duty of the Administration. (Page 316 of the evidence.)

After all, what is the remedy? The true remedy must lie in the personal quality of those directly responsible for the efficiency of the Force. If the Minister and the Commissioner are strong men, they can always resist any outside pressure to induce any act that is not in the truest interests of the whole of the Force.

The only other influences mentioned during the course of the inquiry have been Masonic and religious. There is absolutely no ground whatever for even the suggestion of any effect on the Force from either of these sources.

Under the guise of giving evidence on the question of political influence, a disgraced detective, doing duty as a constable in Invercargill, made a most serious accusation against Mr. G. Laurenson, M.P. The statement, when being made, appeared to me so improbable and extraordinary that I warned the constable of the effect of what he was saying, and suggested that he should be careful. He, however, persisted in asserting the truth of what he said. I then caused a copy of his statement to be furnished to Mr. Laurenson, and ultimately, at the latter's request, the constable attended at the sitting at Christchurch so that the merits of the charge might be dealt with. But at this sitting, Mr. Laurenson being present, the constable practically withdrew the statement made in Invercargill, and said that he had not thoroughly understood the effect of what he said, and certainly did not mean what every one thought he meant. Mr. Laurenson gave evidence on oath denying the allegation, and the incident ended. I am quite convinced that the constable knew full well the effect of what he was saying, and I am equally convinced that there was not a shadow of truth in the abominable accusation that he made. The man had actually been promoted after leaving Lyttelton, and the disrating affair had admittedly nothing to do with Mr. Laurenson.

"As to the methods of promotion of members of the Force, and the reasons governing the selection of members of the Force for promotion."

There is no doubt whatever that there is a very strong feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction throughout the Force with regard to the manner in which certain constables have been promoted to be sergeants. The evidence fairly teems with instances illustrating this discontent, given by witnesses all over New Zealand. A great deal of this discontent and dissatisfaction is, in my opinion, entirely well founded, and I think I can show conclusive evidence of it. Of course, in any Force, however constituted, there is always bound to be a very great deal of dissatisfaction on the subject of promotions. Men always

expect to be taken at their own estimate of themselves and their capacity, and I am very far from saying that every man who has advanced his claims for promotion is qualified for it. But when I see some of the inconsistent, inequitable, and apparently quite unwarranted instances of promotion, I do not wonder at many men feeling aggrieved, and expressing themselves in no measured terms over the way in which they have been treated. The Commissioner has repeatedly, during the course of this inquiry, asked complaining constables whether they have ever applied for promotion, and, if answered in the negative, has appeared quite satisfied that he has completely disposed of the complaint. I say most unhesitatingly that there should be no necessity for a man who is entitled to it to ask for promotion. I would almost regard the asking for it as a disqualification. It is scarcely necessary to say that all promotions should go by merit and service, and that, all things being equal, seniority should govern. The Commissioner tells me that all promotions recommended by him have been based on these considerations. He can, I suppose, easily persuade himself that this is so, but in several instances the facts do not bear it out. I have no doubt whatever, and it is not seriously disputed, that the main consideration in conferring some of the promotions has been to get the increased pay for the work being done by the constable by means of the improved rank. I cannot imagine anything more mischievous in practice than this system, nor more disastrous to the best interests of the Force. A man should always be paid according to the work he does, but he should be paid as for the work, and not given a rank that he is in no way entitled to. I will take the case of what is probably the most flagrant instance of all to emphasize what I mean—that of Sergeant Muggeridge. He was enrolled into the Police Force on the 1st July, 1899. After doing only seven months' actual police work, he was appointed a junior clerk in the Wellington District Office on the 23rd February, 1900. On the 1st September, 1901, he was appointed to be Police Storekeeper, and on the 1st October, 1906, he was promoted to be sergeant over the heads of about 273 constables, all senior in service to himself. And this, too, after seven months' actual police work, and less than seven years' complete service! Can it be wondered at that constables with excellent records, some of them with over thirty years' actual and continuous police service, proved men, and recommended by their officers for promotion before this man even entered the Force, should feel dissatisfied with an administration where such an egregious act of injustice was possible? Men under these circumstances naturally become disheartened, and lose all confidence in the controlling head. A single instance of this sort does incalculable mischief in striking a fatal blow at the *morale* of the Force. It is, of course, impossible to say how many of the 273 constables who were passed over in favour of this man were fully qualified for promotion, but I certainly know of a great number. It is sufficient in this connection to point out that twenty-two sergeants have been promoted since the elevation of Sergeant Muggeridge, each one being senior in service to this man, and each one of these is now, of course, junior to him as sergeant, and therefore so much lower in the competition for further promotion. Is it a stretch of imagination to assume that very few of these twenty-two men were any less fit for promotion on the 1st October, 1906, when Sergeant Muggeridge received his promotion? And what on earth were his special qualifications from a police point of view that justified such an extraordinary jump? The work done by the Storekeeper is important and responsible, but certainly does not call for any special ability, and I have shown elsewhere that it might have had better and more satisfactory results. I say emphatically that if the Commissioner considered that this man was underpaid he should have made provision for his remuneration in some direct way. It was quite as easy to deal with him on the estimates as "Police Storekeeper," with a certain salary, as to term him "Sergeant (Storekeeper)," with allowances. Periodically the Commissioner asks each Inspector to forward to him a list of constables with over ten years' service and under fifty years of age whom they can recommend for the rank of sergeant. Evidently seven years in a store is of more moment than ten years in active police work.

Another fruitful source of discontent has been the promotion of some of the men who have been acting as District Clerks in various parts. The latest of these appointments has been that of Sergeant Cummings, who entered the Force on the 1st July, 1899, and was promoted on the 1st July, 1909, having served exactly ten years. This man is District Clerk in the Napier office. He has been a District Clerk since the beginning of 1907. He was an assistant clerk for about seven years previously. Presumably he has done very little active police work. There is no doubt that the duties of District Clerk are onerous, important, and responsible, and deserve special recognition, but not in the form of police rank, and it is a great mistake in the interests of the Force to make service in the District Office a short cut to promotion. It has created the utmost dissatisfaction. This man was promoted over the heads of 209 other constables all senior to himself.

There are several other instances in which District Clerks have been unduly promoted over the heads of men their seniors, and who have themselves afterwards been promoted, but losing the seniority. The system in a Police Force that permits such a thing as this is radically bad.

Of five other District Clerks, I find that one was promoted over the heads of 126 seniors, a second over 113, a third over 89, a fourth over 140, and a fifth over 221.

Of the sergeants in the Headquarters Staff, one was put over the heads of 161 seniors, another over 172, and a third over 53.

I do not question the quality of these men—they are, no doubt, very competent in their respective vocations; but their advancement over the heads of men who have since themselves been promoted cannot be defended, looking to the fact that their qualifications were mainly clerical. The others should either have received promotion when they were entitled to it, and ahead of these clerks, or else, having been once passed over, should have been left as constables. This sort of in-and-out business has played havoc with the spirit of the Force.

To show the lack of method in carrying out promotions, and to justify the existence of the apparent grave discontent in the Force, I will take the case of another man, Sergeant McKeefry. This man was enrolled into the Force in 1887 after service in the Armed Constabulary. He was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1908, at the age of forty-eight. He applied for promotion in 1904 and received a favourable reply. He remained satisfied until December of that year, when a man junior to himself was promoted. He then felt annoyed, and applied again. He got a reply saying that the application would be considered when the next selections were being made. After eighteen months there were other men junior to himself promoted. He then saw the Commissioner on the subject, and he told him for the first time that he would have to pass an examination. Several of the men junior to McKeefry had never passed an examination before being promoted. However, he sat and passed, and finally got his stripes. The result to him of it all was that twenty-six men junior to him in service were his seniors as sergeants. I know McKeefry well, and I also know many of the men who have become his seniors. Many of them were in no sense his superiors. As he says, he taught many of them all the police duty they ever knew. McKeefry was without doubt as much qualified for promotion in 1904 as when he received it in 1908, and the loss of seniority has been wholly undeserved, and rankles sorely.

I could multiply instances of unfair promotion, but it would serve no good object. A number of witnesses have given evidence in detail showing how utterly inconsistent has been the so-called method of promotion. These details can be seen in the evidence. There are several instances on record where very worthy constables, with excellent records and anxious to be advanced, have been told that they are too old for promotion. They know that this has not been a bar to others. Men are told that no one can be promoted over fifty years of age. And yet a man of over fifty was promoted this year, and is now doing duty in a city. Other men are told that they cannot be promoted because they have not passed the Police Examination. They know, and it is admitted to be true, that

a number of men, and even quite recently, have been promoted, and have never passed, or been asked to pass, any examination. This is the sort of thing that causes grave discontent in the Force, and has been partly responsible for the setting-up of this Commission.

Other men have been told that they have not been promoted because they have not been recommended by their Inspectors. And yet I find an instance of a man being promoted who was not only not recommended, but was declared to be unfit for promotion. It was not very long after his promotion that this man was reduced owing to gross misconduct—misconduct, by the way, that ought, in a sergeant, to have secured his dismissal. What induced the Commissioner to promote this man in spite of the lack of recommendation? I have not received any satisfactory answer.

There can be no doubt that the Inspectors are the persons who are best qualified to know the merits of men for promotion; but I do not think that a recommendation should be the only qualification. A case came under my notice in which a certain constable had worked under a certain Inspector for five or six years, and he had refused to recommend him for promotion, as he did not consider him qualified in any way. The man is transferred and works for twelve months in his new district, is recommended by his Inspector, and forthwith receives promotion. The possible weakness of the system is here shown to perfection. The man has yet to prove himself, but at present I am inclined to think that the estimate of the first Inspector was the sounder of the two.

There is little in general to find fault with in the manner in which the Detective Branch have been dealt with. But I am bound to say that I can see no justification for the promotion of Detective Quartermain. This man was enrolled on the 1st April, 1903, and was made detective on the 1st April, 1909, over the heads of most capable and excellent men who had been doing plain-clothes work to the great advantage of the Dominion, and who naturally looked forward to being promoted in their turn, and who feel sorely aggrieved at the preference shown to Quartermain. This detective is shown in the return of the Headquarters Staff as a Finger-print Expert. He was a constable assisting the Finger-print Expert prior to his promotion. He might just as readily have been made a sergeant. The only excuse so far offered for his promotion has been that he was previously in the prison service, and is a very useful man. This is hardly likely to be a sufficient *solatium* to those passed over in his favour.

It has been said of men who have been in charge of important stations for many years that they are not qualified for promotion as sergeants because they do not possess the requisite education. In some instances this has been urged as a reason for refusing promotion to certain men. I have no hesitation in saying that, if a man has been able for a number of years to give complete satisfaction while in charge of a station—at any rate, of scores of stations that I could name—his educational attainments, even if slight, are fully equal to all that will be required of him in the position of sergeant. He has proved his capacity for writing intelligent reports, making out returns, &c., correctly, conducting prosecutions in Court, and very often as Clerk of Court, having to do a great deal more, even to the preparing of informations, &c.

I have in my mind the case of a constable who has been described by a large number of witnesses as a most capable and efficient man, and qualified in every way for promotion. Some witnesses have spoken of him as one of the best and most capable constables they have ever come in contact with. Witnesses of all classes have testified to his worth. I myself have known him for years to be all that he is described. He has been in charge of important stations, both country and suburban. He has held the position for many years of Clerk of Magistrates' Courts, with minor offices attached. This man has been refused promotion because he has not passed the prescribed examination. He is a poor writer and a bad speller, but this has not disqualified him from doing yeoman service. He has even been in a station with a second man under him and given complete satisfaction. I am sending this man's name to the Minister, recommending him for immediate promotion. In this connection I am very much inclined to agree

with the evidence of Inspector Mitchell on page 7, paragraph 17, in which he deals with the education necessary for a sergeant.

I am strongly of opinion that no constable should be promoted to the rank of sergeant after he has passed the age of forty-five years. It is an excellent practice that has obtained for some years, under which every man on promotion shall be required to do at least two years' sectional duty in a city before he is placed in charge of a subdistrict. This duty is exceedingly trying, if properly done, and tells greatly on the men over the age named—that is to say, on the average man, for I do not dispute that there are some men young at fifty. But a sergeant, to be efficient in a city, must be smart, active, and energetic, and every year over forty-five makes a big difference. But I would not make this rule apply until certain special cases have been dealt with. There are several men in the Force who for several years past have been fully entitled to promotion, and the passing-over of whom is absolutely unaccountable-for. A wrong should always be righted, if such be possible, and there can be no manner of doubt that these men should receive their due. I believe that the Force throughout would desire that this should be so. Very grave wrong would be righted, and intense dissatisfaction removed. These men should, after promotion, as soon as possible, be placed in charge of suitable stations. It cannot now be remedied that they have lost their seniority, but they will have the satisfaction of feeling that justice, if somewhat tardily, has been done. I am forwarding separately to the Minister a list of the names of those men whom I consider entitled to special consideration in this connection.

I further recommend that no constable be promoted to sergeant until he has been medically examined, and certified as fit to discharge the duties of this rank. I consider this most important in the interests of the service. The men I have referred to above must submit to this examination in common with all others.

There is a constable in the Auckland District who, I consider, has been very hardly done by, and I should have been pleased indeed to see my way to recommend him for immediate promotion. He is, however, now fifty-nine years of age, and I feel that his time has passed for such consideration. If my suggestion with regard to "senior constables" is approved, he will be one of the very first to be selected. It will be some slight *solatium* to him.

The following is a return of the sergeants promoted yearly from 1899 to 1908, inclusive :—

Year.					Number of Promotions.	Year.					Number of Promotions.
1899	4	1904	6
1900	4	1905	5
1901	7	1906	23
1902	7	1907	8
1903	6	1908	8

The large number promoted in the year 1906 was due to an augmentation in that rank, as the result of recommendations made by the Commission of 1905.

In the appendix will be found a complete list of all the sergeants in the Force, showing the age and length of service of each one at the time of his promotion (Exhibit No. 10). This will be very useful for purposes of reference when going through the evidence dealing with the various points.

As touching the question of promotion, I desire for a moment to refer to the position of the station sergeants. The creation of this office was the outcome of a recommendation by the Police Commission of 1905. In the report of that Commission the following passage occurs : " With a view to relieve the Inspector and the Sub-Inspector of a great deal of unimportant clerical work, which at present occupies far too much of their time, and thereby prevents them from giving a due share of attention to the supervision of police duty proper, we recommend the appointment of an additional officer at each of the four centres. This officer should have authority over all sergeants and constables, and should be carefully and specially selected for the very important and responsible duties which he would be called upon to perform." The undoubted intention at that

time was that only those officers should be appointed to the position who would be qualified for promotion to Sub-Inspectors. The Commissioner has stated in evidence that there are station sergeants who are not qualified for the higher ranks (page 84, paragraph 7, of the evidence). The station sergeants were first appointed on the 1st March, 1906, and, of those four men, three have since been promoted to commissioned rank, and one still remains a station sergeant, and he the senior in actual police service of two out of the three promoted. Of the present four station sergeants, it is to my mind very doubtful if three of them were appointed with a view to future promotion, looking to their age, &c. This extraordinary departure from the original clear intention has produced a very anomalous position. There is one station sergeant and there are five Chief Detectives presumably qualified for promotion, and from whom, according to precedent, a selection would have to be made for future promotion. Can it be wondered at that such a position has created almost a scare amongst the members to the uniform branch? Such a state of things as this is clearly impossible to be allowed to continue, and the matter must be remedied as soon as possible. I do not wish it to be inferred that a man may not make an excellent station sergeant even if not fitted for further advancement, but, as the last four promotions have been exclusively made from the station sergeants and Chief Detectives, it has come to be regarded as a necessary precedent to such promotions that a man must have served in one of the two ranks. Hence the dismay amongst the members of the uniform branch. Now, it seems to me that the only way in which to deal with a state of things that has almost created an *impasse*, is to do away altogether with the rank of station sergeant and substitute in its place that of senior sergeant. This grade might be limited to, say, twenty-five officers, this being a fair proportion of the eighty-eight sergeants now on the roll. Included amongst these senior sergeants, according to seniority, should be the four existing station sergeants. The others should be selected from the very pick of the sergeants now in the Force, having regard strictly to merit, with seniority, and the possession of those qualities which would approve a man for promotion to the higher ranks.

From this roll of senior sergeants, in conjunction with that of the Chief Detectives, will have to be selected the future Sub-Inspectors of the Force.

I suggest that these senior sergeants should be paid at the rate of 13s. 6d. per diem, with the ordinary house allowance of 1s. 6d. per diem where not provided with free quarters. The majority of these men would be sergeants who are now in charge of important subdistricts.

GENERAL.

Headquarters Staff.

For some time past there has been growing up a feeling of intense dissatisfaction at the creation and constitution of what I shall refer to as the Headquarters Staff. At the present time this feeling is very keen and deep-seated, and is seriously affecting the *morale* of the entire Force. It has found expression in many parts of the Dominion, and in some places has been spoken of by witnesses with intense bitterness. I have tried to view the matter from every standpoint, and especially from the point of view of the Commissioner, who is entirely responsible for the creation of this staff. The deeper I gauge the feeling on this point throughout the Force, and the more I strive to get to the true inwardness of it, the more thoroughly I am convinced that no possible benefit results either to the Commissioner or to his administration, or to the Force generally, by this surrounding of the head of the Force with a staff of officers holding police rank and discharging merely the duties of an ordinary Civil Service staff. The following statement shows the extent of the Headquarters Staff, with the salaries and allowances paid to each man :—

Rank.	Salary.	House Allowance.	Special Allowance.	Clerical Allowance.	Total.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1 Sub-Inspector	290 0 0	60 0 0	350 0 0
1 sergeant	200 15 0	27 7 6	18 5 0	18 5 0	264 12 6
1 sergeant	191 12 6	18 5 0	18 5 0	228 2 6
1 constable	155 2 6	18 5 0	18 5 0	191 12 6
1 sergeant (<i>Police Gazette</i>)	219 0 0	27 7 6	18 5 0	18 5 0	282 17 6
1 Chief Detective	292 0 0	36 10 0	328 10 0
1 sergeant (Storekeeper)	200 15 0	27 7 6	18 5 0	18 5 0	264 12 6
1 constable (assists generally between Store, <i>Gazette</i> , Finger-prints, and Head Office)*	136 17 6	18 5 0	155 2 6
1 Finger-print Expert	200 0 0	200 0 0
1 Finger-print Expert (detective)	182 10 0	27 7 6	18 5 0	228 2 6
Total	2,493 12 6

* A recent appointment owing to increase of work.

This makes the total cost of the Headquarters Staff, excluding the Commissioner, £2,493 12s. 6d.

It will thus be seen that the whole staff, with the exception of the Finger-print Expert at £200, is particularly well provided for, and I am inclined to think that an ordinary Civil Service staff could do the work quite as efficiently (excluding the detective work) and at considerably less cost to the country. I am aware that this is very largely a question of policy, but it is my duty to express my opinion on the position where I think it affects the efficiency and discipline of the Force. It has been said, but without the smallest reason, that the work is better done by these police officers than would be the case with a civilian staff. Such a contention is absurd. Then, to say that the Commissioner can secure more discipline and control over police officers than over civilians is, in my opinion, equally absurd, as applied to strictly office work. To say, too, that a knowledge of police duty is essential to such a staff is equally a stretch of imagination.

The Chief Clerk, Sub-Inspector Wright, is without doubt a very capable departmental officer, but for some reason or other there is a generally expressed distrust of him. This is nothing new with regard to himself personally. Ample evidence of it will be found in *Hansard* of the session of 1901, page 680, *et seq.* At that time he was in the District Office at Wellington, and was afterwards transferred by the present Commissioner to his own staff, and on the 1st January, 1906, he was promoted to the rank of Sub-Inspector. Since then there has been simmering discontent in the Force, and there will be found ample proof of it in the evidence submitted herewith. For some reason or other there is a profound impression that Mr. Wright dominates the Commissioner, and uses his position to unduly interfere with the administration of the Force and to advance the interests of those favourable to himself. I am not going to express any opinion as to whether this belief is well founded or not. It would be exceedingly difficult to obtain proof of it, and I prefer to leave the matter at this. I am quite satisfied that a change must be made, and I strongly recommend that immediate steps be taken to rearrange and reorganize the staff at Headquarters. Sub-Inspector Wright should be sent out to do ordinary police duty at his present rank. The details of how this should be arranged could very easily be worked out by the Commissioner. A competent man should be appointed from the Civil Service to act as Chief Clerk. He would soon pick up the duties. The first two sergeants and the constables should also be sent out to do uniform duty, according to the respective status of each. Their places would have to be filled by capable Civil servants, and one would require to be classed as "Accountant." The two Finger-print Experts should not be interfered with. I am not able to satisfy myself as to the necessity for the appointment of the Chief Detective. He is supposed to do work of a special and confidential nature, but I should

imagine that he is not overworked by any manner of means, and his office is very largely a sinecure.

The sergeant who acts as editor of the *Police Gazette* seems to be well paid at £282 per annum. He tells me that his time is fully occupied. The *Gazette* is now published weekly, and the issue has been very much improved under the present Commissioner. The publication generally is very creditable to the Department. I make no recommendation as to its control, but suggest that the matter receive attention. It was changed from a fortnightly to a weekly issue on the 1st June, 1904. The cost of printing the *Gazette* for the twelve months ending 31st May, 1904, was £441 7s. The cost for the twelve months ending 31st May, 1909, was £605 18s., to which has to be added the cost of making process-blocks and printing illustrations, £59 4s. 6d., making the total for the year £755 2s. 6d.

As regards the sergeant who acts as Storekeeper, I am bound to say that I can see no possible reason for giving police rank to such an officer. It has caused, as I have stated elsewhere, a great deal of dissatisfaction, and the Department has certainly not benefited. Some of the stuff supplied from the Store has been disgraceful, and the sergeant must be held responsible for this. This refers not only to the quality of some of the stuff, but to the different shades of the uniform-cloth, which shows out so badly on parades. I suggest that the whole matter be fully inquired into by the Commissioner, with a view to put the work on a better footing. I am convinced that the work can be improved upon, and its usefulness considerably extended. It is impossible to go into details in such an inquiry as this. If it is found possible, as I fully expect, to improve on the present system, I recommend that the sergeant be sent out to do uniform duty at his present rank.

The feeling that I have referred to as practically existing throughout the Force on this subject of the Headquarters Staff was very well and moderately expressed by Inspector Mitchell on page 13 of the evidence, and was fully indorsed and emphasized by Inspector Cullen in Auckland, as the result of his long and varied experience.

Sub-Inspectors.

There are two Sub-Inspectors in charge of subdistricts, under Inspectors who live at a distance. One is at Timaru, and one at Palmerston North. Timaru is attached to Christchurch, and Palmerston North to Wanganui. When men are sent from other districts to work under these Sub-Inspectors, no information whatever is supplied as to their antecedents, and the Sub-Inspectors are wholly ignorant on the very points of which they ought to have some knowledge. The defaulters' lists are sent only to the Inspectors. I recommend that in every case a copy of such lists be sent to the Sub-Inspector.

Clerks.

Some comment has been made as to the manner in which constables are selected to be sent into district offices to act as assistant clerks. I have been surprised to be informed by the Commissioner that the position is little sought after, and that he receives very few applications to be detailed for that duty. The Inspectors in the four centres are very much in favour of being allowed to select their own clerks from the men under their control. I can see no possible objection to this. There is a wide selection of men in the large districts, and the Inspectors, for their own sakes, would only select competent men. Making their own selection would insure their own satisfaction, and thus remove any cause of complaint, such as exists at present.

Detectives.

It has been urged that a special grade should be created for the Detective Branch of the service, giving them a special status of their own, and making the Chief Detectives of equivalent rank to the Sub-Inspectors. I do not consider this necessary or even desirable, and I see no reason to alter the existing order of things, at any rate, for the present. The right of detectives to be con-

sidered in promotion to commissioned rank, where special qualifications and abilities are desired, has been fully recognised, and the principle acted upon in the very recent promotion of Sub-Inspector McGrath from the rank of Chief Detective. In any future promotions it must be assumed that those in authority will only select the very best men available who are suitable both by merit, service, and seniority, whatever branch of the service they may belong to. For this purpose it is desirable that both branches should be considered as one. There ought to be no jealousy where the welfare of the Force is the first consideration.

Looking to the fact that the uniform branch and the Detective Branch are now treated as one in the matter of the promotions to the higher ranks, I consider it essential that no man should be advanced to plain-clothes duty until he has served at least two years in uniform.

Senior Constables.

It has been suggested that a grade of Senior Constable should be instituted, to include all men of over thirty years' service, and who have excellent records, but who have been overlooked for promotion or who have failed for some reason, not personal to themselves, to secure promotion. There is no doubt a very grave feeling of dissatisfaction amongst these older men, and it has found very free expression during the course of the Commission. It must be apparent to every one that it is quite impossible to give promotion to all who desire it and even deserve it, and there will always be dissatisfaction on the part of a number of men at being passed over; but nevertheless there are a number of very excellent men who have put in a life's service in the Force, and who are now too old to be suitable in any way for promotion. I do not quite see my way to make a definite recommendation on the subject, but I think that the Commissioner might consider whether it would not be wise and politic to create this special grade, giving the men one chevron, and paying them an extra 6d. a day, making the maximum pay 10s. per diem. Of course, the very greatest care would have to be exercised to only include those whose record of late years would justify the selection.

Leave.

The annual leave at present granted to members of the Force is twelve days, and this may be allowed to accumulate for three years.

I recommend that this be extended to fifteen days for officers of over five years' service, and that it be allowed to accumulate as at present.

It has been pointed out to me as a hardship, and not without reason, that the members of the Force when taking their annual or triennial leave are never able to take advantage of the special fares which obtain over the New Zealand Government Railways during holiday time. The police, as a rule, never get their leave at such times, owing to the special duties then cast upon them. The inability to get the benefit of such concessions is a distinct loss to them. I would suggest to the Department the possibility of making such arrangement with the Railway authorities as would enable members of the Force when on leave to travel under special concession of reduced rates.

Physical Training.

I do not consider that sufficient attention is paid to the physical training of the members of the Force. At the Auckland Central Station there is a gymnasium, which is very extensively used by the men at that station, and the beneficial effects of which are testified to by all the officers. A gymnasium is almost a necessity to the well-being of the young men who very largely compose the Force in the centres. Apart altogether from the actual physical benefit that results to the men, it is a most valuable agency in working off the exuberance of spirits peculiar to young men of a certain age and constitution, and which if unexploited is liable to find outlets in undesirable channels. Arrangements should be made to secure suitable places at Wellington, Christchurch,

and Dunedin, which could be used for the purpose if it is found impossible at present to build. A small gymnasium should be at once provided at the Training Depot.

In connection with physical training, I consider that the Department would be more than repaid in efficiency by the appointment of a special officer to act as Physical Instructor. He should give a certain time each year to each centre, and to the training of recruits at the Training Depot. It would not be long before there would be men quite competent to undertake the duties of interim Instructors during his absence. There is a member of the Force at the present time in the person of Constable Skinner, now stationed at Tauranga, who has special qualifications for the position, and who is a perfect enthusiast in all that pertains to the culture of physical attributes. Some very interesting evidence given by this constable will be found on page 369 of the evidence herewith. Apart from his evidence he gave me instances by means of photographs of stages of extraordinary development to which his pupils might be brought. I commend this matter to the favourable consideration of the Police Department.

Rifle Shooting.

During the course of this inquiry my attention has been directed to a matter which appeals to me as being of some importance. It is not strictly perhaps within the order of reference; but, if at all, it would come under the head of efficiency. It seems to me that every constable on joining should be trained in the use of the rifle, and to do this he should receive instruction both manual and firing. After coming out of the depot he should be encouraged to still further perfect himself as a marksman, and every encouragement should be given by prizes, competition, &c. In this way the Police Force of New Zealand could be trained to become a most valuable and effective nucleus of an armed force whose greatest value would be shown at a time of future emergency, if such unfortunately arose. I make no recommendations of details, but I strongly commend the idea to the consideration of those in authority.

Attending Court.

A matter has been mentioned in all the centres which seems to me to be deserving of some remark and consideration, because it certainly involves in some cases an appearance of hardship and consequent dissatisfaction. I refer to the cases of constables who, having been on night duty, and having to attend Court in the morning to support charges against prisoners, have their ordinary period of rest so completely broken as to render them in some degree unfit for the following night's duty, and to make them so sleepy as to cause a risk of being haled before the Inspector for not working the beat properly. Of course, one fully recognises that constables in the discharge of their duty must take the rough with the smooth, but the grievance in this instance seems to me to be a real one, and as, in my opinion, the matter may be easily remedied, I think one may fairly be justified in suggesting a remedy. At present all constables who have arrested persons during the night duty, and who come off such duty at 5 a.m., are required to attend the sitting of the Court at which these persons will be dealt with, at such hour—say, 9.30 a.m. up to, say, 11 a.m.—as the Court has been appointed to sit at. The great majority of these cases are the ordinary simple “drunks,” and the great mass of these always plead “Guilty,” and no evidence is required. I suggest that the arresting constable should not be required to attend Court until notified by his superior officer of the necessity for doing so. Where a man is admitted to bail after arrest, as is often the case, the condition of the recognisance might be arranged for some hour p.m., so that, if the man does not then appear, the constable giving evidence would have received the necessary amount of rest. In those cases in which prisoners in custody plead “Not guilty,” it could easily be arranged that the case should be adjourned to such later hour as the Magistrate might deem suitable, and thus secure the same result. I am aware that, in order to satisfactorily carry out my suggestions, the approval and co-operation of the Court authorities in the four

centres would have to be obtained; but I do not think that this would cause any difficulty, for I know from a long experience that it would make very little difference to them. I limit the proposal to the four centres, because it is only in these that the grievance is a real one, owing to its frequent occurrence. This is no matter of pampering or coddling. It is one that most clearly affects a large body of men in the Force, and materially affects the efficiency. There are a large number of entries on the defaulters' lists showing that men have been dealt with by their Inspectors for failing to attend Court, say, at 9.30 a.m., when they only get to bed at, say, 5.30 a.m. I am informed that the practice suggested is followed in other places, and with great advantage.

Sunday Leave.

Complaint has been made that there is no regular system by which men can get an occasional Sunday off duty. One man stated upon oath that he had not had a Sunday "off" for three years. I recognise the difficulty there must be in relieving men in this way, and I think that in most districts the officers would be glad to assist the men in this direction. It is, I think, only reasonable that every man, whatever his calling, should have an occasional "day of rest." Attention has been directed to this matter in other parts of the Empire, and the need has been emphasized. I make no recommendation, for I am not in a position to do so, but I suggest to those in authority that a little more attention should be paid to this need.

Late Leave.

Constables in various parts have tried to make it a grievance that while they are living in barracks they are required to be in by 11 p.m. I may say at once that I consider this full late enough, and I am of opinion that discipline could not be properly maintained were this rule not strictly enforced. There is really no cause at all for complaint. Extension is very readily granted where request is made and proper and sufficient reasons shown. I imagine it is not very difficult to find reasons. A very little excuse seems to suffice.

A Dunedin Complaint.

The men in the Dunedin Station complain bitterly that they are compelled to wear uniform in leaving the station until they reach their homes. It is not the rule in any other centre, and I think should now be abolished. It was made under special conditions, and these conditions no longer exist. It may appear to some people a very small grievance, but there is a good deal underlying it. Now that police matters in Dunedin are so very much improved, there seems no sound reason why a special rule should be retained which only acts as a reminder of a most regrettable period.

Appeal Board.

Suggestions have been made that an Appeal Board should be set up on the same lines as is now the case in the Railway and elsewhere. I may say at once that I am not at all in favour of such a proposal. The Police Force stands on quite a different footing from any other public service in the Dominion. It is, or should be, under strict discipline, and the right of appeal would only foment dissension. With firm, strong, and equitable administration there would be no general demand for an Appeal Board, and I feel sure that the effect would merely be to remove control from those who ought to exercise it, and to seriously affect the discipline.

Detective Rank.

It has been urged that a special grade should be established for the Detective Branch. I have heard no convincing argument in favour of a change in this direction, and I agree with the Commissioner that the time is not ripe yet for such a departure. For the present the uniform branch and the plain-clothes branch must be as one Force, and each member stand on his own merits for promotion.

Superintendents.

A suggestion was made by Inspector Cullen that it would be of advantage to reorganize the Force by the appointment of four Superintendents, with Inspectors, &c., working under them in defined districts. I am not clear that any distinct advantage would result in altering the present system, and I prefer to express no opinion in favour of it as likely to increase the general efficiency of the Force.

But it does seem to me to be worthy of consideration, looking to the enormous disparity in size and importance in the several police districts, whether the Inspectors in the four centres might not be termed, perhaps, Superintendents, with a view to give the Sub-Inspectors, and senior sergeants working under them, a step up in rank. There is certainly no comparison between the work done by these officers and that done by men of similar rank in any of the other districts.

Situations outside the Force.

Strong exception has been taken throughout the Force to the issue of Circular No. 14/08. This runs as follows: "In future, applications for situations outside the Police Department are not to be made without the sanction of the Commissioner being first obtained." This is dated the 26th August, 1908. No good reasons have been shown for the making of such a rule, and I recommend that the circular be withdrawn.

General Complaints.

A number of sergeants and constables have come before the Commission all over the Dominion and made complaint about various matters personal to themselves and mainly about questions of promotion. I have looked thoroughly into every case brought under my notice, and, without dealing specifically with each case, I may say generally that, where I make no recommendation as to special consideration of any particular case, it may be taken for granted that I have absolutely satisfied myself that the cases do not call for further consideration. I prefer to deal with them in this way to specifying the cases in particular.

Educational.

At my Christchurch sitting Mr. G. W. Russell, M.P., was good enough to come forward and give evidence containing suggestions on educational lines, which, coming from an expert, were most interesting and valuable. As Chairman of the Canterbury College Board of Governors, a position in which he has rendered such yeoman service, he was enabled to speak with authority and to make suggestions from the standpoint of practicability. His evidence will be found on page 158 *et seq.* I feel that the subject is too large a one to be dealt with at present, and within the scope of this report, and there are many other matters which *must* be disposed of first.

Emoluments.

There is a great difference in the emoluments attached to the different police-stations in the Dominion. It is, of course, absolutely necessary that constables in charge of certain country stations should, as a matter of policy, act as Clerks of Courts with other minor offices. The amount paid annually to a constable acting as Clerk is generally £10; and small sums are often paid in respect of other services. But the main addition to the "extras" is the mileage that is earned. One witness told me that, when he was in a certain district, for some six years he earned no less than £130 per annum in addition to his constable's pay. This certainly is rather astonishing, but I imagine that such districts are few and far between. I happen to know this particular district very well indeed, and I should say that the money was very well earned. I am not prepared to make any recommendation in respect of this matter.

Work done for other Departments.

I think it is as well here to draw attention to the very large amount of work that is done by the police for other Departments. I doubt if the extent of that work is fully realised. I do not, of course, in any way refer to work that would strictly be considered as coming within the description of ordinary police duty, but mainly to "inquiry" work, which apparently is cast upon the police as possessing special facilities for doing it. The greater part of this class of work is apparently done for the Education Department, and very valuable work it is too. Inspector Ellison deals very fully with the matter on page 480 of the evidence. I do not see how a great deal of this work could be done otherwise than through the police, but I certainly do think that the work as at present done casts a very unnecessary amount of labour on the Inspectors and their staffs. I am not prepared to make any recommendation on the matter, but I draw attention to it, because I believe that, if work of this class continues to increase, special provision must be made for doing it. Sir E. O. Gibbes, in his evidence on page 457 *et seq.*, gave some replies to questions asked by myself and Inspector Ellison which seem to open up the question of the quality and effect of the work done which might justify some further consideration.

Finger-print Branch.

The Commissioner deserves credit for the high state of efficiency to which he has brought the Finger-print Branch of the service. I must, however, take exception to his statement that he established the branch. Such a branch had been established before Mr. Dinnie came to New Zealand. It was under the charge of Mr. R. Lascelles Ward, and was attached to the Prisons Department. It was handed over to the control of the Police Department on the 8th July, 1903, and in a letter from the Hon. Mr. McGowan, authorising the change, he gives as a reason that the identification of criminals falls naturally within the province of the police. Mr. E. W. Dinnie, the present Finger-print Expert, who is a son of the Commissioner, was first employed on the 6th July, 1903, as an assistant to Mr. Ward, at 8s. per diem. This was increased to 10s. per diem as from the 1st October, 1904, and later, on the recommendation of the Commissioner, his son was permanently appointed Finger-print Expert and Photographer as from the 1st October, 1906, at a salary of £180 per annum (*vide New Zealand Gazette*, 1906, page 2657).

There are two officers who figure in the appropriations as experts. The principal expert (Mr. Dinnie) receives a salary of £200 per annum. His assistant, who ranks as a detective, receives in all, with allowances, £228. The former cannot be said to be overpaid, for his duties are important and responsible, and it is undoubtedly through his exertions mainly that the branch has become so valuable an adjunct to our criminal system. I understand that a constable is now assisting in the branch, and no doubt qualifying for a complete knowledge of the system. It seems to me very important that there should be a succession of officers qualifying in knowledge for the discharge of duties in connection with this branch. One is told with bated breath that the work is so special, so important, and so difficult that there is the greatest danger in interfering at all so as to secure an extension of a knowledge of the system. Being a mere layman who possesses only a superficial knowledge of the work of the branch, I am not going to be the proverbial fool who blunders in where the angels even fear to tread. I therefore limit myself to the humblest suggestion that occasionally a suitable man might be taken in, with such technical knowledge of photography, &c., as would make him useful with a view to training him to take the place of those who in course of time will be going out of the branch.

House Allowance.

Married constables are paid, where there are no quarters, a weekly house allowance of 7s. The sergeants similarly receive 10s. 6d. a week. Rents have gone up so enormously of late years that I think the time has arrived when these allowances should be increased, and especially so in the case of married

constables, who find the first five years of their police life the most difficult in the way of making ends meet. I recommend that the constables receive a weekly allowance of 10s. 6d., and the sergeants a weekly allowance of 14s., in all cases where free quarters are not supplied.

Travelling-allowances.

There is considerable complaint throughout the Force on the score of the small rate of travelling-allowance to sergeants and constables when on duty. They are paid 6s. a day, whereas the detectives get 8s. The latter seems a reasonable amount, and, as the cost of accommodation in both town and country has materially increased of late years, I think that 6s. is decidedly on the low side. I suggest that the Commissioner should consider whether the allowance all round should not now be raised to 8s. per diem.

Travelling.

A great deal has been said throughout the inquiry with regard to the regulations which obtain in respect of police officers, when travelling, having to use the steerage of steamers, if under commissioned rank. Rather than do so they invariably prefer to pay the difference themselves between the saloon and steerage fares. In the Auckland District the Northern Steamship Company allow all police officers to travel in the saloon at steerage rates. I understand from the Commissioner that new regulations are being drafted which will have the effect of removing all complaint as to these matters.

Departmental Inquiries.

I think that it would help to advance the discipline of the Force if the Commissioner and the Inspectors, or any person appointed by the Minister, were empowered by statute to take evidence on oath when holding inquiries affecting members of the Force. A similar provision to that contained in "The Government Railways Act, 1908," and the regulations made thereunder, would meet the case. I recommend that this be done as soon as convenient.

Rewards.

The question has been brought up in a few places, by dissatisfied constables, of the unsatisfactory and unfair way in which rewards have been apportioned amongst interested members of the Force in the matter of specially meritorious actions in the discharge of police duties. This only comes very remotely within the scope of my Commission, but in any case I certainly have no material upon which I can form a judgment or express an opinion. A matter such as this must be necessarily left to the head of the Department, who must be deemed to deal with all cases strictly on their merits and with due regard to the value of the work done.

General Conduct.

If there is one thing more than another that strikes one in connection with the New Zealand Police Force, and especially after a close inquiry such as the present one, it is the absolute freedom from allegations of bribery, corruption, or oppression, such as we are frequently hearing of in connection with the older Police Forces in more populous lands. I think that this may fairly be considered a subject for congratulation, for it not only shows the existence of a healthy tone in the community, but attests the general honesty of the Force.

Police and Ex-Prisoners.

It has been attempted to be shown that the police have been in the habit of interfering with ex-prisoners by giving information to their employers as to their antecedents, and in other ways, the effect being to prevent these men from

leading honest lives. I do not think that there is the slightest ground for a general accusation of this sort. On the contrary, there is evidence that the police—and with them I include the detectives—have done much to keep men straight after a lapse, and have assisted to get them suitable employment. It is inevitable that a certain class of criminals should be always under surveillance by the detectives, and when a crime is reported inquiries are frequently made at once amongst this class, wherever they may be. I believe that this duty is carried out, as a rule, with a minimum of injury to the particular class.

Strength.

To show the growth of the Police Force from 1899 to 1909, I have caused to be prepared a comparative return, which gives all the required information.

	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.
Inspectors	7	6	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	9	9
Sub-Inspectors	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	6	6	6	7
Station Sergeants	4	4	4	4
Sergeant-major	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Sergeants	51	54	54	56	58	58	64	66	73	78	82
Chief Detectives	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
Detectives	11	16	16	16	16	17	21	21	25	27	30
Constables	475	499	504	514	522	534	553	540	561	586	619
Acting-detectives	17	16	18	14
Totals	534	586	591	604	613	626	655	667	699	734	771
In addition to the above there were,—											
Police Sergeants	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Matrons	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
District constables	20	19	20	22	20	22	22	21	18	20	20
Native constables	7	7	7	7	11	11	9	9	9	9	10

District Constables.

There are twenty district constables doing duty in various parts of the Dominion. The following is a return showing where they are stationed, their rate of pay, and their length of service :—

Number.	Police District.	Station.	Rate of Pay per Annum.	Length of Service.
			£	Yrs., mos.
8	Auckland	Cowes	60	0 10
		Herekino	50	1 11
		Hobsonville	75	1 1
		Hohoura	65	3 7
		Mangawai	100	4 7
		Ohaewai	75	9 11
		Okupu	60	14 1
		Panmure	62	8 3
3	Thames	Katikati	62	20 11
		Te Whaite	50	9 1
		Tokaanu	75	0 4
3	Napier	Fraser Town	137	10 9
		Herbertville	50	1 10
		Weber	62	1 2
1	Wanganui	Moawhango	50	2 10
1	Wellington	Cullensville	30	12 9
1	Christchurch	Waikari	40	0 10
2	Dunedin	Broad Bay	50	10 2
		Portobello	40	1 7
1	Invercargill	Half-moon Bay	75	9 1

According to the report of the first Police Commission, in 1898, there were then fifteen district constables. The following passage appears in that report : “ These men are residents in localities where there is no regular police officer, who have been sworn in as constables, and who receive a small salary in respect of their being occasionally called upon to perform local police duty. They wear no uniform, and are not liable to be transferred, and are under but little supervision. They are useful in the absence of regular police, but are regarded as a ‘makeshift,’ and will disappear as settlement advances and the Force becomes strong enough in numbers to supply their places with trained constables.” It is curious to note that this was written eleven years ago, and that, although settlement has increased to a marvellous extent, and the Force now numbers 771, as against 533 at that time, yet there are five more district constables now than there were then.

Native Constables.

There are also ten Native constables employed, and I attach a return showing their stations, rate of pay, and length of service :—

Number.	Police District.				Station.			Rate of Pay per Annum.	Length of Service.
								£	Yrs. mos.
5	Auckland	Mangonui	30	2 9
								90	15 9
								100	0 1
								52	2 0
								30	0 9
3	Thames	Omaio	20	3 11
								30	3 11
								40	2 8
2	Napier	Gisborne	137	9 4
								128	27 0

The pay apparently varies from a minimum of £20 to a maximum of £137. I imagine that there is not a great demand made upon the man who only gets £20 per annum. These constables are appointed to do duty in localities where there is a large Native population.

Special Cases.

The cases of a district constable and of a Native constable were brought before me. Both men were anxious to be enrolled into the Police Force and given a number. Both constables were spoken of as being exceptionally good men. They have held their positions for a number of years, and have given all their time to police duty. If I could possibly see my way to do it, I would very willingly recommend that both these men be taken on as they desire; but there is a difficulty over the Police Provident Fund. Both these men contribute to the Public Service Superannuation Fund, and until these two funds are merged, or until provision is made for the transfer from one fund to the other on an equitable basis, I fear that nothing can be done. I believe that both these constables receive 7s. 6d. a day, with a lodging-allowance. They are fairly entitled to a small increment. The evidence of these two men will be found on pp. 226 *et seq.* and 243. Their Inspector speaks most highly of them on page 238. They are evidently excellent men.

Dismissals and Resignations.

It will be as well here to give a return of the men dismissed from the Force, and the reasons for such dismissal, from the 1st July, 1907, to the 30th June, 1909; also a return showing the men called upon to resign, and the reasons,

during the same period; and a further return of the number of voluntary resignations during the same period :—

Dismissals.

Period.	Number of Dismissals.	Reason for Dismissal.
1/7/07 to 30/6/08 ..	<div> <div>1</div> <div>3</div> <div>1</div> <div>1</div> </div>	<div>Using obscene language.</div> <div>Being under the influence of liquor.</div> <div>Convicted of assault.</div> <div>Making a false statement in his application to join police.</div>
Total	6	
1/7/08 to 30/6/09 ..	<div> <div>1</div> <div>6</div> <div>1</div> <div>2</div> </div>	<div>Being under the influence of liquor, and making a false statement regarding a rug.</div> <div>Being under the influence of liquor.</div> <div>Being concerned in disorderly conduct on the public street, and failing to render assistance to a person who had been assaulted.</div> <div>Convicted of assault.</div>
Total	10	

Compulsory Resignations.

Period.	Number.	Reasons.
1/7/07 to 30/6/08 ..	<div> <div>1</div> <div>1</div> <div>1</div> </div>	<div>Marrying without permission.</div> <div>Borrowing money from an hotelkeeper.</div> <div>Seducing a girl and refusing to marry her.</div>
Total	3	
1/7/08 to 30/6/09 ..	<div> <div>2</div> <div>1</div> <div>1</div> <div>2</div> <div>1</div> </div>	<div>Immorality.</div> <div>Failing to report theft of a purse and £1 12s. 6d., and failing to account to the owner for the money which he advised her he had recovered.</div> <div>Neglecting to assist his brother constables in a street disturbance.</div> <div>Receiving beer when on duty.</div> <div>Making a false statement regarding his marriage when applying for enrolment.</div>
Total	7	

Voluntary Resignations.

Period.	Number.	—
1/7/07 to 30/6/08 ..	32	..
1/7/08 to 30/6/09 ..	29	..
Total	61	

Discharges.

Rule 68 of the regulations provides that a printed certificate of character, made out in accordance with his record, shall be granted to every man who has been discharged from the Force. No other certificates of character or service are allowed to be given to parties leaving the Force. This rule has not been strictly observed. No exception can be taken to the form of printed certificate, but objection is taken that the man who leaves after many years of excellent

service, and with exemplary records of merit, is no better off than the indifferent man, who may be no better than a "waster." I can see no objection to certified copies of the record of merit being attached to all certificates where a man is discharged with a good character.

The Wrack Case.

A case was brought under my notice in Auckland which I think I ought to refer to at some length with a view to remove certain misapprehensions which have arisen with regard to the true facts. The circumstances, as placed before me by Mr. James Regan, the proprietor of *Saturday Night*, and the statement made by Mr. Kettle, S.M., would seem to raise a presumption that there had been a gross neglect of duty, and perhaps something worse, on the part of the police. I have closely examined all available papers in connection with the case, and the following is the true position.

A man named Charles Stevenson Wrack, a warder at the Mount Eden Gaol, was on the 4th February, 1907, adjudged by Mr. Kettle, S.M., to be the putative father of the illegitimate child of a young woman whose acquaintance Wrack had made while she was serving a sentence in gaol, and he was ordered to pay 7s. 6d. per week towards the maintenance of the child, with other charges and costs. The hearing was a lengthy one, occupying some six days, and during the proceedings the defendant gave evidence on his own behalf, and this evidence was clearly entirely disbelieved by the Magistrate, who also had reason to believe that evidence given by the same defendant in another affiliation case, heard by another Magistrate in 1898, had been false, Wrack being questioned by Mr. Kettle as to the truth of certain statements made by him in that case.

The burden of the complaint made against the police in this connection is that at the close of the affiliation proceedings against Wrack, Mr. Kettle, S.M., directed, on the 4th February, 1907, that he should be prosecuted for perjury, and that the information charging him with this offence was not laid until the 2nd March, 1907, and a warrant to apprehend issued, when it was found that Wrack had probably left New Zealand, and could not be arrested. As a matter of fact, he has not up to the present time been apprehended, although inquiries have been made as to his whereabouts in Victoria, in New South Wales, and in those parts of New Zealand where it was thought likely that he might be found.

Mr. Kettle himself, and others interested in the case, seem to be under the impression that he had directed a prosecution for perjury against Wrack at the close of the affiliation proceedings. This is clearly not so, as conclusively shown by a reference to the official file. On the 5th February, 1907, Mr. Kettle addressed the following memorandum to the Inspector of Police at Auckland:—

"The Magistrate's Office, Auckland, 5th February, 1907.

"To Inspector of Police, Auckland.

"*Morrison v. Wrack.*

"*Mangan v. Wrack.*

"I desire to draw your attention to the admission, on oath, made by Mr. Wrack, defendant in this case, in Court yesterday, to the effect that in a case against him (*Morrison v. Wrack*, in 1898, and heard before Mr. Brabant, S.M.) he swore falsely. I enclose copy of Mr. Brabant's notes of evidence given by Mr. Wrack; and this morning's *Herald's* report of Mr. Wrack's admission is substantially accurate. I also desire to draw your attention to the evidence given by Mr. Wrack in the case *Mangan v. Wrack*, and my decision delivered yesterday, in order that you may, after full inquiry, take such proceedings (if any) as in your opinion are warranted by the circumstances.

"CHAS. C. KETTLE, S.M."

This was minuted by the Inspector as follows: "CHIEF DETECTIVE MAR-SACK,—Get full newspaper reports of proceedings of case, and paste them on paper. Then brief evidence in alleged perjury cases and submit. There may

be two charges of perjury against Wrack, one for cases before Mr. Brabant and the other before Mr. Kettle. There may be a difficulty in former case of getting a witness to prove he administered oath to Wrack.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 7/2/07."

On the 21st February, 1907, a full brief of the evidence, as instructed, was submitted by the Chief Detective, and on the same day the file was sent to the Crown Solicitor with the following minute:—"MR. TOLE,—“Do you consider a prosecution should be instituted against Wrack for perjury? Please advise early.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 21/2/07."

On the next day the file was returned by the Crown Solicitor with the following memorandum:—

"February 22, 1907.

"Memo. for the Inspector of Police, Auckland.

"Re *C. S. Wrack and Alleged Perjury*.

"I have perused and considered the evidence contained in the attached file, and am of the opinion that on the first and second assignments there is a good case for a prosecution, and action should be taken accordingly. With regard to the third assignment, as it appears doubtful whether Sutherland can now be found and called as a witness, I think that this charge might be dropped. I return your file 917/07.

"JOS. A. TOLE,
"Crown Solicitor."

This was minuted as follows: "THE COMMISSIONER,—Please authorise the Crown Solicitor to conduct prosecution of Wrack.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 22/2/07." The following minutes then appear on the documents: "INSPECTOR CULLEN,—Approved. Please report result.—W. DINNIE, Com. 25/2/07." "MR. TOLE,—Please prepare necessary documents and conduct prosecution.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 28/2/07."

As already stated, an information was laid and warrant issued on the 2nd March, 1909, but from that time to the present nothing has been seen of Wrack. It has been broadly stated that for certain reasons this man Wrack was allowed to get away, and that the police connived at his disappearance by unduly delaying the proceedings. Apart from the fact that the whole proceedings seem to have been very leisurely, and that Wrack was not kept under strict police surveillance, having regard to the serious nature of the charges against him, and the strong *prima facie* evidence of the truth of them, I am not prepared to say that there is anything to support the allegations made against the police. Had Mr. Kettle expressly directed a prosecution for perjury, instead of requesting the police to make further inquiries and take such proceedings (if any) as might be considered warranted, the position would, of course, be wholly different. It would seem, too, that there was ample grounds for such direction. As it was, the police, without such full and complete knowledge of all the circumstances as was possessed by Mr. Kettle, thought it incumbent on them to make long and, as I think, unnecessary further inquiries, and at the end to submit the whole matter, still more unnecessarily, for the opinion of the Crown Solicitor. There is evidence on the papers to show that Wrack, hearing of the projected prosecution, thought it wise to disappear; and this he has done most effectually.

Auckland Police Surgeon.

A great deal was said in Auckland about the relations existing between the Inspector and the members of the Force generally and Dr. Sharman, the Police Surgeon. There can be no doubt at all that those relations are exceedingly strained, and do not tend to operate in the best interests of all parties. As things are now, the great majority of the men refuse to have the services of the Police Surgeon. The trouble has been in existence for a long time, and the

Government caused a departmental inquiry to be held. The matter does not come strictly within my order of reference, and I can make no definite recommendation on the subject. The position, however, ought to be dealt with in some way or other, and especially now that so much publicity has been given to the whole business.

Rank and Service.

I append below an interesting return showing the length of service of all ranks on the 1st July, 1909. It shows that 255 constables out of 613 have less than four years' service, and that 104 have between ten and fifteen years'. All the Inspectors have over thirty years' service. This ought to insure that they are all men of ripe experience. The service of each rank on the 1st July, 1909, is shown in the following table :—

Ranks.	Under 1 Year.	1 Year to 2 Years.	2 Years to 3 Years.	3 Years to 4 Years.	4 Years to 5 Years.	5 Years to 6 Years.	6 Years to 7 Years.	7 Years to 8 Years.	8 Years to 9 Years.	9 Years to 10 Years.	10 Years to 15 Years.	15 Years to 20 Years.	20 Years to 25 Years.	25 Years to 30 Years.	30 Years and upwards.	Total.
Inspectors	9	9
Sub-Inspectors	3	4	7
Station Sergeants	4	4
Sergeants-major	1	1
Sergeants	1	15	17	13	14	23	83
Constables ..	69	69	59	58	38	20	18	18	19	28	104	24	20	37	32	613
Chief Detectives	1	3	..	1	..	5
Detectives	1	1	1	7	11	6	2	1	2	32
Acting-detectives	1	..	1	1	4	3	1	1	1	13
Police Surgeons	1	3	4
Matrons ..	1	1	2	4
District constables ..	1	5	2	2	1	1	2	5	..	1	20
Native constables ..	2	..	2	1	2	1	..	1	..	1	..	10
Total ..	73	75	63	61	42	23	23	22	22	40	142	51	36	57	75	805

Pay.

Subjoined is a return showing the present rates of pay of all ranks in the Force. This shows at a glance the exact position. Following that return, I have, for the purpose of comparison, had a return inserted showing the proportion of police to population, and cost of police per inhabitant, throughout Australasia. This return also shows the comparative rates of pay, with certain other concessions.

Rank.	Pay.	
	From	To
Inspectors ..	£330 per annum ..	£460 per annum.
Sub-Inspectors ..	£260 ..	£310 ..
Station-Sergeants ..	12s. 6d. per day ..	13s. 6d. per day.
Sergeants-Major ..	12s. 6d.
Sergeants ..	10s. 6d. ..	12s. 0d. per day.
Chief Detectives ..	15s. 6d. ..	16s. 6d. ..
Detectives ..	10s. 0d. ..	15s. 0d. ..
Constables ..	7s. 6d. ..	9s. 6d. ..
Acting-detectives* ..	7s. 6d. ..	7s. 6d. ..
Police Surgeons ..	£100 per annum
Matrons ..	£100 ..	£120 per annum.
District constables ..	£30 ..	£137 ..
Native constables ..	£20 ..	£137 ..

* With allowance of 1s. per day.

Return showing the Proportion of Police to Population, and Cost of Police per Inhabitant, and Rates of Pay of Constables, in each of the undermentioned Places.

Place.	Number of Police.	Population.	Proportion of Police to Population.	Cost of Police per Inhabitant.	Rates of Pay of Constables.
				s. d.	
New Zealand ..	771	1,008,373	1 to 1,308	3 4 $\frac{1}{4}$	7/6 to 9/6 per day.*
Victoria ..	1,571	1,271,174	1 „ 809	4 5 $\frac{3}{4}$	6/6 „ 10/ „ †
New South Wales ..	2,465	1,591,673	1 „ 645	5 9 $\frac{3}{4}$	7/ „ 8/6 „ ‡
South Australia ..	413	407,179	1 „ 985	4 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	7/ „ 8/6 „ §
Queensland ..	970	552,345	1 „ 569	7 4 $\frac{3}{4}$	£108 „ £134 per year.
Western Australia ..	504	267,111	1 „ 529	9 0	7/6 „ 8/6 per day.¶
Tasmania ..	233	185,500	1 „ 796	4 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	6/ „ 7/ „ **

* With material for uniform free, house allowance or quarters, a pension, and twelve days' annual leave.

† With quarters, fuel, light, and water, and seventeen days' annual leave.

‡ With house allowance or quarters, special allowance in expensive districts, pension, allowance for uniform, and twenty-eight days' annual leave.

§ With quarters, light, allowance for uniform, long-service pay, fourteen days' annual leave, and excursion rates on railways.

|| With house allowance or quarters, pension, three weeks' annual leave, excursion rates on railways, special allowance in expensive districts.

¶ With lodging-allowance, uniform-allowance, and a benefit fund to which the State contributes.

** With uniforms free, and a compensation-allowance fund to which the State contributes.

Lamps.

Complaint has been made throughout the Dominion of the nature and quality of the lamps supplied to the police, and required to be taken by them on night duty. The evidence condemnatory of these is so unanimous amongst all the commissioned officers, and sergeants, and men throughout the Force that it is astounding that nothing has been done by the Commissioner to deal with the matter in a businesslike way. I found, to my surprise, in Auckland that the men, with the knowledge of their officers, had been for some time past purchasing at their own cost up-to-date electric lamps, and having them recharged when necessary, also at their own cost, rather than use the objectionable regulation lamp. I recommend the matter for consideration.

Batons and Handcuffs.

My attention has been drawn to the batons and handcuffs as at present used, and which are stated to be obsolete.

I see no fault to find with the batons. They are very seldom used, and then only for defensive purposes, and more for pushing than striking. The one shown to me, and suggested as a substitute, would be by no means suitable.

The general run of handcuffs are certainly of an obsolete pattern, but I understand that others are supplied on requisition.

Mr. Arnold, M.P., and the Commissioner of Police.

A great deal of unpleasantness was caused at my Dunedin sitting by the very hostile attitude taken up by the Commissioner of Police towards Mr. Arnold, M.P., in connection with certain remarks made by him in Parliament on police matters generally. I am not in the least concerned with anything that Mr. Arnold may have said there, and he is certainly not answerable to me nor to the Commissioner for what he may think proper to say in his place in Parliament. The Commissioner made some very foolish and ill-advised remarks, which, coming from a man in his position, call for some comment. In the first place, he accused Mr. Arnold of making deliberately false statements. Then he stated that certain files might be "faked," practically inviting the suggestion, without the smallest reason, that a particular file actually had been "faked." Then he made the extraordinary assertion that he had not given his son the full leave he was entitled to, with an object in view. When asked by Mr. Arnold what that object was, he replied as follows: "It was for such as yourself. It

was a little bit of bait for such as yourself to bite at. . . . I knew what I was doing at the time, and I knew it would be made public. . . . We laid a trap for men who are interfering with the Department.” (*Vide* page 76 of the evidence.)

The main dispute between the two was over the statement made by Mr. Arnold that the Finger-print Expert, who is Mr. Dinnie’s son, had been granted six months’ leave on full pay to go to England. As a matter of fact—and there is not the slightest doubt about it—the young man was granted six months’ leave, but only one month on full pay; and there is no reason for believing that any other recommendation was ever made. The Hon. Mr. McGowan is very precise on the point, and the Commissioner has stated so on oath. It was natural that the Commissioner should feel strongly on the point, looking to his relationship to the Finger-print Expert. I think, myself, that it is a matter for regret that a person holding an important and responsible position such as this should be a near relation of the head of the Department. Apart from the fact that anything savouring at all of nepotism should be avoided in the public service, the position cannot lend itself to the interests of true discipline. The relations between the two inevitably form a subject of comment in the Force generally.

The Commissioner of Police.

At the conclusion of the main evidence in Wellington the Commissioner asked me, as I have previously stated, to allow him a fortnight’s time in which to prepare a written statement of the evidence that he proposed to give. So that he should be placed at no possible disadvantage, although I considered the time asked for unreasonably long, I decided to grant his application. The statement he finally made is embodied in the evidence. It is necessary that I should refer to it to some extent, as some portions of it are misleading, and therefore liable to create a wrong impression. He has gone somewhat beyond his proper function in summing up the results and effect of the evidence, but I do not desire to attach very much importance to this. The responsibility for the findings must be mine, and in every instance in which I express opinions adverse to the Commissioner’s review of his own administration, I am able to support my findings and opinions, either by the evidence actually given, or by reference to the official files, from which I have made copious extracts.

At the very opening of the Commission, the Commissioner emphasized the fact that he had applied for an inquiry into what he was pleased to term the *reckless* charges made by members of Parliament as to certain matters in connection with the Police Force. As he evidently wished it to be implied that he was responsible for the setting-up of this Commission, it is perhaps a little inconsistent that he should on certain occasions have shown a disposition to impede rather than to assist the work of inquiry. In the exercise of my discretion and within the powers of my commission, I have called for a large number of files of papers from the Commissioner’s office where I have thought that in any way whatever I might be assisted in obtaining material upon which I could better report on police matters generally, keeping strictly within the order of reference of my Commission. I quote here the paragraph conveying the authority,—

“And also to have before you and examine any books, writings, records, and documents whatsoever which you shall deem necessary for your information in these premises.”

Through the agency of those files, in cases where the oral evidence fell short of exactitude, I have in places discovered matter that has caused me to refer to what I have termed the ineptitude of the Commissioner’s administration in certain directions. His reference to my action on page 499 of his statement is entirely uncalled-for and almost impertinent. Wherever I have thought it necessary I have made verbatim extracts from the files to support the view I have taken. In that respect, it is quite true, as he says, that the files speak for themselves. How they speak is a matter of opinion, and must be judged, as

between the Commissioner and myself, by those who will have to consider this report. And the conduct of the Commission by myself must be judged by what is disclosed in the official report of the evidence—as to whether the object, and intention, and effort throughout has been to ascertain the true position of affairs with a view to improvement, or merely to cast blame.

The Commissioner has given a somewhat long and detailed account of his police experience in various places outside New Zealand. That he has a long and honourable police record no one can possibly doubt. Whether a long actual police experience necessarily qualifies a man for successful administration of a Force such as ours is a matter of opinion. A man must be judged by the result of his work. Where I have found it necessary to differ considerably from the Commissioner's views on certain matters, and to criticize adversely certain phases of his administration, I have done so with regret, for I fully recognise that in everything he has done he has acted honestly, with the best intention, and with due regard to what he believed, however mistakenly, to be the best interests of the Force.

The Commissioner has thought proper to refer to the charges made by Messrs. T. E. Taylor and Arnold in the House of Representatives, and has referred to them as either grotesquely exaggerated or absolutely baseless. I have made no reference to statements made by either gentleman in Parliament. I have nothing to do with them. Mr. Taylor has given no evidence before this Commission. Mr. Arnold, however, did so at some length in Dunedin, and certainly the description of the Commissioner of the quality of his matter would not refer to the bulk of the charges made in that evidence.

The Commissioner makes the astounding statement that there is no general dissatisfaction in the Force. Why, the evidence is full of instances in which men have come forward and expressed the gravest dissatisfaction, and it would certainly be unfair to term these men what the Commissioner thinks proper to call "agitators."

On page 496 of his evidence the Commissioner deals with a matter of administration to which I have taken serious exception on the score of efficiency and discipline—the habit that has lately grown up under him of giving the option to constables and sergeants to go or not, as they please, to certain stations. His statement does not represent the true facts. There are numerous instances on the files where the Commissioner has telegraphed or written to Inspectors as follows: "Ask Constable A if he is willing to go to ———?" A reply has often come back, "Constable A says that it would not suit him to go to ———," or "Constable A is not willing [*or declines*] to go to ———." Or, "Ask Constable A if he has any objection to go to ———?" and the Inspector replies, perhaps, "Constable A is willing to go to ———"; or, "Constable A agrees to go to ———." And the same with the sergeants. I have elsewhere expressed my opinion of this system of administration as being essentially weak, and not conducive to discipline.

I agree with the Commissioner that a clerical training is a very important one, but it is not correct for him to say that it is a necessary qualification for those holding the higher ranks in the service. He surely does not mean that all the Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors have been District Clerks. Such is not the case.

I totally disagree with the Commissioner in his contention that it is necessary for the District Clerks to secure early promotion. There is absolutely no ground for such a statement. The effect of his action, as I have pointed out elsewhere, has been most mischievous.

It is not necessary for me to say much about his references to the Headquarters Staff. I have dealt fully with the question elsewhere. Not one of the reasons he gives in favour of the present position has any foundation in fact. What he means by a "certain amount of legal knowledge of police matters" being requisite I have no idea, nor probably has he himself.

I cordially agree with him when he says that "to place the right men in the right place is the secret of successful administration." But we should probably

disagree as to whether this has been carried out. No hard and fast rule can be laid down to govern promotions or anything else in the Police Force. Successful administration must depend on the exercise of discretion and a sound judgment, and on the possession of knowledge.

Although the evidence is full of complaints, and some of them valid ones, on the score of promotion, the Commissioner makes the astonishing statement that there is only one instance before the Commission in which the slightest suggestion can be made of delay in promoting a constable, and he excuses himself in this case by saying that he could scarcely be expected to promote this constable, although recommended by his Inspector, because the late Commissioner had not recommended him six years ago; and it is as well to note here that the late Commissioner only saw this man *once*, and then only for a moment. As I have said elsewhere, a grave injustice has been done to this man, which I hope to see rectified. It is a curious commentary on the Commissioner's attitude with respect to the information left him by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge that he gives this as an excuse for promoting a certain constable who had *not* been recommended by his Inspector, and that this man was such a shocking bad selection that he had to be reduced very shortly after promotion.

The Commissioner has thought proper to reflect upon the attendance at the Commission of Mr. R. A. Wright, member of Parliament for Wellington South. He says that Mr. Wright displayed a marked hostility to himself personally and to the Police Force generally. There is not the slightest foundation for such a statement. The clear object in making it is to reflect upon my action in giving Mr. Wright the privilege of asking any suitable and proper questions of any member of the Force. I explained that I accorded this privilege to any member of Parliament who desired it, in his capacity of trustee of the public interests. Mr. Wright displayed not the slightest hostility towards Mr. Dinnie, and the latter's wild statement is a mere flight of imagination.

The Commissioner takes credit to himself for considerably improving the efficiency of the Force after he took over charge from ex-Commissioner Tunbridge. Whether this credit can be justly claimed must be judged by the evidence. There is no doubt, I take it, that the Force was highly efficient when Mr. Tunbridge left it. It is unfortunate that a Commission of Inquiry should have to sit upon it to-day.

CONCLUSION.

After having been all over the Dominion, having come in contact with a very large number of members of the Police Force of all grades, having heard the evidence, in many instances highly condemnatory of administration, general and local, having seen the demeanour of certain members of all ranks from the Commissioner downwards towards each other, I feel bound to assert the opinion that the handling of police matters in the immediate future will require the exercise of great tact and discretion. The position of several officers, if left as they are, will be perfectly impossible, and grave trouble may arise. As I have previously pointed out, the Commissioner has stated his opinion of one Inspector to be that, where a matter affects him personally, he becomes so vindictive as to be capable of giving false and unreliable evidence on oath. I do not believe this to be true for one moment, but it serves to show the spirit that may possibly underlie and actuate police administration, general and local, for some time to come. What is going to be the position of certain men who have given evidence adverse to their superiors? The progress of a Commission such as this through the country must necessarily seriously affect discipline, and is liable to create turmoil. I can do no more now than leave the position here in the hands of those in authority, with an earnest injunction to grapple honestly and sincerely with any difficulties that have arisen, and to endeavour to the very best of their ability to smooth over the rough edges of controversy and rivalry, so that no feeling of soreness may continue, or risk of doing injustice may arise, but that all may work together for the benefit of a Force that, taken as a whole, is a credit to the Dominion, and that compares favourably with any similar Force in the world, and that, properly handled, will still further enhance its reputation.

I cannot conclude my report without placing on record my very sincere appreciation of the able and loyal assistance rendered to me by Mr. J. D. Gray, who has acted throughout as Secretary to the Commission. The work has been long and arduous, and he has been as my right hand.

To Messrs. Leslie, Gore, Russell, and Berry are also due my thanks for very correct and prompt reports of the proceedings.

The full evidence taken before me is forwarded herewith.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this eighteenth day of October, in the year one thousand nine hundred and nine.

H. W. BISHOP,
Stipendiary Magistrate and Commissioner.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

INVERCARGILL, WEDNESDAY, 7TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court at 10.30 a.m.

Present: H. W. Bishop, Esq.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance to represent the Police Department.

The Commission was read by the Secretary.

The Commissioner intimated, in response to a question by Mr. Dinnie, that the proceedings would be open to the public and the Press.

Mr. Dinnie said that he had asked for this ruling because he wished it to be understood that he had applied for this Commission, and because he wished the Press to know the particulars of his application, which he thereupon read as follows:—

“Police Department, Wellington, 17th June, 1909.

“Hon. the Minister of Justice.

“In view of the serious and reckless charges which have been brought against myself and the Police Department, over which I have had the honour to preside for the last six years, by certain members of Parliament, and which charges I have not had the opportunity of refuting, in the interests of the Department, the public, and myself I respectfully beg to request,—

“1. That those charges be at once definitely framed by those members who made them.

“2. That a copy be supplied to me in order that I have a fair opportunity of defending myself and the Department.

“3. That an independent tribunal be appointed to investigate the charges and report the result thereof.

“4. That the result be made public through the Press.

“5. That in justice to me a copy of this application be forwarded to the Press without delay.

“W. DINNIE,

“Commissioner of Police.”

The Commissioner said he presumed the Minister would have no objection to a copy being furnished to the Press, but it was unusual to hand a Ministerial document to the Press except by consent of the Minister to whom it was addressed. Mr. Dinnie must take the responsibility for its publication.

The Commissioner publicly announced that every officer in the Police Force was specially invited to give evidence before the Commission if he so desired, and that he (the Commissioner) desired to assure members of the Force that they could give evidence before him throughout these proceedings with a feeling of the greatest possible security from future injury in the service because of their evidence; and in this connection he read the following assurance from the Hon. the Minister of Justice:—

“H. W. Bishop, Esq., S.M., Police Commission, Invercargill.

“For the purpose of insuring that every police officer who gives evidence before the Commission should do so freely and without any possible fear of the consequences of his evidence should it be averse to the administration of the Department, I, as Minister of Justice, desire you to give an assurance that the giving of such evidence will not be allowed to prejudice in any way the career in the Police Force of any such officers, provided, of course, that in your judgment as Commissioner such evidence is not given falsely or in bad faith.

“J. G. FINDLAY,

“Minister of Justice.”

The Inspector of Police for Invercargill District asked the direction of the Commissioner in regard to certain police officers in his district who desired to give evidence relative to their service in the Armed Constabulary Force counting for superannuation purposes.

The Commissioner ruled that this question did not come within the scope of the Commission.

George Scandrett, police constable, stationed at Invercargill, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Connell, police constable, stationed at Invercargill, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alfred James Mitchell, Inspector of Police, Invercargill District, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

INVERCARGILL, THURSDAY, 8TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

James Stuck, retired farmer, Invercargill, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alfred James Mitchell, Inspector of Police, Invercargill, was further examined.

John Campbell Mackenzie, sergeant of police, stationed at Gore, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick McGrath, sergeant of police, stationed at Bluff, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Wallace Abercrombie Brookes, sergeant of police, stationed at Invercargill, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James Kerr Simpson, sergeant of police, stationed at Invercargill, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 3.10 p.m.

DUNEDIN, MONDAY, 12TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 James Frederick Arnold, member of Parliament for Dunedin Central, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 12 noon.

DUNEDIN, TUESDAY, 13TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 William Walker, ex-constable, residing at Invercargill, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Thomas Ryan Sonntag, nurseryman, Roslyn, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Frederick Mallard, ex-Inspector of the New Zealand Police Force, of Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Owen Patrick Brosnan, hotel porter, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Henry Higgins, sergeant, stationed at Lawrence, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Terence O'Brien, Inspector in Charge, Dunedin Police District, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

DUNEDIN, WEDNESDAY, 14TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 James Neil, chemist, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Richard Luby, commission agent, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Frederick Matthews, ironmoulder, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Michael Mason, constable, stationed at North Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Vyvyan Richard Taylor, constable, Palmerston South, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Hugh Henry Butler, constable, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Thomas Bandy, constable, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 John Fox, constable, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 George Bennett Edwards, constable, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Luke Mullany, sergeant, stationed at Port Chalmers, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

DUNEDIN, THURSDAY, 15TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 John Downey, miller, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Terence O'Brien, Inspector, Dunedin, was further examined.
 Patrick Herbert, Chief Detective, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Robert Crawford, sergeant, stationed at Clyde, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Albert Tivy Emerson, sergeant, stationed at South Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Gilbert, sergeant, stationed at North Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

DUNEDIN, FRIDAY, 16TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 In response to a telegram from the Hon. the Minister of Justice, forwarding a communication from the Hon. George Jones, M.L.C., stating that the management of the Oamaru Police Force from Christchurch was most unsatisfactory, and asking that the Commission should sit at Oamaru to investigate this and other matters, the Commissioner decided to hold a sitting at Oamaru on Tuesday next, and the Hon. Mr. Jones was informed accordingly.
 Alfred Edgar Sidney Ward, detective, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Thomas King, station sergeant, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Terence O'Brien, Inspector, Dunedin, was further examined.
 Diana Pine, married woman, of Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Temple Dark, constable, stationed at South Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Charles Henry Lennon, constable, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 John McIntyre, constable and Inspector of Weights and Measures, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 James Frederick Arnold, member of Parliament, was further examined.
 Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

DUNEDIN, SATURDAY, 17TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Joseph Charles Willis, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James Frederick Arnold, member of Parliament, was further examined.

Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.

Terence O'Brien, Inspector, Dunedin, was further examined.

The Commission adjourned at 12.15 p.m.

DUNEDIN, MONDAY, 19TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

John Fox, constable, stationed at Dunedin, was further examined.

Francis George Cumming, agent, Prison Aid Society, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William John Phair, Sub-Inspector, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick Denis O'Connell, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Thomas O'Grady, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Edwin Murray, sergeant and District Clerk at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Michael McKeefry, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Eccles, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 3 p.m.

OAMARU, WEDNESDAY, 21ST JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Magistrate's Court at 12 noon.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.

Thomas Griffiths, sergeant, stationed at Oamaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Robert James Gillies, Inspector in Charge of Canterbury and North Otago District, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Miller MacKenzie, carrier, Oamaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

TIMARU, THURSDAY, 22ND JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Magistrate's Court at 10 a.m.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Henry Teevan, medical practitioner, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Ellis Mills, wharf labourer, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Gillespie, constable, stationed at Temuka, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Henry Green, Sub-Inspector at Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Joseph Weathered, constable and Police Gaoler, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick Bowman, sergeant, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Henry Green, Sub-Inspector, Timaru, was further examined.

In response to the request of Mr. W. Dinnie, who desired to visit Wellington to deal with urgent departmental business, the Commission was adjourned until Tuesday, 27th July, 1909, at Christchurch.

The Commission adjourned at 3 p.m.

CHRISTCHURCH, TUESDAY, 27TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Provincial Council Chambers.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Mr. Dougall, solicitor, appeared for Mr. George Laurenson, M.P.

John Connell, constable, stationed at Invercargill, was further examined.

George Laurenson, member of Parliament for Lyttelton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.

Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.

Charles Rutledge, ex-sergeant, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Henry Symes, Police Surgeon, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Ernest Alexander Regan, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Martin James Carney, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Justin Eric MacCarthy, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 4.10 p.m.

CHRISTCHURCH, WEDNESDAY, 28TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Provincial Council Chambers.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Ernest Alexander Regan, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was further examined.

Edward McKay, sergeant, stationed at Rangiora, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William James Whatman, constable, stationed at Little River, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Fouhy, sergeant, stationed at Ashburton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Gillespie, constable, stationed at Temuka, was further examined.

Thomas Frederick Hammond, constable, stationed at Bingsland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick James Fitzgerald, constable, stationed at Lyttelton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.

Michael Leahy, constable, stationed at Oxford, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

CHRISTCHURCH, THURSDAY, 29TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Provincial Council Chambers.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Frederick Knight Hunt, solicitor, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Victor Grace Day, Stipendiary Magistrate, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Michael Donnelly, barrister, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Charles Rutledge, ex-sergeant, was further examined.

Maurice Roche, ex-constable, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James Johnston, station sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alfred Edward Remer, sergeant, stationed at Sydenham, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.

David Jackson, constable, stationed at Addington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Peter Maloney, constable, stationed at Akaroa, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick Ryan, sergeant, stationed at Lyttelton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alfred Edward Remer, sergeant, was further examined.

Michael Donovan, sergeant, stationed at St. Albans, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Edward Punjab Bird, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

George Keep, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Richard Thomas Hodgson, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Thomas Frederick Hammond, constable, was further examined.

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

CHRISTCHURCH, FRIDAY, 30TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Provincial Council Chambers.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

George Warren Russell, member of Parliament for Avon, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Charles Rutledge, ex-sergeant, was further examined.

James O'Connor, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Clifford Simeon Thompson, representative of Turnbull and Jones (Limited), electrical engineers, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Miller, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Burrows, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Thomas Gibson, acting-detective, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Thomas Alfred Evenden, constable, stationed at Rangiora, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.

Frank Joseph Bishop, Chief Detective, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James Johnston, station sergeant, was further examined.

Alfred Edward Remer, sergeant, was further examined.

Mr. O. T. Y. Alpers, solicitor, Christchurch, appeared for Constable T. F. Hammond, and made a statement.

Robert McClelland, sergeant and District Clerk, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Joseph Albert McGrath, Sub-Inspector, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Thomas Frederick Hammond, constable, was further examined.

Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.

The Commission adjourned at 4.10 p.m.

CHRISTCHURCH, SATURDAY, 31ST JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Provincial Council Chambers.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Robert James Gillies, Inspector, gave further evidence.

Frank Joseph Bishop, Chief Detective, gave further evidence.

Joseph Albert McGrath, Sub-Inspector, gave further evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 11.20 a.m.

GREYMOUTH, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the Magistrate's Court.
Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
Malachy O'Grady, constable, stationed at Greymouth, was sworn, and gave evidence.
David James White, constable, stationed at the State Colliery, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Alfred Hastings Jones, constable, stationed at Stafford, was sworn, and gave evidence.
James Arthur Cruickshank, constable, stationed at Ross, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Thomas Barrett, sergeant, stationed at Hokitika, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Eugene Egan, sergeant, stationed at Greymouth, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Patrick Black, Inspector in Charge of Grey District, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Thomas Oliver, sergeant and District Clerk, Greymouth, was sworn, and gave evidence.
William Campbell, detective, stationed at Greymouth, was sworn, and gave evidence.
The Commission adjourned at 12.10 p.m.

REEFTON, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 8.30 p.m.
Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
James Black, sergeant, stationed at Reefton, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Thomas Keenan, constable, stationed at Westport, was sworn, and gave evidence.
William Aloysius Conlon, medical practitioner, Reefton, was sworn, and gave evidence.
The Commission adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

WESTPORT, THURSDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 8 p.m. at the Magistrate's Court.
Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
Leonard John Cockery, hotelkeeper and ex-constable, Westport, was sworn, and gave evidence.
James Stevenson Reid, constable, stationed at Seddonville, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Samuel Joseph Dew, sergeant, stationed at Westport, was sworn, and gave evidence.
The Commission adjourned at 9.10 p.m.

NELSON, MONDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Magistrate's Court.
Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
James Cameron, constable, stationed at Richmond, was sworn, and gave evidence.
John Wybrant Ellison, Inspector in Charge of Wellington District, was sworn, and gave evidence.
John Timothy Foley, constable, stationed at Collingwood, was sworn, and gave evidence.
John Dougan, sergeant, stationed at Nelson, was sworn, and gave evidence.
The Commission adjourned at 11.45 a.m.

PICTON, TUESDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 6.45 p.m. at the Magistrate's Court.
Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
George Albert Williams, constable, stationed at Seddon, was sworn, and gave evidence.
William Thomas Mason, sergeant-major, stationed at Blenheim, was sworn, and gave evidence.
The Commission adjourned at 7.20 p.m.

WANGANUI, FRIDAY, 13TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the Magistrate's Court.
Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
Thomas Bourke, sergeant, stationed at Wanganui, was sworn, and gave evidence.
James Bree, constable, stationed at Wanganui, was sworn, and gave evidence.
James Riordan, constable, stationed at Wanganui East, was sworn, and gave evidence.
James Fitzpatrick, constable, stationed at Marton, was sworn, and gave evidence.
James Siddells, detective, stationed at Wanganui, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Walter Henry Haddrell, sergeant, stationed at New Plymouth, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Francis Cullen, sergeant, stationed at Stratford, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Stephen Till, sergeant and District Clerk, Wanganui, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Edward Wilson, Inspector in Charge of Wanganui District, was sworn, and gave evidence.
Horton Charles David Wade, constable, stationed at Eltham, was sworn, and gave evidence.
The Commission adjourned at 3 p.m.

PALMERSTON NORTH, SATURDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 9 a.m. in the Supreme Court.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Martin Dudley Stagpoole, sergeant, stationed at Palmerston North, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Charles Bowden, sergeant, stationed at Feilding, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Henry Beattie, sergeant, stationed at Taihape, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Frederick Woods, constable, stationed at Foxton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Robert Edwards, architect and Justice of the Peace, Palmerston North, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John William Henderson Macleod, mounted constable, stationed at Palmerston North, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alexander Russell, constable, stationed at Palmerston North, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alexander Crozier, ex-constable, Marton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Albert Graham, farmer, Apiti, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John O'Donovan, Sub-Inspector in Charge, Palmerston North Sub-district, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Andrew Duncan Thomson, Stipendiary Magistrate, Palmerston North, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

NAPIER, TUESDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. at the Magistrate's Court Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Thomas James Wilton, constable, stationed at the Spit, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Walter Torr, district constable, stationed at Wairoa, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Wilson Smart, sergeant, stationed at Hastings, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alexander Cruickshank, sergeant, stationed at Dannevirke, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Folley, sergeant, stationed at Napier, was sworn, and gave evidence.

David Dearlove Hutton, sergeant, stationed at Gisborne, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Denis Joseph Cummings, sergeant and District Clerk, stationed at Napier, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Edward Hill, detective, stationed at Napier, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Dwyer, Inspector in Charge, Napier District, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Joseph Aldous Raynes, bailiff, Napier, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 1.25 p.m.

AUCKLAND, TUESDAY, 24TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Supreme Court Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Samuel Thompson, constable, stationed at Dargaville, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Frederick Hammerley, mounted constable, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick Carmody, constable, stationed at Whangaroa, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Andrew McDonnell, constable, stationed at Aratapu, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick John Dunne, constable, stationed at Ponsonby, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Frederick Augustus Moore, sergeant, stationed at Whangarei, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 3.15 p.m.

AUCKLAND, WEDNESDAY, 25TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Supreme Court Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Edward Clare Blomfield, barrister, Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick John Dunne, constable, was further examined.

George Foreman, constable, stationed at Otahuhu, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John James Taylor, ex-constable, attended and asked permission to go into the question of his dismissal from the Force; but the Commissioner ruled that he was expressly debarred by the order of reference from doing so.

Frederick Augustus Moore, sergeant, was further examined.

Bartholomew Sheehan, sergeant, stationed at Newton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

AUCKLAND, THURSDAY, 26TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Supreme Court Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Ernest Schmidt, labourer, attended to ventilate a grievance arising out of a police prosecution, and the Commissioner ruled that the matter did not come within the scope of the Commission.

Edward Claude Budd, a clerk in holy orders, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Ward George Wohlmann, sergeant and District Clerk, Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James W. Taylor, retired Civil servant, attended to ventilate a grievance in regard to lack of police supervision; and the Commissioner ruled that the matter did not come within the scope of the Commission.

George Hastie, sergeant, stationed at Hamilton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Hanson, sergeant, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Martin Rogers, sergeant, stationed at Onehunga, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Archibald McPhee, sergeant, stationed at Newmarket, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Lawrence Carroll, sergeant, stationed at Eden Terrace, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James Coghlan Griffiths, sergeant, stationed at Newton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick Crean, sergeant, stationed at Newton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alexander McGilp, constable, stationed at Birkenhead, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Timothy Donovan, constable, stationed at Parnell, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Charles Henry Greenhead, settler, Waiuku, attended to ventilate a grievance against the police in connection with a private prosecution; and the Commissioner ruled that the matter did not come within the scope of the Commission.

The Commission adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

AUCKLAND, FRIDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Supreme Court Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

James McGowan, member of the Legislative Council and ex Minister of Justice, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Henry William Northcroft, Stipendiary Magistrate, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Thomas Wainhouse, constable, stationed at Kingsland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Theophilus Wake, farmer, of Hobsonville, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Frederick Hammerly, mounted constable, was further examined.

Gilbert Ronald McKay, constable, stationed at Eden Terrace, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James Ferguson, sergeant, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John James Hogan, sergeant, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alfred Ernest Rowell, sergeant, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Edwin Eales, sergeant, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Peter Harvey, sergeant, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Ramsay, sergeant, stationed at Queen Street Wharf, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Walter Joseph Baskiville, sergeant, stationed at Devonport, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 4.5 p.m.

AUCKLAND, MONDAY, 30TH AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Supreme Court Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Charles Cargill Kettle, Stipendiary Magistrate, Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Frederick William Shortland, barrister, Taumarunui, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Edward William Sharman, Police Surgeon, Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Edwin Eales, sergeant, was further examined.

Patrick John Dunne, constable, was further examined.

Charles Henry Poole, member of Parliament for Auckland West, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

AUCKLAND, TUESDAY, 31ST AUGUST, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Supreme Court Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Timothy Donovan, constable, was further examined.

Charles Henry Poole, member of Parliament, was further examined.

John Henry Sweeney, plain-clothes constable, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Walter Hollis, detective, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Peter Thomas McMahon, detective, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Alfred James Robert, constable, stationed at Epsom, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Gilbert Ronald McKay, constable, was further examined.
 Daniel Murphy, constable, stationed at Freeman's Bay, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 John Thomas Wainhouse, constable, was further examined.
 James Rogers, constable, stationed at Eden Terrace, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 George Thomas Storey, constable, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Edward Hunt, constable, stationed at Newmarket, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Joseph Lipscombe, constable, stationed at Newmarket, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 John Eugene Cullen, journalist, Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

AUCKLAND, WEDNESDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Supreme Court Buildings.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 Patrick John Dunne, constable, was further examined.
 James Treanor, station sergeant, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Richard Marsack, Chief Detective, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Charles William Hendrey, Sub-Inspector, stationed at Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Henry William Northcroft, Stipendiary Magistrate, was further examined.
 The Commission adjourned at 4.5 p.m.

AUCKLAND, THURSDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Supreme Court Buildings.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 Bartholomew Sheehan, sergeant, was further examined.
 Charles William Hendrey, Sub-Inspector, was further examined.
 John Eugene Cullen, journalist, was further examined.
 John Cullen, Inspector in Charge of Auckland District, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 4.5 p.m.

ROTORUA, MONDAY, 6TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Native Land Court.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 Arthur Skinner, constable, stationed at Tauranga, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 James Sellers Willcocks, constable, stationed at Whakatane, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Charles O'Reilly, constable, stationed at Opotiki, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 John Watt, sergeant, stationed at Rotorua, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Ernst Gerard, Official Assignee, Auckland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 George Gardiner Menzies, road engineer, Rotorua, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Paul appeared to ventilate a grievance arising out of a police prosecution; and the Commissioner ruled that the matter did not come within the scope of the Commission.
 The Commission adjourned at 12.45 p.m.

THAMES, WEDNESDAY, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 9 a.m. in the Magistrate's Court.
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.
 Thomas Henry Hellyer Beddek, constable, stationed at Shortland, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Andrew Morgan, sergeant, stationed at Thames, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Samuel Flavell, constable, stationed at Waikino, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Thomas Benjamin Miles, constable, stationed at Waihi, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Timothy James Cummings, constable, stationed at Waihi, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 William Hector McKinnon, sergeant, stationed at Waihi, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 Nicholas Kiely, Inspector in Charge of Thames District, was sworn, and gave evidence.
 The Commission adjourned at 11.30 a.m.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 13TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Museum Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

John James Meikle attended to lay a complaint against Constable Leece; and the Commissioner ruled that the matter did not come within the scope of the Commission (see Minutes of Evidence, page 391).

John Robert Thompson, constable, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Joseph Gallagher, constable, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Patrick Doyle, constable, stationed at Mount Cook, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Arthur Calwell, constable, stationed at Mount Cook, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Willetts, constable, stationed at Wellington South, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William James Taylor, constable, stationed at Wellington South, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Michael Greene, constable, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Museum Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Michael Redican, constable, stationed at Island Bay, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William James Simpson, constable, stationed at Day's Bay, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Edwin Arnold, Visiting Justice to H.M. Prison, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Alfred Hammond, acting-detective, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Foster, sergeant, stationed at Petone, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Nathaniel Miller, sergeant, stationed at Masterton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Barrett Rutledge, sergeant, stationed at Mount Cook, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Stuart Richardson, Engineer and Manager, Wellington Corporation Tramways, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Michael Murphy, sergeant, stationed at Mount Cook, was sworn, and gave evidence.

George Morris, dairyman, Newtown, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Edward Wilkie Watson, Civil servant, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Michael Greene, constable, was further examined.

The Commission adjourned at 3.35 p.m.

WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Museum Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

George Hogben, Inspector-General of Education, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Norman Dow Abbott, acting-detective, stationed at Mount Cook, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Mathieson, sergeant, stationed at Wellington South, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Samuel Adam Brown, constable, stationed at Masterton, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Charles William Kelly, sergeant, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

James Dale, sergeant, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Museum Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

William Mathieson, sergeant, was further examined.

Michael Murphy, sergeant, was further examined.

William Coffey, journalist, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Lyons, sergeant, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Robert Darby, station sergeant, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John William Martin Dart, sergeant in charge of Training Depot, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Hugh McCrorie, sergeant, stationed at Mount Cook, was sworn, and gave evidence.

David Stewart, sergeant, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Norman Dow Abbott, acting-detective, was further examined.

Thomas Duncan, commission agent, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William McGill, sergeant, stationed at Headquarters, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Patrick Hackett McGuire, sergeant and District Clerk, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Amos Muggeridge, sergeant and Police Storekeeper, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Museum Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Edwin Osborne Gibbes, Bart., Secretary of Education, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Robert Joseph Collins, Secretary to the Treasury and Paymaster-General, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Michael Fleming, constable, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

George Nash, dairyman, Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Arthur Edwin Andrews, acting-detective, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Charles Robert Broberg, Chief Detective, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William Bernard McIlveney, Chief Detective, stationed at Headquarters, was sworn, and gave evidence.

William McNeely, sergeant, stationed at Headquarters, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Michael Gaffney, sergeant, stationed at Headquarters, was sworn, and gave evidence.

John Willetts, constable, stationed at Wellington South, was further examined.

Arthur Hobbins Wright, Sub-Inspector and Chief Clerk and Accountant, stationed at Headquarters, was sworn, and gave evidence.

Samuel Percival Norwood, Sub-Inspector, stationed at Wellington, was sworn, and gave evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

WELLINGTON, SATURDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Museum Buildings.

Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.

Michael Greene, constable, was further examined.

John William Martin Dart, sergeant, was further examined.

Samuel Percival Norwood, Sub-Inspector, was further examined.

John Wybrant Ellison, Inspector in Charge of Wellington Police District, was further examined.

William Mathieson, sergeant, was further examined.

This concluded the evidence, and on the application of Mr. Dinnie, who asked for an interval of two weeks in which to prepare his statement of evidence, the Commission was adjourned until Monday, the 4th October, 1909.

The Commission adjourned at 1.5 p.m.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 4TH OCTOBER, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Museum Buildings.

Mr. C. P. Skerrett, K.C., appeared on behalf of Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police.

Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.

The Commissioner declared the proceedings closed for the taking of evidence, and intimated that his report would be forwarded to His Excellency in due course.

The Commission adjourned at 12.30 p.m.

INDEX TO MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

- Abbott, Norman Dow (acting-detective), 426, 450.
 Andrews, Arthur Edmund (acting-detective), 460.
 Arnold, Edwin (basketmaker), 409.
 Arnold, James Frederick (member of Parliament), 19, 72, 80.
 Auckland evidence, 244.
- Bandy, William Thomas (constable), 46.
 Barrett, Thomas (sergeant), 180.
 Baskiville, Walter Joseph (sergeant), 301.
 Beattie, Henry (sergeant), 215.
 Beddek, Thomas Henry Hellyer (constable), 377.
 Bird, Edward (sergeant), 155.
 Bishop, Frank Joseph (Chief Detective), 164, 176.
 Black, James (sergeant), 184.
 Black, Patrick (Inspector), 181.
 Blomfield, Edward Clare (barrister), 258.
 Bourke, Thomas (sergeant), 195.
 Bowden, Charles (sergeant), 214.
 Bowman, Patrick (sergeant), 111.
 Bree, James (constable), 198.
 Broberg, Charles Robert (Chief Detective), 460.
 Brookes, Wallace Abercrombie (sergeant), 17.
 Brosnan, Owen Patrick (porter), 29.
 Brown, Samuel Adam (constable), 433.
 Budd, Edward Claude (clergyman), 271.
 Burrows, John (sergeant), 162.
 Butler, Hugh Henry (constable), 45.
- Calwell, William Arthur (constable), 395.
 Cameron, James (constable), 189.
 Campbell, William (detective), 183.
 Carmody, Patrick (constable), 248.
 Carney, Martin James (constable), 128.
 Carroll, Lawrence (sergeant), 278.
 Christchurch evidence, 114.
 Cockery, Leonard John (ex-constable), 186.
 Coffey, William (journalist), 438.
 Collins, Robert Joseph (Secretary to Treasury), 459.
 Conlon, William Aloysius (medical practitioner), 185.
 Connell, John (constable), 2, 114.
 Crawford, Robert (sergeant), 63.
 Crean, Patrick (sergeant), 279.
 Crozier, Alexander (ex-constable), 219.
 Cruickshank, Alexander (sergeant), 229.
 Cruickshank, James Arthur (constable), 179.
 Cullen, Francis (sergeant), 204.
 Cullen, John (Inspector), 348.
 Cullen, John Eugene (journalist), 328, 368.
 Cumming, Francis George (agent), 86.
 Cummings, Denis Joseph (district clerk), 234.
 Cummings, Timothy James (constable), 384.
- Dale, James (sergeant), 436.
 Darby, Robert (station sergeant), 440, 453.
 Dark, William (constable), 71.
 Dart, John William Martin (sergeant), 442, 476.
 Day, Victor Grace (Stipendiary Magistrate), 148.
 Dew, Samuel Joseph (sergeant), 188.
 Dinnie, Walter (Commissioner), 76, 80, 84, 96, 121, 489.
 Donnelly, Michael (barrister), 150.
 Donovan, Michael (sergeant), 155.
 Donovan, Timothy (constable), 280, 315.
 Dougan, John (sergeant), 192.
 Downey, John (miller), 51.
 Doyle, Patrick (constable), 393.
 Duncan, Thomas (commission agent), 450.
 Dunedin evidence, 19.
 Dunne, Patrick John (constable), 250, 258, 312, 330.
 Dwyer, John (Inspector), 236.
- Eales, Edwin (sergeant), 299, 312.
 Eccles, William (sergeant), 95.
 Edwards, George Bennet (constable), 49.
 Edwards, Robert (architect), 218.
 Egan, Eugene (sergeant), 181.
 Ellison, John Wybrant (Inspector), 191, 477.
 Emerson, Albert Tivy (sergeant), 63.
 Evenden, Thomas Alfred (constable), 163.
- Ferguson, James (sergeant), 298.
 Fitzgerald, Patrick James (constable), 138.
 Fitzpatrick, James (constable), 200.
 Flavell, Samuel (constable), 381.
 Fleming, Michael (constable), 459.
 Foley, John Timothy (constable), 191.
 Folley, William (sergeant), 231.
 Foreman, George (constable), 259.
 Foster, John (sergeant), 412.
 Fouhy, William (sergeant), 134.
 Fox, John (constable), 47, 86.
- Gaffney, Michael (sergeant), 469.
 Gallagher, John Joseph (constable), 392.
 Gerard, Ernest (Official Assignee), 375.
 Gibbes, Sir Edwin Osborne (Secretary of Education), 456.
 Gibson, Thomas (acting-detective), 163.
 Gilbert, William (sergeant), 63.
 Gillespie, John (constable), 102, 135.
 Gillies, Robert James (Inspector), 98, 121, 150, 172, 174.
 Graham, Albert (farmer), 220.
 Green, Henry (Sub-Inspector), 101, 112.
 Greene, Michael (constable), 402, 421, 476.
 Greymouth evidence, 176.
 Griffiths, James Coghlan (sergeant), 279.
 Griffiths, Thomas (sergeant), 96.
- Haddrell, Walter Henry (sergeant), 203.
 Hammerly, John Frederick (constable), 246, 297.
 Hammond, Alfred (acting-detective), 410.
 Hammond, Thomas Frederick (constable), 138, 168, 171.
 Hanson, John (sergeant), 277.
 Harvey, Peter (sergeant), 300.
 Hastie, George (sergeant), 276.
 Hendrey, Charles William (Sub-Inspector), 337, 347.
 Herbert, Patrick (Chief Detective), 55.
 Higgins, William Henry (sergeant), 31.
 Hill, William Edward (detective), 236.
 Hodgson, Richard Thomas (sergeant), 157.
 Hogan, John James (sergeant), 298.
 Hogben, George (Inspector-General of Schools), 422.
 Hollis, John Walter (detective), 321.
 Hunt, Frederick Knight (solicitor), 148.
 Hunt, William Edward (constable), 326.
 Hutton, David Dearlove (sergeant), 233, 241.
- Invercargill evidence, 1.
- Jackson, David (constable), 151.
 Johnston, James (station sergeant), 150, 166.
 Jones, Alfred Hastings (constable), 178.
- Keenan, Thomas (constable), 185.
 Keep, George (sergeant), 156.
 Kelly, Charles William (sergeant), 434.
 Kettle, Charles Cargill (Stipendiary Magistrate), 301.
 Kiely, Nicholas (Inspector), 386.
 King, Thomas (station sergeant), 67.
- Laurenson, George (member of Parliament), 120.
 Leahy, Michael (constable), 147.
 Lennon, Charles Henry (constable), 72.
 Lipscombe, Joseph (constable), 326.
 Luby, William (commission agent), 40.
 Lyons, William (sergeant), 439.
- Macintyre, John (constable), 72.
 Mackenzie, John Campbell (sergeant), 15.
 Mallard, Frederick (ex-Inspector), 27.
 Maloney, Peter (constable), 152.
 Marsack, Richard (Chief Detective), 333.
 Mason, Michael (constable), 41.
 Mason, William Thomas (sergeant-major), 194.
 Mathieson, William (sergeant), 429, 437, 488.
 Matthews, Frederick (ironmoulder), 41.
 McCarthy, Justin Eric (constable), 129.
 McClelland, Robert (district clerk), 169.
 McCrorie, Hubert (sergeant), 449.

- McDonnell, Andrew (constable), 249.
 McGill, William (sergeant), 450.
 McGilp, Alexander (constable), 279.
 McGowan, James (ex-Minister of Justice), 284.
 McGrath, Joseph Albert (Sub-Inspector), 170, 176.
 McGrath, Patrick (sergeant), 16.
 McGuire, John Patrick Hackett (district clerk), 451.
 McIlveney, William Bernard (Chief Detective), 466.
 McKay, Edward (sergeant), 131.
 McKay, Gilbert Ronald (constable), 297, 325.
 McKeefry, Michael (sergeant), 94.
 McKenzie, William Miller (carrier), 99.
 McKinnon, William Hector (sergeant), 384.
 McLeod, William Henry (constable), 219.
 McMahon, Peter James (detective), 325.
 McNeely, William (sergeant), 468.
 McPhee, Archibald (sergeant), 278.
 Meikle, John James, 391.
 Menzies, George Gardiner (engineer), 376.
 Miles, Thomas Benjamin (constable), 383.
 Miller, Nathaniel (sergeant), 413.
 Miller, William (sergeant), 161.
 Mills, Ellis (labourer), 100.
 Mitchell, Alfred James (Inspector), 6, 12.
 Moore, Frederick Augustus (sergeant), 255, 260.
 Morgan, Andrew (sergeant), 379.
 Morris, George (dairymen), 419.
 Muggeridge, Amos (police storekeeper), 453.
 Mullany, Luke (sergeant), 50.
 Murphy, Daniel (constable), 325.
 Murphy, Michael (sergeant), 419, 438.
 Murray, Edwin (district clerk), 93.
 Napier evidence, 226.
 Nash, George (dairymen), 460.
 Neil, James (chemist), 39.
 Nelson evidence, 189.
 Northcroft, Henry William (Stipendiary Magistrate), 293.
 Norwood, Samuel Percival (Sub-Inspector), 475, 477.
 Oamaru evidence, 96.
 O'Brien, Terence (Inspector), 33, 51, 70.
 O'Connor, James (constable), 161.
 O'Connor, Patrick Denis (sergeant), 92.
 O'Donovan, John (Sub-Inspector), 221.
 O'Grady, Malachy (constable), 176.
 O'Grady, Thomas (sergeant), 92.
 Oliver, Thomas (district clerk), 183.
 O'Reilly, Charles (constable), 373.
 Palmerston North evidence, 212.
 Parsons, Basil John (constable), 369.
 Phair, William John (Sub-Inspector), 87.
 Picton evidence, 194.
 Pine, Diana (married woman), 71.
 Poole, Charles Henry (member of Parliament), 313, 315.
 Pratt, George (Native constable), 243.
 Ramsay, William (sergeant), 300.
 Raynes, Joseph Aldous (ex-constable), 241.
 Redican, Michael (constable), 405.
 Reefton evidence, 184.
 Regan, Ernest Alexander (constable), 126.
 Reid, James Stevenson (constable), 187.
 Remer, Alfred Edward (sergeant), 150, 153, 168.
 Richardson, Stuart (electrical engineer), 417, 419.
 Riordan, James (constable), 199.
 Roberts, Alfred James (constable), 325.
 Roche, Maurice (ex-constable), 150.
 Rogers, James (constable), 326.
 Rogers, Martin (sergeant), 277.
 Rotorua evidence, 369.
 Rowell, Alfred Ernest (sergeant), 299.
 Russell, Alexander (constable), 219.
 Russell, George Warren (member of Parliament), 158.
 Rutledge, Barrett (sergeant), 415.
 Rutledge, Charles (ex-sergeant), 122, 150, 160.
 Ryan, Patrick (sergeant), 152.
 Scandrett, George, 1.
 Sharman, Edward William (police surgeon), 310, 312, 315, 327.
 Sheehan, Bartholomew (sergeant), 261, 347.
 Shortland, Frederick William (barrister), 309.
 Siddells, James (detective), 201.
 Simpson, James Kerr (sergeant), 18.
 Simpson, William James (constable), 406.
 Skinner, Arthur (constable), 369.
 Smart, William Wilson (sergeant), 227.
 Sonntag, Thomas Ryan (nurseryman), 27.
 Stagpoole, Martin Dudley (sergeant), 212.
 Stewart, David (sergeant), 450.
 Storey, George Thomas (constable), 326.
 Stuck, James Reynolds (farmer), 9.
 Sweeney, John Henry (constable), 320.
 Symes, William Henry (police surgeon), 122.
 Taylor, Vyvyan Richard (constable), 43.
 Taylor, William James (constable), 400.
 Teevan, Henry (medical practitioner), 99.
 Thames evidence, 377.
 Thompson, Clifford Simeon (electrician), 161.
 Thompson, John Robert (constable), 391.
 Thompson, Samuel (constable), 244.
 Thomson, Andrew Duncan (Stipendiary Magistrate), 255.
 Till, Stephen (district clerk), 205.
 Timaru evidence, 99.
 Torr, Walter (district constable), 226.
 Treanor, James (station sergeant), 330.
 Wade, Horton Charles David (constable), 211.
 Wainhouse, John Thomas (constable), 294, 326.
 Wake, Theophilus (farmer), 295.
 Walker, William (ex-constable), 25.
 Wanganui evidence, 195.
 Ward, Alfred Edgar Sidney (detective), 64.
 Watson, Edward Wilkins (Civil servant), 420.
 Watt, John (sergeant), 373.
 Weathered, John Joseph (constable), 108.
 Wellington evidence, 389.
 Westport evidence, 186.
 Whatman, William James (constable), 133.
 White, David James (constable), 177.
 Willcocks, James Sellars (constable), 371.
 Willetts, John (constable), 398, 469, 473.
 Williams, George Albert (constable), 194.
 Willis, Joseph Charles (sergeant), 78.
 Wilson, Edward (Inspector), 206.
 Wilton, Thomas James (constable), 226.
 Wohlmann, Ward George (district clerk), 272.
 Woods, Frederick (constable), 217.
 Wright, Arthur Hobbins (Sub-Inspector and Chief Clerk), 470, 474.

ERRATA.

Page 14, questions 17 and 18, *for* "Wilson" *read* "Wright."

Page 80, line 21 from bottom, *for* "Mr. Dinnie" *read* "Mr. Arnold."

Page 152, line 25 from bottom, *for* "Riccarton" *read* "Lyttelton."

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

INVERCARGILL, WEDNESDAY, 7TH JULY, 1909.

GEORGE SCANDRETT, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 1.)

Witness: I joined the Police Force eight years ago. I was stationed for a few weeks in Dunedin, and was then transferred to the Bluff. After six months' duty there I was transferred to Invercargill and from there to Gore. After three years' duty there I was transferred to Gladstone, where I am stationed at present. At a meeting of the Invercargill police I was appointed delegate to give evidence before the Commission on certain matters. I propose to give evidence on generalities only. In the first place, we consider the pay insufficient; we think the service a very dangerous one. In quite recent cases constables have been wounded and stabbed. There is also the danger of disease through transferring cases of fever or blood-poisoning and recovering and handling dead bodies. Then there is great need of respectability in the Force. If the men wish to be respected by the public they must be well dressed and live in respectable localities. Again, the cost of living has become very much higher than it was seven years ago. It was found necessary some years ago to increase the old-age pension from 7s. 6d. to 10s., and on that occasion the Premier said that 7s. 6d. in 1899 was equivalent to 10s. in 1906 in purchasing-power. Then there is the matter of house-rent. A married constable must live convenient to the fire-bell, and in consequence of having to live in the centre of the town he has to pay a much higher rent for a suitable house than he otherwise would. A fair rental in Invercargill is about 14s., whereas 7s. only is allowed for house-allowance. If a constable went farther afield he would be out of hearing of the fire-bell, and would be probably fined for non-attendance, while he received no extra pay for duty at the fire. I have made a few comparisons with other departments in this respect. Gaol warders' house-allowance was raised two years ago from £20 to £30; they are now receiving 11s. 3d. a week, as against a constable's 7s. and a sergeant's 10s. 6d.; and warders may live where they choose. In respect to uniform clothing, we pay for the making-up of our own uniforms. The average cost for the full uniform is about £2 10s. In some cases it may be less, and in others more. We are allowed a tunic every eighteen months, and trousers every nine months. With other items of clothing, such as the shako, we are supplied free, with the exception of boots, the average cost of the latter being about £2 2s. a year. A gaol-warder has a tunic every twelve months and boots and trousers every six months, all free of cost. In respect to travelling-allowance and railway concessions, the police have all railway inquiries to make and the prosecuting of all their by-law cases; they have a very considerable amount of work to do for the Railway Department, and we are of opinion that since we do so much for them we should be allowed some concession, especially when travelling on leave. I would suggest that the police should be allowed a free pass once a year to where they are going on holiday leave. In consequence of police duties being most pressing in the holiday season, we cannot take advantage of the cheap railway holiday-fares, and even when we are travelling on leave we are liable to be called on for duty. Railway employees get a free annual pass, and their wives and families travel once a month at quarter-rates. In respect to teachers, also, I understand they have a free pass from the Friday to the Monday morning in order to attend technical classes. They are only compelled to attend two classes, and the rest of the Saturday and Sunday they have free. We are allowed 10s. a day travelling-allowance when on transfer or on duty away from home. We consider that hardly sufficient. Other departments are allowed more.

1. *Mr. Dinzie.*] In the matter of rent, how long were you in the Force before you were in charge of a station?—Five years.

2. So that for five years you were free from rent?—Yes.

3. In regard to uniform, you know that alterations have been made recently by which uniforms are provided more frequently than before?—Yes.

4. And there are no complaints as regards uniforms lasting out their time?—There have been cases where there has been a shortage, but in those cases the matter has been rectified.

5. Boots and socks and underclothing are supplied from Headquarters at wholesale price?—Yes.

6. Do you know that applications have been made to the Railways in regard to concessions for travelling?—You have told us that that has been done by yourself.

7. And the reply was that the Railway Department could not see its way to grant the concession?—Yes, I understood so.

8. *The Commissioner.*] You associate with the men generally?—Yes, I am a good deal with them.

9. How, in your opinion, do the men at present in the Force compare in general conduct with those at the time you joined?—I have not been much outside Invercargill, but I should say the conduct here seems exemplary, and everything seems to work very smoothly.

10. Is the men's physique satisfactory?—Yes.

11. Have you remarked any increase or otherwise of insobriety amongst members of the Force?—I know nothing of that nature here: there was one constable removed some time ago for insobriety.

12. You can give me his name privately: is that the only instance?—Yes. I should have mentioned another matter in connection with the cost of board to single men. The average cost here is 15s. a week at a boardinghouse.

13. You think, then, because a man is in a small place such as this he should have some special consideration in the matter of board?—Yes, I think so; the men in a similar position in the larger centres are better off. The single men live in quarters here, but they have to pay 15s. for board alone; it cannot be done cheaper here.

14. In regard to immorality?—I see nothing of that here.

15. Do you know of any tendency to use political influence?—I have never heard of it, nor has it been brought under my notice in any way.

16. You have never had an "axe to grind"?—No.

17. Have you anything to say about methods of promotion?—No, I received no instructions to say anything about that. I am perfectly satisfied with my own promotion.

18. Have men been promoted over your head?—I cannot expect to be further advanced for the amount of service I have done. I am quite satisfied with my position. I have reason to believe I could have got promotion if I had applied for it.

19. Do you not want it?—Practically it amounts to that. The place suits me very well.

20. Assuming you wanted promotion, that you were not satisfied with your present position, how would you set about getting it?—I would put in an application through the regular channels in a legitimate way.

21. Have you any knowledge of the fact that it is stated that there are not the same class of men coming forward for enrolment in the Force that used to come forward?—I have heard it said, and we attribute that to insufficiency of pay and other considerations, such as house-rent, which all come under the head of "insufficiency of pay."

22. You recognise the fact that the average constable, if he left the Force, would find it extremely difficult to get as good employment in a civilian capacity at the present time?—Perhaps just at the present time.

23. Is any encouragement given by members of the Force to suitable men who apply for enrolment? If the service were made attractive in every way perhaps every constable would be a recruiting officer?—If we felt thoroughly comfortable, I believe we would induce others to join.

24. What is your opinion of the status of the Force in the minds of the community? Is it thought derogatory to be a constable?—Yes.

25. To what do you attribute that?—I suppose it is on account of the pay.

26. Several constables have told me that there are people who think that because a man is a constable he occupies a position different from that of an ordinary citizen: is that the general feeling?—There is such a feeling, but I do not think it is general.

27. You cannot suggest any way in which the Force could be made more attractive than through increased pay?—No.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You are satisfied with the present system of promotion, and you think if you applied you would be treated fairly?—I feel sure I should, and I go so far as to say that you at one time asked me to put in an application.

29. That shows you were not overlooked?—Yes.

30. Do you think the respectable class of the community look down on the Force?—Some do; but the feeling is not general.

JOHN CONNELL, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 2.)

Witness. I entered the Police Force in 1893, and have been nearly sixteen years in the service. For the first two years I was stationed at Christchurch, and during eleven years I was at Lyttelton. For eight years I did acting detective and detective work. I was appointed full detective in June, 1907, having for the six previous years been acting detective. I was appointed to the Detective Force during Commissioner Tunbridge's time, on account of the pillaging and thieving at Lyttelton. I was successful in my work there, but, unfortunately, having had a good number of wharf-lumpers through my hands, on the eve of the election before last the member for that constituency (Mr. Laurenson) went to the Commissioner in Wellington and made a complaint against me. I have not a note of the date, nor have I the papers connected with the matter. The complaint was made on behalf of some of the lumpers with whom I had had occasion to interfere, but who, I may say, were not good characters. I do not think Mr. Dinnie entertained the complaint, and Mr. Laurenson communicated with the Minister of Justice, Mr. McGowan.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Speaking from memory, what did the complaint consist of?—So far as I can remember, it was that I was interfering with too many of the lumpers in the discharge of my duty, and he (Mr. Laurenson) would like to see me removed. The Minister of Justice, through the Commissioner, sent to me for an explanation, which I gave. The result was not too good, so far as Mr. Laurenson was concerned.

2. You had the complaint before you?—Yes; and I also got a copy of the answer to Mr. Laurenson. The papers are on the file. Later on Mr. Laurenson came into the police-office in Lyttelton, and asked me if I would take an out-station, saying that he could get me a better station than Lyttelton. I should think this was two months or less before the election of 1905.

3. I want you to be as accurate as you can about this private conversation, as, you see, there is no record of it?—Mr. Laurenson mentioned several places where I should get more money; he said it would be beneficial to me, and that he liked me very well. I said, "It does not appear as if you did"; and I told him what I thought of him.

4. What was that?—I do not like to tell you; the conversation was a private one. I did not accept any favours from him, and I told him what he had been doing behind my back with the Commissioner. He said, "Well, you can't blame me; these fellows are worrying me, and I must do something for them."

5. You imply they were his constituents?—That is so. He said, "Before you got amongst them they could furnish their houses well, and get boots and clothes from the ships, but now a great many are leaving here."

6. You are making a very serious allegation against a member of Parliament?—I am speaking the truth.

7. I am not questioning the truth of your statements, but you are practically asking me to understand that, as the result of a private conversation between you, Mr. Laurenson implied that his grievance against you was that the lumpers of Lyttelton were not able to continue thieving and dishonestly supplying their houses with clothing, &c.?—He put it in the words I used.

8. He said the lumpers had been able to have comfortable homes and boots, and so on?—Yes, before I came amongst them. He said, "You watch them at all hours of the night"; and so on. Soon after this he complained again to Mr. Dinnie about another matter. The complaint was forwarded to me. There was a young man who had been locked up for being drunk and disorderly and for using obscene language, for which he was convicted. His father or he complained to Mr. Laurenson that I had assaulted him while in custody, although no complaint was made to the sergeant or the Inspector in charge of the district. There was nothing in writing except what Mr. Laurenson got from the Commissioner himself. Nothing was done in that matter. The next trouble was in regard to complaints about young boys using guns in the street. Two little boys had been shot with guns used by children for shooting sparrows. I found three boys, one pointing a gun at a tree under which three little children were playing; the gun was loaded; and the other boys had a box of ammunition. I took the gun away, and examined the tree, which had marks of several pellets. I made a report on the matter. Next day the sergeant in charge at Lyttelton (Rutledge) said I had better hand the gun back to the boy, that the boy's mother had gone almost on her knees to him, and had promised that the thing would not be repeated. He said there was not much good in bringing youngsters before the Court. I carried out his instructions, and handed the gun back. A complaint was made as if I had done something desperate, and an inquiry was held, and I was shifted from Lyttelton to Christchurch. I think this was in March. I went to Christchurch as acting-detective, and was there for some time.

9. You were promoted subsequently to these complaints?—Yes; I do not know why, but I could not give satisfaction in Christchurch. I had a bit of misfortune, and I was reported for being late at the office and for trifling things that in the case of another man who had not the same influence used against him would have been taken no notice of. I was reported and fined for not reporting myself to the sergeant in charge at Lyttelton when sent down to do duty on New Year's Day. During the eleven years I was at Lyttelton I have never known a detective coming down from Christchurch on duty at a regatta meeting to report to the sergeant.

10. To what do you attribute the unusual treatment you allege you received?—I do not know. It did not matter what I did I could not give satisfaction. I consider I have been dealt with unfairly.

11. What has led up to your position to-day?—I was reported for things in Christchurch I was not really guilty of. For months and months I never had any sleep, through illness and death in my family. Sometimes I used, I admit, to be ten minutes late coming to the office, but I tried to do my best. I was supposed to be at the office at 9, and sometimes I came about ten minutes past. But I worked at the office later than a good many others. On one occasion I was attending the express train. I was supposed to come in at 5. I made a report which did me a lot of harm. I said I was on duty attending at the arrival and departure of trains, and I said I was the only one there, and I got into trouble.

12. By referring to the other detectives?—Yes. The Chief Detective got men to put in reports saying all the men attended the train. I never saw the reports till the file came back. I was sent to Dunedin, and got into serious trouble there. I was sent there as detective. I applied to get away, because they were making it too warm for me. I desire to put in the following statement: "133 York Place, Dunedin, 22/4/09.—Report of Det. J. Connell, relative to having met with an Accident while on Duty.—I have to report that while going from Morningson to Mr. Cunningham's place at Kaikorai Valley, at about 6.35 p.m. on the 19th instant, to make inquiries *re* his house having been burnt down at Abbotsford recently, I took a short cut to get to his house, which avoided my going about two miles further around. In going down the hill I slipped, and in trying to right myself I tripped and fell forward, my head striking on a stone, which rendered me unconscious for about three hours. There was no person in the vicinity and no houses near by. When I regained consciousness I went back up the hill as well as I could, and on to the Kaikorai Valley Road. From there I caught the car for my home, which is situated in York Place, and between where the accident occurred and the police-station. When I got home all my children were in bed. I washed the wound in my head, and, as it was so late at night, I did not send for the doctor, but sent for him at about 8 a.m. next morning, and acquainted the Chief Detective. I may state that I was in another part of Kaikorai Valley in the morning of the same date to inform Mrs. Armstrong, who lives at 128 Kaikorai Valley Road, of the arrest of her daughter at Alexandra for theft. Mrs. Armstrong was not home, but I saw her husband, who is working at the woollen mills there, as stated in the papers already sent in *re* this matter. While there Mr. Cunningham, who lived some distance from this place, was away from home, but would be back in the morning. I then went across the hill to Morningson to make inquiries there *re* the school being broken into. I got back to the detective office about 1 p.m., and after I had a bit of dinner I went to the north end of the city to try and find Mr. Carlyle, who lived in Mr. Cunningham's

house at the time of the fire, and who I had been making inquiries for amongst all the boarding-houses in the city, as he had left no address when he was leaving the place where he was burnt out. I got back to the office again between 5 and 6 p.m., and after I had some tea I proceeded to Mr. Cunningham's place to see him, as he was supposed to be home about that time, but unfortunately I met with this accident. I had several inquiries on hand, and was anxious to get through with them.—J. CONNELL, Det.—The Chief Detective, Dunedin." This was the time at which I got reduced.

13. What for? There is nothing there?—Those are the facts.

14. What allegation was made against you?—I really do not know.

15. Were you charged with being drunk?—I was not charged at all. While I was in bed the Chief Detective brought up some papers, and said I had better make a report of the accident, and that is a copy of the report I made. He said it was usual for a special report to be made to the Commissioner in a case like this. The next thing I heard was that I was reduced to the rank of constable, as I was not fit to be a detective. I was not charged with insobriety, nor have I been since I was in the Force.

16. Do you want me to understand you were given no reason for your reduction?—It was that I had not given satisfaction.

17. Was that conveyed by letter?—The Chief Detective (Herbert) and the Sub-Inspector made inquiries, but could not prove anything but what I have stated.

18. What did they allege?—That I must have been drunk, or I would not have gone there at night.

19. Did you understand that you were reduced on the ground that you were charged with being drunk?—They must have had some charge, but I did not know what it was.

20. You state now deliberately that you do not know what you were reduced for?—I do not.

21. Where were you sent?—To Invercargill, some weeks after I was reduced. In the meantime I was doing uniform duty in Dunedin. I grumbled about being put on uniform duty in the same place where I had been reduced from detective to constable. Soon after the Commissioner sent to know if I would go to Invercargill, and I came here. I was given the option of coming here. Since I have been here I have had no trouble. In regard to this business of being reduced, I gave the facts as to where I was. I saw Detective Mitchell and several constables while I was about town making inquiries, and they could certainly have found evidence if I had been guilty of any offence.

22. Did you ask for an inquiry?—No; when I was reduced the thing was finished. Part of the time I was in bed, and when I came on duty again the thing was put on record. I was told to report myself for uniform duty, but I was not charged with any offence whatever.

23. You allege that there were no complaints formulated, and you had no opportunity of defending yourself?—None whatever. The Chief Detective made a report on his own authority. He knew all about the Christchurch trouble. I cannot prove this, but I heard it remarked that I would not make any more reports in Dunedin as to how the office was run. I am very unfortunate to have been placed in this position. I have done my best in the service in every way. I do not consider my treatment has been at all fair; I think it is cruel and unjust. I was never charged with being drunk; I was never drunk in my life. I have never drunk as much in my life as some of the police on the job have done in one day.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You said "nothing was done" in the matter of the complaint made against you in respect of assaulting a man at Lyttelton: what do you mean? Was the complaint sent to you for inquiry?—Yes.

25. Was your explanation considered satisfactory?—It could not be otherwise. I was not punished.

26. In regard to the complaint about a gun, was not the complaint not in regard to your taking the gun, but making a misleading report?—When the gun was handed back, to show that the woman was bitter against the police, she wrote to the Commissioner, saying that during the time the gun was in my possession it was damaged, and she wanted payment for it. I did not make a misleading report.

27. But that was the charge against you?—Those were the Commissioner's remarks; I was not charged at all.

28. In regard to Christchurch, you say you were dealt with for failing to report yourself for duty only?—For irregular attendance at the office—as a matter of fact, for neglect of duty.

29. Was there not a charge of making a false entry in the detective's diary?—Yes; the trains were running on New Year's Day about every ten minutes. I went by a train ten minutes later than I said I did, and it was charged as a false entry; but they wanted to get something against me.

30. *The Commissioner.*] You admit the entry was not correct?—Yes.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] On the 4th of the same month was there not a charge of neglect of duty in not promptly investigating a burglary at Fleming's boardinghouse?—I was reported for being ten minutes late. On that morning it was raining very hard, and I could not ride a bicycle, and because I was not in time to catch a man who was going by train the Chief Detective was angry. I went as quickly as I could.

32. On all these charges you were fined and transferred to Dunedin, and a report was to be submitted in three months on your conduct, and as to your fitness for the detective branch of the service?—Yes; I was fined £3 for what I consider was nothing at all; and I did not get a chance to put in three months.

33. Yes, before you had put three months in you were reported from Dunedin?—Yes, for meeting with an accident.

34. For unsatisfactory performance of your duties as a detective?—Yes, through meeting with an accident.

35. In all cases where papers are referred to me, is it not the practice for me to minute them and have them referred to you?—As a matter of fact, ever since this trouble about Mr. Laurenson and the lumpers my success has not been too good.

36. *The Commissioner.*] You mean you are a marked man?—I have been indeed.

37. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In cases where you are reported by your superior officer you see the files?—Yes.

38. And you are examined before the Inspector?—Unfortunately for me, the Inspector was away in Melbourne, and there was no examination, and I never saw anything. The Chief Detective came to my house and said I had to make a report, and that he had to make a special report to the Commissioner.

39. You saw reports of your Inspector saying you were unfit for service as a detective?—I never saw anything of the kind; I never saw the file. I noted it. The Inspector was in Melbourne at the time.

40. *The Commissioner.*] If you noted it you saw the file?—I had no chance to defend myself whatever.

41. But you saw the complaints you had to answer?—I stated what happened; these people framed a report out of their own heads, and did not give me any chance. As a matter of fact, it was charged against me that I must have been drunk or I would not have gone to this place at night.

42. You think the Christchurch matter prejudiced the authorities in dealing with you in Dunedin?—Yes; the subject of the report when I was reduced was all in connection with Christchurch.

43. Can you give any evidence as to the general sobriety of members of the Force either in Christchurch or in Dunedin? I do not want the names for publication, but will ask you for them privately?—I would sooner not do so.

44. Why? I can compel you to give the names if I choose. I shall make no improper use of the names?—Taking the police as a whole, they are all right so far as sobriety is concerned.

45. Do you know of any individual cases where members of the Force in any of the towns have been in the habit of indulging to excess?—I do not know anything, except one case where a man had just joined and was dismissed by the Commissioner. I cannot say anything about individual members drinking to excess.

46. I do not mean being reeling drunk in the streets, but taking more than is good for them, and showing signs of liquor?—I cannot give the names.

47. You have not seen men in the Force under the influence of liquor?—Not men who are now in the Force. I have seen men who have been discharged for drunkenness.

48. But you are not able to say you have ever seen men now in the Force under the influence of liquor?—Not so as to be unfit for duty.

49. You give me the impression of being able to say something but being unwilling to do so?—I cannot tell you.

50. I will ask you the plain question again, can you assure me on oath that you have never seen a man who is at present in the Force under the influence of liquor?—I cannot swear that.

51. Then you have seen one?—A man is under the influence if he drinks at all.

52. Are any of the detectives, say, in Christchurch, in the habit of taking a great deal of liquor?—There may be. I do not like to bring a charge against an individual.

53. But it does not become public: you would simply afford me information for further inquiry. I may find your allegation either true or untrue?—I do not like to bring any charge. There are people over the men who should give that evidence.

54. What people are there who can give me that evidence?—Those in charge. I might say that I absolutely refused to work with a man who was mate with me. Your Worship knows who he is.

55. But I want to have it in evidence from you?—That man has got more power or “pull” than I have.

56. What “pull” has he got? How did he get it?—I do not know.

57. Does he say he has got it?—Yes, and boasts about it.

58. What have you gathered to be the source of the “pull”?—It is political and otherwise; he happens to know people in the right place.

59. I take it that beyond two or three instances, which probably I know of, you are not aware of any drinking to excess: do you decline to answer?—I do not decline to answer. I am sorry to say there are, but I do not think I should be right in giving the names.

60. I say you are called upon to give the names. I have asked you to give them in private, though if I thought proper I could demand that they should be given in public?—I beg your Worship's pardon; I understood the names were to be published.

61. I never suggested it; I should consider it a grave injustice to allow any allegations to be made public until I had satisfied myself by further evidence that they were true. I shall certainly require you to give the names privately to the secretary?—Yes, your Worship; I misunderstood you.

62. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say there are some men with political “pull” and otherwise: what do you infer?—That if it were not for the “pull” they would not be there.

63. Whom have they a pull over? Do you suggest I know anything about it?—I do not know, but if it were not for their political “pull” they would not be in the Police Force of New Zealand.

64. You say there are some men in the Force you have seen under the influence of drink: how many?—I do not know a policeman addicted to drink.

65. You mean, then, men not now in the Force. So far as you know, there are no men now in the Force addicted to drink?—I do not know one constable. The Commissioner asked me in reference to the detectives.

66. Well, do you know any detective now in the Force who has been under the influence of drink at any time?—I do know some—a man is under the influence who takes it.

67. You say there are a few in the detective branch of the service who take too much?—I certainly say so.

68. Do you suggest that I know that?—I do not say you do, but I do not see why you should not.

69. Do their immediate superiors know it?—Unless they are blind.

70. Have they reported it?—I cannot say.

71. *The Commissioner.*] But you know, at any rate, that one man has been spoken to by his superior on that account?—I never heard him spoken to.

72. Have you ever heard he has been warned about drinking?—I should expect so, but I never heard it.

73. You say some members of the Force have a “pull,” political and otherwise: what do you mean, in addition to political influence?—That they are acquainted with people who are in a position to use political influence.

74. You do not imply there is any distinction made in connection with religion?—No.

75. I want you to be quite clear: is it only political influence you are referring to?—Yes, political, pure and simple.

76. You mean that people with political influence can get at the Commissioner or the Minister?—Yes.

77. When you were stationed at the Police-station at Christchurch, was there any drinking on the premises?—I never saw a sign of it.

78. Nor in Dunedin?—No.

ALFRED JAMES MITCHELL, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 3.)

Witness: I am in charge of the Invercargill District, which comprises twenty-two stations, bounded by the Clinton Station on the one side, and it includes all stations south of that. Before coming to the colony I was in the A Division, London Metropolitan Police Force, and in the London City Police at Bow Lane. I joined the Force here in 1877, and was stationed at Havelock North. After about twelve months I left the service, and joined the New South Wales Force, where I remained about a year. I rejoined this Force in 1879, at Dunedin. From there I was transferred to Lawrence, where I acted as district clerk for about two years; thence to Otaki; thence to Paeroa, where I remained ten or eleven years; thence to Freeman's Bay; and thence to Hastings for two or three years. There I was promoted and transferred to Wellington as sergeant. I remained there about twelve months; thence to Napier; thence promoted to Sub-Inspector and transferred to Wellington in 1900; thence, after eleven months, to Auckland; and after fourteen months appointed to rank of Inspector, and transferred to Invercargill in 1902. I was appointed to the rank of Inspector in October, 1902. I was transferred from Auckland to Invercargill, where I have continued to the present time. In this district there are one Inspector, four sergeants, thirty-four constables, one district constable, and one detective.

1. Have you any suggestion to make in regard to the district?—No.

2. Have you any views as an old police officer in regard to the present organization or its possible improvement?—I have no suggestions to make.

3. In regard to control?—No.

4. In regard to enrolment?—I may say from memory that during the past three years some fifteen to twenty files have reached me from the Commissioner's office desiring inquiries to be made regarding the character of applicants for enrolment. In every one of these, without exception, the ground of inquiry has covered the period from the time the applicant left school. I know of no one inquiry that to my mind was incomplete, nor could I suggest in any way that any one inquiry could have been made more perfect; and if any little point had been overlooked the file was returned, asking the omission to be made good.

5. I may take it that in no case of any file being submitted to you was it subsequently found that the appointment was an undesirable one?—I think not. In regard to the difficulty that may exist in inducing men to join the Force, I do not know that the pay is the chief obstacle. I am rather inclined to think that the educational test has been rather high. Experience shows that the educational attainments of men who have lived many years in the country are not so high as those of men in the towns, and, although the probability is that a better class of men could be got from the country than from the town, they have the obstacle to face of the educational attainments required by the Department. I think if the test were put one standard lower the service would benefit—that is, to the Fourth Standard. I think men should be competent for enrolment who have passed the Fourth Standard. This would, I think, lessen the difficulty in regard to obtaining applications for enrolment.

6. As a matter of experience, do you think a higher standard of education—I am speaking of the school standards—makes a man a better constable?—By no means.

7. When you get a file in regard to an application for enrolment, do you depute a constable to make inquiries?—If inquiry has to be made in the various sub-districts of a district they go to the officer in charge of the various sub-districts in which inquiry is to be made, whose local knowledge is of advantage in making the inquiry.

8. You find some constables more careful in their inquiries than others?—That is so; but they are usually instructed to interview reliable persons in the district and the neighbourhood and to obtain written memoranda from them.

9. There is very often an instance which points out a weak spot in the system. I know a case in which a man was reported on very favourably indeed by a constable, and who received a damning report from one who knew him better?—That is so; but to prevent any conflict of that sort I make it a point to encourage the constable to add to the file a written opinion of the persons he has interviewed, so as not to leave it to his own view of the case.

10. Do you think the constables now in the Force encourage, or otherwise, young men to come forward for enrolment?—I have yet to learn that constables doing beat duty interest themselves much—

11. I do not mean that. I mean it is quite conceivable that a young man who had some idea, perhaps visionary, of entering the Force might ask the opinion of a constable he might know. I would not make every constable a recruiting officer?—The class of reply he would receive from a constable in such a case would largely depend upon the state of the constable's health at the minute, and on whether he had a grievance; but, speaking generally, I should be surprised if, taking the constables as a body, they would do other than encourage an applicant.

12. As regards the discipline obtaining in the Force, is there in your experience any deterioration?—No.

13. Are you getting a good class of men as sergeants?—I have no fault to find. Of course, I can only speak of those I have worked with. If a sergeant were a little lax his immediate superior would be expected to sharpen him up a bit, and he would pass that on to those below him. The men must take their tone from their sergeant, as they are more in touch with him than with any other officer.

14. That accentuates the necessity for having the best men as sergeants?—Undoubtedly.

15. Would you say the Force to-day is as efficient as it has been in the course of your experience?—I should say it was better than in the early period. I think a better class of men come forward.

16. Do you think the present system of promotion gives you the best class of men?—I think so. The standard rule which is observed at present is that a man must be ten years a constable before he is eligible as a sergeant. This should give a man ample opportunity to gain the necessary experience.

17. Would you think it more necessary to consider the standard of education in the promotion from constable to sergeant than in original enrolment in the Force?—The mere fact of a man being, for instance, a bad speller should not in itself be a bar to his receiving promotion. As to a constable's qualifications entitling him to higher rank, I take it the educational test alone would not avail him much; for this reason: instances are known to many where a man's education has been limited, but his disposition has been such that he has been able to exercise influence for good over constables, whereas another man who has been highly educated has been a perfect failure as a sergeant in the matter of commanding men and maintaining his own position on a higher level than those he has to control.

18. You recommend for promotion, and those are the conditions which influence you?—That is so; all Inspectors are asked by circular to make recommendations only to the Commissioner.

19. How do you find those recommendations received and acted upon?—So far as I am concerned, I cannot say there has been any overlooking of my recommendations, and when the term has come, promotion has followed. In some cases of men belonging to this district whom I have recommended for promotion, promotion has already been given effect to. In other cases possibly the fault has been my premature recommendation.

20. You mean in regard to seniority?—Yes; I deliberately overlooked the fact that a man had not had ten years' service; but I thought from my knowledge of him he was highly qualified to rank as sergeant, and that the Department would have benefited, so I recommended accordingly.

21. How does the general conduct of members of the Force compare with your experience all along?—I can speak of the police in Southland as a body in very high terms as a respectable lot of men. I am rather surprised to hear that as a body they are not thought well of by the respectable portion of the community.

22. But they are: some men, however, are inclined to be hypersensitive. They are, however, certainly not the most respectable portion of the community?—In regard to the respectable portion of the community, I can say most positively that they entertain a very very high opinion of the Force as a body, and if the slightest irregularity is noticed their interest in the welfare of the Force is so great that they often inconvenienced themselves to give me a hint. This, I think, speaks volumes.

23. In regard to sobriety, I must have this matter of the general sobriety of the Force answered directly: I am not dealing with the question of getting absolutely drunk, but with a general tendency to take more than is good for them?—Since I came here two men have been noticed to be the worse for liquor. They are not now in the Force, both having been very promptly dealt with on my bringing the stat- in which I found them under the notice of the Commissioner. They were both at once dismissed. With these two exceptions, I cannot say that any man in the district has had a weakness in this direction.

24. In regard to general morality, meaning sexual morality?—I can only speak in the highest terms of the men under myself.

25. You have had no instances of affiliation?—No. I can speak of the men of Southland without exception as being most praiseworthy.

26. Have you become aware at any time of any attempt on the part of individual officers or men to use influence, apart from the ordinary channels through the Commissioner?—Of my own knowledge, I have not; but I hear things about it.

27. Has any man ever said to you anything such as, "Well, if I don't get it this way, I will get it another"?—Possibly he has, but I cannot think of an instance at the present moment, nor can I call to mind any particular man who has said so.

28. You have no certain individual knowledge of men in the Force in whatever position going behind the Commissioner?—No.

29. In regard to you disciplinary dealings with the men, you deal with them judicially, and there is right of appeal to the Commissioner?—Yes.

30. How do you find the acceptance of your decision? Are your decisions ever overruled?—I can say positively that in no instance has my decision been overruled or questioned.

31. Have you any fault to find in regard to your own relations with the authorities?—None in the least. I consider I have been very lucky.

32. Have you any opinion in regard to Constable Connell since he has been here?—During the time he has been here I have had no cause whatever to complain. He is not an agitator by any means. I think he has learnt the lesson to keep his grievance to himself, and not to try to sow seeds of dissatisfaction amongst those with whom he works. I have no evidence that he has attempted to do that, but he considers he has a grievance in being sent here as a constable.

33. Have you any views in regard to the promotion of detectives to higher office in the Force?—No; I have no suggestions for improvement on the present system.

34. You think a man who has acted as Chief Detective is entitled to promotion as Sub-Inspector?—I do; I see no reason why he is not fully qualified.

35. There is not much crime here?—No.

36. Have you any plain-clothes men here?—No.

37. You are sufficiently staffed?—Well, I should like a plain-clothes man here.

38. There is an extreme amount of dissatisfaction on the part of some members of the Force in regard to the Headquarters staff: do you know anything of this? I want to know what is the general feeling?—Of course, I am aware it exists. In regard to my own feelings, it seems to me to be not altogether desirable that a Sub-Inspector should assume authority in the absence of the Commissioner, and more or less dictate to an Inspector, and I think there should be an alteration in this respect.

39. That view would not obtain with a purely clerical staff?—No. There would be no objection to a Chief Clerk acting for an Under-Secretary who was away.

40. Have you heard any feeling in regard to the extra privileges that men get in the Commissioner's office on account of not doing outside duty?—I know nothing at all about that.

41. Is your district clerk a sergeant?—No; but I am in hopes to get him promoted shortly.

42. Is it within your knowledge that the district clerks in the Dominion are generally sergeants?—Yes.

43. Can you give me a solid reason why district clerks should be sergeants?—A man who acts as district clerk must have increased responsibilities, and, unless he possesses qualifications above the ordinary constable, it would be idle to expect him to be able to perform his duties.

44. Is it not an absolutely clerical position?—Yes.

45. What has the position of sergeant to do with that of district clerk?—Well, it gives him increased pay. He gets 1s. a day clerical allowance, which I think is far too small for a position of great responsibility.

46. Then, the position of sergeant does not help him except in providing further remuneration?—That is all; it is simply a means to an end.

47. You know of no reason from a police standpoint, or from that of efficiency, why he should be a sergeant?—No.

48. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I spoke to you, did I not, about the desirability of reducing the educational standard of applicants to the Force?—Yes.

49. Since I took charge of the Department there has been a change, has there not, as regards the appointment of Chief Detectives: the Chief Detective was simply an ordinary one, so named because of seniority?—Yes, the matter of pay has been revised.

50. You are aware that previously one or two have been made Chief Detectives who were not fit for the position?—Yes, by virtue of seniority, they held a position which they were not fit for.

51. Their pay has been considerably advanced since I have been here?—Yes.

52. You know that constables do resort to influence, and hold the belief that influence has an effect?—I know it is the subject very largely talked of, but of my own knowledge I know nothing of it.

53. Do you not think that the fact of members of Parliament listening to constables is an inducement for the latter to ask for their influence?—That is a question I would rather not offer an opinion about.

54. But it induces constables to go to members?—Necessarily it does, and, moreover, the members only hear one side of the question from the man with a grievance.

55. Do you not think the clerks in the office should have some knowledge of police duties?—I cannot see of what advantage it is, unless there is a possibility of their leaving the office and going on the street.

56. Supposing, for instance, I left my office, is not the Sub-Inspector in a position to answer any questions in regard to pressing matters in a way in which no ordinary clerk could do?—He occupies a false position such as I do not think he should.

57. But should not any one in that position have some knowledge of police duties so as to be able to answer questions in my absence?—It would be decidedly an advantage.

58. Are you aware that throughout the Force the clerical staff are police officers?—Yes; but I do not think a Sub-Inspector should be placed in such a position as to enable him to dictate to one in a higher position in the service than himself.

59. I quite agree with you there, but I mean as regards police experience?—In Australia members of the Force hold clerical positions, and so they do in England.

60. *The Commissioner.*] But a man who had been some time in the office would acquire a knowledge of police duty?—My own opinion is that in the absence of the Commissioner there should be a senior Inspector to take his place.

61. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But in the Commissioner's office there should be a man with police knowledge to attend to matters in the Commissioner's absence?—Undoubtedly; I think a Chief Inspector should be put there as Acting-Commissioner.

62. Previous to my taking charge you remember the Accountant and the Chief Clerk were both experienced police officers?—Yes.

63. *The Commissioner.*] But they have ceased to hold police rank?—Yes, both are Civil servants.

64. Do you think that is more desirable?—Yes.

65. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You quite approve of the present system of promotion?—Yes; I do not see how it could be improved upon.

66. You believe in efficiency and not seniority, or the two combined?—Yes; seniority should take second place to efficiency in the service.

67. One man has been promoted over the heads of a number of others, has he not, because he has passed an examination as a solicitor?—If my opinion were asked, I should say without hesitation he was well worthy of promotion.

68. On what ground?—General capacity.

69. You refer to general qualifications, not as being affected by the passing of an examination?—It strengthened his claim.

70. How is he going to make a better sergeant because he is a solicitor—it only raises his standard of education?—That is so.

71. You have already said it is not necessary, in order to make a man an efficient sergeant, that he should have extra education?—No; but with the two qualifications combined, as in this instance, I think promotion was deserved. I know the class of man he is.

72. The mere fact of one man being promoted over two or three hundred means nothing, as the others may not be qualified for anything but to act as constables?—Yes. In your knowledge there are a great many men whom it would be farcical to appoint as sergeants.

73. *The Commissioner.*] I want this made clear: I understand from you that you do not think the pay and emoluments of the Force debar applicants?—What I think is this: it would be a great inducement to get a proper class of men if the pay were raised 6d. a day all round. At the same time, I do not think the pay is much of an obstacle at the present time.

74. But you think they are entitled to another 6d.?—Yes.

The Commissioner: I ask you formally to produce all records in the district office. [Records produced.]

THURSDAY, 8TH JULY, 1909.

JAMES REYNOLDS STUCK, Retired Farmer, examined on oath. (No. 4.)

Witness: My complaint is against Inspector Mitchell, for having used his position to interfere with the course of justice. The facts are as follows: A marriage was arranged between my daughter and Thomas Boyle. I consented to the marriage, but stipulated that my daughter should not be compelled to be married at the Roman Catholic Church, but that the marriage should take place at the Church of England. I arranged with Archdeacon Stocker to perform the ceremony on New Year's Day, having been authorised to make all the necessary arrangements in Boyle's absence. Three or four days before the date fixed, Boyle, who was a platelayer at Mossburn, came to Invercargill, and on Sunday interviewed my daughter in my absence, with the result that on my return my daughter said the marriage would not take place at the English but at the Catholic Church. This caused some unpleasantness, and my daughter promised she would not go to the Catholic Church. Next day she stopped with me, not leaving my sight all day, and, although there was a large gathering to see the marriage, it did not take place. At about 5.30 Boyle came to see my daughter, and, as the legal time had expired, I left them together. I met them again, and an arrangement was come to in regard to getting a new license, and Archdeacon Stocker agreed to marry them at a private house—her married sister's. My suspicions, however, became aroused, and on Wednesday morning at 6 o'clock I went to the Catholic Church, where I tried all the doors, and found them fastened. I remained there till about 6.45, when I heard the click of a door, and saw the front door open. I could see no one. About five minutes after Dean Burke, Father Delaney, and another man in civilian dress, whom I did not know, went into the church at the back door from the Dean's house. I entered at the front door, and looked all round the body of the church, and when I passed the vestry I heard some mumbling, as if some one was at prayers. I went out again, and heard the 7 o'clock train coming up. I stood on the steps of the church, and watched to see if my party were in it, but could see nothing of them. I heard the train stop at the Elles Road Station, and I went to where I could obtain a view of the platform, and saw two women and a man board the train. A few minutes after the train went on, Dean Burke, Father Delaney, and the other person came out of the church, and passed close by me without seeing me. It was 7.15 when I left the Catholic Church. I went to where my daughter was staying, but she had not been seen there since the previous evening, nor had she used the bed that night, and her sister pretended to know nothing about her. Next morning I asked John Newton, the guard of the 7 train, if he had taken on any passengers at the Elles Road Station, and he said, "Yes, two females and a man," and that he recognised one of them as one of my daughters, and that a platelayer who happened to be on board the train told him it was

Boyle. I got further evidence from Thomas Jones, guard of the 7 train at Kingston, who said he was on the platform when the Gore train arrived, and saw the Boyles alight and go to a hotel. I told the Registrar of Marriages here what had occurred, and he said he would not be able to get me a copy of the marriage-certificate for some time, as returns were only sent in every three months. On the Thursday morning I went to Dean Burke, and asked him to give me a copy of the register, or allow me to look at it, telling him the position, and asking if she was married. He put on a very serious face, and said, "I don't know anything about it, but I will make all inquiries, and let you know." I have never heard anything more from him. As soon as I thought it was time to be able to get the certificate I wrote to the Registrar, but I did not get it until May. After I got the certificate I went to Sergeant Black and laid a complaint. He took it down, and I signed it, and he took it to Inspector Mitchell, and I was told it would be attended to. About eight or nine days afterwards I was asked to see Detective McIlveney, who took down five type-written sheets of particulars from me.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you see the Inspector personally on the matter?—Not at that time. After about eight weeks I met the detective, and asked him if anything was being done. He said there were two or three he had not seen yet. I went away for about six weeks, and on my return I was told the detective was about to be removed. I went to see him just as he was leaving, and he told me he had turned over all the correspondence to Inspector Mitchell. I went to Mr. Mitchell's room, and he looked up the papers, and read me a statement from three persons—Thomas Boyle and the two witnesses of the marriage. I thought it was strange there was no other paper read to me. Knowing the detective as well as I do, I thought it was strange he had not interviewed any of my witnesses, so I asked the Inspector if there was no other evidence taken by the detective. I saw I had touched a tender spot. He said he had done all he intended to do, and he had no time for such—I believe his word was "rot." I said, "Well, if you have not time I will find some one who has." That was the last time I spoke to him. I wrote to the Minister, and some time after I received an acknowledgment, and later on I received a letter from Mr. Dinnie, with some excuse. I cannot find the letter, but it was as much as to say that there was nothing to be done. My opinion is that they are all tarred with the same brush.

2. What kind of brush?—Well, they were all Catholics. That is how the matter stands. When I saw there was a change of Ministry I thought I would write to the new Minister to see what I could get from him, but just then I saw there was to be a Commission, and I thought that would answer my purpose better.

3. Did you consider the advisability of prosecuting yourself?—No; I acted on the Registrar-General's advice.

4. Your daughter and Boyle were both of age, and had a right to get married where and how and when they liked?—Yes.

5. Your desire was simply to see that your daughter was properly married?—Yes; that was my desire.

6. In whose interest?—In the public interest. I was spoken to by one or two clergymen. It was the talk of the place, and they said if they had been concerned in it they would have been prosecuted.

7. You insinuate that because certain officers of the police are Roman Catholics the authorities were being protected?—Yes.

8. Why did you not lay an information yourself?—I did not know what expense I might be dragged into.

9. So you handed the matter over to the police, and said, "Here is a breach of the law; it is for you to look into it"?—Yes.

10. *Inspector Mitchell.*] Do you remember what month you first spoke to me about this matter?—Immediately I received the certificate in May, 1906.

11. Would you be surprised to hear it was not until November you came to the station and spoke to the police?—No, I would not, because I was away two or three times; but I know it was shortly after I received the certificate from the Registrar-General.

12. *The Commissioner.*] But it is a long time between May and November. Apparently you received the letter from the Registrar-General shortly after the 8th May?—I believe I did.

13. *Inspector Mitchell.*] If I tell you the correspondence shows it was on the 5th November you first came to the police-station would you contradict it?—No, because I was away twice, for weeks at a time.

14. Within two or three days of your first visit to the station you were invited by Detective McIlveney to give him a full statement?—Yes, I believe it was within a week.

15. When he took your statement did the detective strike you as being biassed in the matter, or as trying to cloak or conceal anything?—No; he was very enthusiastic, and took great interest in the matter, apparently.

16. Had you not reason to believe that following on your statement further inquiries were made from others?—I had no proof they were; I considered from the detective's demeanour that he would have taken evidence from my witnesses. Why did he not go to them as well as to the others?

17. You say he appeared very enthusiastic, so it is unlikely he would only partially do his work?—That is what I thought.

18. Do you remember your second visit to the station, when you and I talked the matter over? On that occasion I read three statements to you?—Yes, those of Boyle and the two witnesses.

19. Do you remember what I said after reading them?—I believe you said, "In the face of these statements, I could do nothing."

20. And that the parties present at the ceremony were those we must rely on to support the charge you proposed to lay against the dean?—Something to that effect; you were not very well pleased, I know.

21. Did I not also say we could not possibly hope for a conviction without evidence?—You might have said so; I would not say you did not.

22. Do you remember the reply you made?—I cannot call it to mind.

23. Did you say words to this effect: that that did not matter, that you were determined to show the dean up?—No.

24. You say so positively?—Yes.

25. Is it not a fact that that was your determination?—It was.

26. Whether evidence was forthcoming or not, to expose the dean?—Yes, because I considered I had been made a fool of. The first time I went to the office on the same day, before I had left the office an hour I saw you call at the dean's house. The next day it was reported all over the store belonging to one of the witnesses how the dean had told how he had put me off when I went to ask for the register.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Where did you get this information?—From people who were in the store.

28. *Inspector Mitchell.*] Would you accept my assurance if I tell the Court I never entered the presbytery in my life till within the last three months?—I followed you, and I believe you entered the gate or porch.

29. Did you see me do so?—Yes, and I walked on.

30. In regard to our conversation at the interview, you received my decision with rather a bad grace; you considered the decision I made known to you was a wrong one when I informed you that the evidence available would not warrant such a charge being preferred?—No; my only objection was that no other evidence was taken.

31. After telling you I could not take action in the matter upon the evidence available, and that I would not be a party to assisting you to show the dean up, did I not suggest if you were determined to take action that the Court was always open to you?—I do not remember anything of the kind.

32. Did I not say if you were determined to go on without evidence you could lay an information yourself as easily as I could?—I considered I had laid an information, and had done my part.

33. Did I not go so far as to explain where you should go?—No.

34. Did you call a third time at the station?—I paid a second visit to your office with a day between; I went back to ask if no other evidence had been taken.

35. Did I not then say to you, "I have done all I can possibly do; I can do nothing more in the matter, and if you are not satisfied go and consult a solicitor"?—No.

36. You say that positively?—Yes; you told me you had no time for such rot, or some such expression.

37. You are sure I did not suggest you should see a solicitor?—I am quite sure; I had already seen the late Mr. Macdonald.

38. Was it not after your third visit you saw Mr. Macdonald?—I do not know whether it was before or after; I believe it was after.

39. Was that not in consequence of my suggestion?—No; I went on my own account.

40. What advice did he give you?—That it would be a difficult matter; he did not give me any encouragement.

41. He advised you much on the same lines as I did?—You did not advise me at all.

42. Was it not advising you to tell you that the proceedings were unwarranted?—You did not tell me that.

43. Were you not disappointed because I would not accede to your request, and instruct an officer to lay an information?—I considered I had laid an information.

44. Then, receiving no encouragement from me or Mr. Macdonald, you communicated with the Minister?—Yes, in a long letter setting forth all the particulars.

45. Had you not reason to believe later on that the Minister, through the Commissioner, had full inquiries made?—I never had anything to show that anything was done.

46. Did you receive a reply from the Minister?—An acknowledgment of the receipt of my letter. The next communication was from Mr. Dinnie, the gist of which was that he did not see that there was anything to be done in the matter.

47. You accuse me of having interfered with the course of justice: how did I do so?—From the demeanour of Detective McIlveney I knew he had something in his mind he wished to say which he could not at the time; you were in your office with the door open, and he and I were in the passage outside; we had always been friends, and he made some remarks which showed me he had something he wished to say but could not.

48. What prevented him saying it?—I suppose he thought he might put his foot in it. I thought he had been ordered not to go further into the matter from what he said.

49. Do you suggest I prevented him from making certain inquiries?—I consider it was through you he did not proceed further in the matter.

50. That I prevented him making further inquiries?—You might have given him a hint.

51. Do you suggest to the Court that I did that?—I believe it was through your influence he made no further inquiries.

52. What motive could I have in hindering inquiry?—Trying to shield Dean Burke.

53. What have I to do with him?—I do not know, but I believed you were trying to shield him.

54. *The Commissioner.*] What is in your mind?—I believe Inspector Mitchell is a Catholic.

Inspector Mitchell: Even supposing I am, under what obligation am I to the dean that I should shield him if he had criminally committed himself?—I have been amongst Catholics for fifty years, and I know the run of their strings.

55. *The Commissioner.*] Do you suggest that the Minister is a Catholic?—I consider he has not been there long enough to form an opinion.

56. You say they are all tarred with the same brush?—I believe they are.

57. Do you suggest the Commissioner of Police is a Catholic?—I do not know; he might be. There are as good Catholics as any other, but they will not swear one against the other on any account.

58. But you do not suggest that Catholics would deliberately perjure themselves?—If those three go into Court and swear this, I have done with it.

59. You allow your feelings over the matter to influence you to make statements you cannot substantiate?—I only give my private opinion.

60. You are impugning the honesty of the Catholic section of the community?—I know that: I am speaking my thoughts.

61. *Inspector Mitchell.*] Mrs. Hoffman, one of the witnesses, in her statement, says the marriage took place on Tuesday, the 2nd January, between 8 and 9 in the morning: why should she tell a lie on the subject?—There is the guard and my other witnesses. Newton took their tickets, and knew my daughter. I took a note in my pocket-book of what he told me.

62. In Boyle's statement, which I read to you, he says, "We were married at 8, or between 8 and 9, in the morning of the 2nd January." He was not in any danger or trying to avoid trouble: why should he tell a lie?—To shield the dean.

63. When reading Boyle's statement to you, do you remember me reading this: "On the day preceding my marriage he [that is, you] referred to me [Boyle] as a rotten crawler, and producing a bottle, said, "If it is holy-water he is looking for, I have got it here." The bottle contained tar, or some such substance, and he also informed me the contents of the bottle would destroy my clothing and my wife's. I fully believed he was carrying a revolver in his pocket, and intended to injure us"?—This is the first I ever heard of it. Detective McIlveney met me in the street one day, and said, "There is a report you are following them with a revolver." I said, "I have never had one in my hand for forty years."

64. You have told the Court that I read Boyle's statement to you?—You did not read that; you only read his statement that the marriage took place at a certain time.

65. Why should I fail to read an important part like that?—You did not read it.

66. Did I not afterwards explain that that would be the reason you did not see what you expected to when the ceremony took place—that they tried to avoid you lest you should do them harm?—We parted at half-past 6 on the Monday night on good terms.

67. Did I not explain that this would explain their going into the church by another entrance, for fear you should do them some harm?—No; I swear I never saw a person in the church but the dean, Father Delaney, and another man.

68. What motive could I have in failing to read such an important part of the statement?—I do not know. You only read from the three statements about the time of the marriage: the three statements appeared to be copies of one another.

69. You tell the Court positively I never explained to you why you may not have seen any one go in at the front door of the church?—No.

70. Is your memory good?—Pretty good.

71. If I swear I did tell you?—Most decidedly you would swear falsely.

72. What motive should I have?—That is your business.

73. Did you make use of such language to Boyle as "You are a rotten crawler," and, producing a bottle, say, "If it is holy-water you are looking for, I have got it here," and say that the contents of the bottle would destroy his and your daughter's clothes?—I did not.

74. Why should he say you did?—I will tell you how it might arise. After I took my daughter away from him on Monday, when she came to my terms, I took a little bottle of oil which had some kind of medicine in it, and threw it away, saying, "I would have spoiled his coat for him." I never spoke to Boyle on the matter. She might have told him this.

75. Your grievance against me is that you think I restricted the inquiry by the detective?—That was my opinion.

76. If I swear to the Court I gave no such instructions, and that there was no restriction in the inquiry, are you prepared to accept that assurance?—I do not think it would alter my opinion.

77. I ask you the question, if I on oath assure the Court that in no way, directly or indirectly, did I restrict the inquiry, are you prepared to accept my assurance to that effect?—I suppose I must accept it.

ALFRED JAMES MITCHELL further examined. (No. 5.)

Witness: In November, 1906, the complainant called at the police-station at Invercargill, to make a complaint. By my instructions Sergeant Black attended to Mr. Stuck at that visit, and furnished a report embodying the substance of the complaint. That report was minuted by myself to the detective stationed here at the time—McIlveney: "Please arrange to see Mr. Stuck in your office, and there obtain a full statement setting forth specifically his grievance. You may be able to ascertain from him where the contracting parties now are." No instructions of any kind were conveyed to McIlveney, either directly or indirectly, as to the scope of the inquiry he was to make. It was dealt with by me, as all other inquiries are—minuted to a subordinate for full inquiry. From the beginning I recognised that the main and most reliable evidence would be forthcoming from those present at the ceremony, and I was naturally anxious that statements from the contracting parties and from the witnesses to the marriage should be obtained, recognising that if that failed me outside evidence would be practically of little or no value. When Mr. Stuck called the second time at the station he came into my office, and I read over to him the whole—I regret to say it in conflict to Mr. Stuck—the whole of the statements made by Boyle and the two witnesses, and I explained to him that the latter portion of Boyle's statement would very

reasonably account for the parties to the marriage having entered the church by the back way rather than by the front way, solely for the purpose of avoiding him, seeing that he had threatened to do them harm. I also explained to Mr. Stuck at that interview that with such material as was then available it would be simply absurd for me to do as he desired—have a charge preferred, and a criminal charge at that—against the dean: that we could not reasonably hope for a conviction without evidence to sustain the charge. I now say that Mr. Stuck, in reply to that, said—I am not giving his exact words, but the gist of it—that it did not concern him so much as that he was determined to show the dean up. I then replied, “Very well; I am not going to be a party to assist you to show any person up,” and suggested to him that if he was so determined to have proceedings taken all he had to do was to lay an information with the Clerk of the Court—the channel equally open to him as to the police. Mr. Stuck left the office very much displeased with me because I would not promise him I would have proceedings taken. He was very angry with me, and I took every care to explain my inability to comply with his request. I took special pains to satisfy him that it was not a case of want of will, but that it would be absurd to do so in the absence of reasonable evidence. He called at the station a third time at the interval of a day or two in order to again ask me if I could reconsider the matter and take action against the dean. He was very determined and persistent that, whether evidence was forthcoming or not, proceedings must be taken against the dean. I said I had done all I could for him, and that I would not take any action, and if he was not satisfied with me why did he not go to a solicitor? In great anger he left the office, and I have reason to believe the next day or two saw the late Mr. Macdonald, explained the whole matter to him, told him what I said, and that Mr. Macdonald said, “Doubtless the Inspector has given you good advice; if evidence is not forthcoming, how can you hope to sustain the charge?” Later on I received a letter from the Commissioner, addressed to the Minister of Justice, signed by Mr. Stuck, setting forth fully his complaint, which was minuted to me for inquiry and report. The whole of the file in the office was attached to the correspondence, and returned to the Commissioner. I heard nothing more about it. Mr. Stuck has told the Court he received a reply. The train that left here at 10.10 in the morning connects with the train leaving Gore at 1.3 in the afternoon, and the mere fact of persons travelling by the train from Gore at 1.3 affords little or no evidence as to the train they left Invercargill by: it might have been either by the 7 or 10.10 train. I explained this to Mr. Stuck when he suggested I should see the guard in charge of the Gore-Lumsden train, and showed that it would be idle to get a statement from him. I say now, without the slightest fear of contradiction, I did everything I could to try and satisfy Mr. Stuck, but unless I was prepared to lay an information of a criminal nature against the dean I failed to do so.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Was any statement obtained from the dean?—Yes, I have a copy here. It is to the effect that the marriage took place about 8 o'clock.

2. And that was corroborated by the two witnesses and the contracting parties?—Yes. One point I omitted to mention. Mr. Stuck emphatically says he saw me enter the gate of the presbytery on some occasion while inquiries were in progress. I say on oath (though I do not accuse him of deliberately trying to mislead the Court) that until within the last three months I have never been in the presbytery in my life.

3. *Mr. Stuck.*] Why was not Mrs. Boyle examined? She will not deny it if brought before the Court?—The detective had full power to make inquiry. His instructions were to make a full inquiry, and when I received the statement of Mr. Boyle and the two witnesses I did not think it necessary to get hers as well.

Witness: I desire to supplement the evidence I gave yesterday. With regard to clerical staffs, I do not wish any inconsistency to appear in the evidence I gave. In regard to the Commissioner's office, I am of opinion (it is not a matter of complaint, but I am making a suggestion) that the service would benefit as a whole if the staff in that office ceased to have police rank. I think whilst grades are to be admitted on the clerical staff necessarily the result is that these men must be competing with men outside engaged in general police duty. My opinion is that this competition is unfair to the men doing every-day uniform duty, and I would suggest that a clerical staff should be provided for by a grade of its own, separate and distinct from the other branches of the police. For instance, though I said I thought all district clerks should be sergeants, I explained my opinion by saying that if one district clerk is to have the rank of sergeant then all should, as the duties performed by each are on the same lines. But I would suggest in preference to that that they should be put outside the pale of the grades and ranks of the service, and so avoid being brought into competition with other members of the Force. A man who has been a number of years doing clerical duty only could not at a moment's notice be sent into the street to compete with men engaged on police work all the time. With regard to Chief Detectives being eligible for promotion to higher grades, I gave the opinion yesterday that they should be, and I still think so; but I wish to qualify it to this extent: The duty performed by Chief Detectives is very different from that of the ordinary police, and they have a different experience as regards the supervision of men from uniform sergeants and station sergeants. Far more care, therefore, is necessary in the selection of a Chief Detective for the grade of Sub-Inspector than in the selection of a station sergeant for the same position.

4. *The Commissioner.*] The crux of the matter is as regards the question of discipline. A man who has been many years in the detective branch of the service must prove to be sufficiently a disciplinarian to qualify for the higher rank—effective discipline is absolutely necessary in the interests of the Force?—Yes, in dealing with his qualifications I include particularly the element of discipline; and I say the same in regard to the Commissioner's office. It is subversive of discipline for a Sub-Inspector to occupy the position of the Commissioner during his absence.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How many of the present Inspectors have been district clerks at one time?—Three, so far as I know. Inspectors Ellison, Wilson, and myself.

6. Do you not think it is essential that an Inspector should have a knowledge of clerical work, and that he ought to go through a district office?—Undoubtedly; but that without practical knowledge would be useless to him.

7. Do you not find that men going through the clerical department have turned out better officers than those who have not passed through?—I know one Sub-Inspector who has, but he combines practical with theoretical knowledge.

8. Is not a certain amount of training in a district office, together with training outside in uniform, essential?—Yes; but I am not sure that it follows that the man with clerical knowledge is going to prove the best policeman.

9. *The Commissioner.*] How are you going to get the office training if you form your office staff under a different grade?—If the solution is not to be found in making members of the clerical staff entirely free and independent of the grades and ranks of the service, I would suggest that a distinct grade be formed which would avoid their coming into competition with the uniformed police.

10. Would you shut them out from the means of ordinary promotion?—If they choose to take that grade I would, but I would give increased remuneration to that service.

11. How are you going to get the training that you both agree to be essential to the best qualities of an Inspector?—In saying “essential” I did not desire to convey that it was indispensable, but that it would be useful for a man to have clerical knowledge. He may obtain that, however, without being a district clerk.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In what way?—The education he receives before joining the service should enable him to prepare a report.

13. *The Commissioner.*] Some Inspectors I have known would make mighty poor clerks?—Of course, there are many men with the clerical experience of a lifetime who cannot write a decent hand. A great deal of the necessary knowledge is to be obtained without passing through the grade of clerk in the office. This matter of clerks in the office and the position they often take up has been a sore point with me for a long time. The position is a false one, and before a former Commission my evidence was strongly directed to the matter of district clerks dominating over station sergeants.

14. I suppose some of them run the office?—They do.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What is your opinion as to the qualifications of the Sub-Inspector at Headquarters?—He is a most capable man, of whom I could not speak too highly.

16. *The Commissioner.*] I want you to make it quite clear if a distinction is to be drawn between these qualities as applying to the ordinary Sub-Inspector and as applying to the Chief Clerk of the Commissioner?—As to the Chief Clerk in the Commissioner’s office, it would be a difficult matter to improve upon the man at present in the position; but I do believe it is unfair to the other Sub-Inspectors outside doing general police duty that they should have to compete with a Sub-Inspector from the office, who would claim an Inspectorship by seniority before those who have been engaged for a lifetime on general police work, all of which is taken for naught.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] They have special qualifications, otherwise they would not be able to take the position?—Yes, for performing their duty as clerks; but they have never been outside as Sub-Inspectors in charge of a district. Take Sub-Inspector Donovan, it would be very difficult to say another is better than he; I should be sorry to say Inspector Wilson is better.

18. Do you not think Donovan stands as good a chance of promotion as Wilson?—I cannot say whether he is junior to Wilson or not, from memory, but supposing he is, I say it is unfair that Wilson should be promoted to the grade of Inspector before him, seeing that he has done nothing but clerical work all the time he has been in the service, while O’Donnell has been doing general duty. Wilson can have no claim to enter into competition with other Sub-Inspectors, and it is a mistake for him to hold that rank.

19. As regards the qualification of the Chief Detective at Headquarters?—He is a man who was most thorough in his work here; it is impossible to speak too highly of the way he performed his duties here.

20. *The Commissioner.*] You speak generally as to his abilities whilst here?—Yes.

21. Who ever called his ability into question?—It has been questioned outside.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your opinion is that the office staff should be transferred to the Civil Service?—I think that would be a very good solution of the difficulty.

23. You would, then, have no objection to the clerk’s minutes on papers?—It would overcome the difficulty in regard to a junior dictating to a superior officer. I wish to emphasize the point that the competition at present existing between members of the Force engaged wholly in clerical work with men out in uniform doing general police duty is wrong.

24. It exists in other Forces?—It may, but to argue that does not excuse the system.

25. Would you believe in a system by which men having experience in the office should go out on probation before getting higher positions?—I do not see why they should enter into competition with policemen doing outside duty holding the rank of sergeant: if he is so treated he would be taking some other man’s place.

26. But I suggested he should go out as a constable till transferred to a higher rank. I urged that district clerks should be sergeants for the reason that three-fourths of them are sergeants at present, and if five out of seven hold that rank the others are entitled to it. It is really a means to the end of getting higher remuneration.

27. *The Commissioner.*] You gave the impression that you do not consider it necessary for the duties that a clerk should be a sergeant, but you think if some are sergeants then all should be; and your ground was that they should receive extra remuneration on account of the duties, and if the only way to do that was by his being raised to the rank of sergeant you say it should be done?—That is exactly what I wish to convey. If a man is qualified to hold the position

of district clerk, then if his brother holds the rank of sergeant he should also hold the rank, because it carries with it certain additional remuneration: it is for that reason only I think they should hold that rank.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The Commissioner would not have the same control over a Civil Servant clerk as he would have over his own men?—That is another matter.

29. There is one question I wish to ask you: Do you know of any political interference so far as you are personally concerned?—I know of no instance where it has been resorted to.

JOHN CAMPBELL MACKENZIE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 6.)

Witness: I am stationed at Gore. In 1876 I joined the Otago Provincial police. I was about three weeks in Dunedin, then at Palmerston for a month, then in charge of Waiholo for six months. From there I was transferred to West Taieri, where I remained for fourteen years and a half. From there I was transferred to Lumsden, where I remained seven years and a half. In January, 1898, I was promoted to the rank of sergeant, and transferred to Queenstown sub-district. In 1903 I was transferred to Gore, where I remained for sixteen months; from there I went to Auckland, where I remained four months; then to Gisborne for eighteen months; and in June, 1906, I was transferred back to Gore, where I remain.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What led up to all these transfers from all the different places?—Probably the interests of the service.

2. During your long service, have you formed any opinion as to the general organization, control, and enrolment of the Force? Is the control satisfactory from your standpoint?—I do not know that I have the same confidence in the Commissioner as I used to have in former Commissioners. I feel that the Commissioner does not back us up so well as we might expect. There is nobody to take our part against the public, and we are not allowed to do it ourselves.

3. In relation particularly to what?—To complaints by the public, and so on.

4. The Commissioner is more inclined to side with the public than with the Force?—I should say so.

5. Do you think this has an unsatisfactory effect upon the Force?—It gives us a feeling that we are not backed up as we ought to be.

6. Is your feeling shared with others within your knowledge?—I have not discussed the matter with any one.

7. Do you notice any deterioration in the class of men being enrolled in the Force of late years?—There probably is not the same class of men available that there used to be, and a much larger number of men are required.

8. Why are they not available?—Probably because the inducements are not sufficient in the way of pay and promotion. The pay is not now what it was thirty-three or thirty-four years ago, when I joined. It is nothing like it, and promotion is extremely slow. The probabilities are that from now for the next ten or twenty years promotions will be very few to the higher ranks.

9. Do you find fault with the manner in which promotion is carried on?—I do not care to go into that. I have not been sufficiently connected with the Department, having been principally in out-stations.

10. But you must have formed certain opinions in regard to men who have not received promotion, but who you thought were entitled to it?—I should consider that a matter of discipline. If an Inspector considers certain men entitled to promotion his opinion is better than mine, and he has a right to have things done the way he wants them.

11. The Inspector has very little to do beyond recommending?—That is a great point in the matter.

12. Do you know anything of any political or improper interference with matters affecting the Force?—No.

13. Have you used political influence yourself?—No, I have not used even police influence. I have taken everything as it came.

14. As regards the efficiency, sobriety, and morality of the Force to-day as compared with your long experience?—I do not know that there is any appreciable difference.

15. How many men have you at Gore?—Two.

16. Do you always get good men?—Yes.

17. You have no cause of complaint?—Not recently.

18. Since when?—Not in Southland of any consequence.

19. So far as your experience of the Force goes, are they apparently sober and moral?—Yes. They compare more than favourably with any other Department in the public service.

20. Have you any suggestion to make in regard to an improved method of promotion? There seems to be a scarcity of first-class men coming forward. How would you improve it?—I have not considered the matter.

21. Have you given any thought to the amount of educational qualification required for enrolment?—No; but I do not think the standard is too high.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you are not backed up as well as you think you ought to be: what was the cause of your transfer from Gisborne to Gore?—I have no official idea.

23. You had the papers on the matter: was it because of neglect of duty?—I do not think it was.

24. Did you apply for transfer?—No; but I had more work than I could do. I had three men's work to do.

25. Were you not transferred for neglect in the performance of your duty?—I was not aware of it.

26. Were you not behind in your clerical work?—I was, but I do not consider that neglect of duty, as I could not overtake it.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Did you ever complain that you had too much work?—I applied to the Commissioner for two men, and he promised me them some time after Parliament. There was and is a tremendous amount of work to be done, and I did more than a fair share of it.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were transferred for neglect of clerical work?—I do not think so.

29. *The Commissioner.*] You were transferred because you could not do the work?—Yes.

30. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Will you give me a case in which you were not backed up?—I was under the impression that a prosecution under the Licensing Act in Gisborne had a good deal to do with my transfer. There was a complaint made by Mr. Stock, a solicitor there, about some man who was arrested.

31. What was the result of the arrest?—The case against the man was dismissed.

32. Was there ground for the complaint?—I do not think so; the man is in gaol now, and has been several times since.

33. But the case you refer to was dismissed?—Yes.

34. What other case have you to complain about not being supported in?—There was another case of a woman named Mrs. Scott, who complained about being turned out of the police office.

35. What was the result of that complaint?—I was cautioned for ordering her out, and I do not consider I should have been.

36. Any other case elsewhere?—There was one case at Gore where a man named O'Neill complained of being summoned for supplying liquor to a young man. The summons was dismissed.

37. What support did you expect in that case?—I expected I was right.

38. But the Magistrate did not think so?—Convictions do not always follow.

39. Did not the Magistrate say there were no grounds for the summons?—I do not recollect what he said. He dismissed the case, after taking time to consider it.

40. Did he not say there was no justification for a summons being issued?—I think he did.

41. As regards promotions and the opportunity a man may have to receive instructions which help him to gain knowledge of police matters, do you know what instructions candidates can secure? Do you know that they have to attend a class at each centre for instruction?—I have heard so.

42. Were your transfers all at your own request?—None of them.

43. But they were in the interests of the service?—Presumably so.

44. Not for misconduct?—No, they were not. When I was transferred from Outram it was against the wishes of the Inspector.

PATRICK McGRATH, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 7.)

Witness: I am stationed at the Bluff. Before I came to New Zealand I was three years and a half in the Royal Irish Constabulary. I joined the New Zealand Force in 1874, but did not remain long, leaving the service to better myself, as I thought. After about two years I joined the Wellington Provincial Force as second-class constable. After serving there for three years and a half or so I had a case before Judge Prendergast, who congratulated the Inspector on the manner in which it was brought. I was promoted, and transferred to Patea. I remained there for thirteen months; then I was transferred to Auckland; thence to the Thames, where I remained for three years and a half; transferred to the North Shore, at Auckland, where I remained nine or ten months; transferred to Hamilton, where I remained for four years; and was then transferred to Sydenham. I was there when prohibition was carried, and Sydenham being reduced to a constable station, I was transferred to Dunedin; and when a station was opened at the Bluff seventeen years ago I was transferred there as sergeant in charge and Clerk of the Court. I have been there ever since.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You are satisfied with your position?—Very well. For years I have been very well treated. I had a grievance when I was at the North Shore, which it is too late to go into now, being reduced four or five steps, as I thought unfairly.

2. Have you anything to say about the organization, control, or enrolment of the Force?—There was one case that came under my notice. A relation of mine came from the Home-country to the Bluff, who thought he would like to join the police. He made application, and reference was made to me for his character. I supplied it, but it did not seem to give satisfaction, and inquiry was made as to where he came from, and they sent to Ireland to make full inquiries. I feel that proper inquiry was made. He is now in the Force.

3. That shows that care is taken?—Yes. I have seen it stated that men can join the Force easily. I do not think that is correct. I myself had to produce a certificate of character from my place in the Old Country; it is not easy to get a character.

4. Have you noticed anything in regard to the control of the Police Force?—It is better than formerly. I have served from one end of the country to the other, and there is a very great improvement. I know some men are grumbling about the rate of pay, and I think they have reason: the pay is too low, especially for a man with a wife and family.

5. That does not apply to men in charge of a station?—No, only to uniform men.

6. Another 6d. would make all the difference?—I am certain it would. The man with me is married, and has two children: he has to pay 10s. a week rent, while only allowed 1s. a day. The rate of wages at the Bluff is 10s. a day, and you could not get a man to do your garden for less. Some wharf labourers get 2s. an hour if they work at night, while a constable gets nothing extra.

7. A single man would be better off than a married man?—But the Department do not care about sending single men, as they have to stay at boardinghouses or hotels.

8. In regard to the discipline and efficiency of the Force?—It is head and ears over the discipline of the provincial days; there is a great improvement in the service.

9. The Force is more efficient to-day than during any part of your experience?—The only place where it was superior was Dunedin; I came over with Branigan.

10. In regard to character and sobriety?—The men are sober, and do their duty; they may grumble, but they do it all the same.

11. They are a credit to the Force?—So far as I can see.

12. Do you know of any cases where constables have used political or other influence?—I never knew of such a case. In my case it has been thought I was a favourite of Sir Joseph Ward. I was never under any obligation to him, nor would I ask it.

13. You have been seventeen years at the Bluff, and have not asked for anything?—So long as I am left alone I am quite satisfied. A man who cannot carry on under Inspector Mitchell is a dunderhead: he can hardly make a mistake.

14. Do you think promotion is unfairly dealt out?—I do not know of a case: some men have been on a station for a long time, but I understand they have refused promotion.

15. What should be the reasons governing promotion?—I should say intelligence and efficiency, taken together with seniority. Seniority alone would not do; you want common-sense and judgment in dealing with the public.

WALLACE ABERCROMBIE BROOKES, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 8.)

Witness: I am stationed at Invercargill. I joined the police in 1889, and was sent to Clyde; from there I was transferred to Invercargill, and from there to the Bluff; from there to Ophir, and from Ophir to Ross; from Ross to Christchurch, on promotion; and from there to Invercargill.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Were you satisfied with your promotion, and the circumstances under which it took place?—Yes, I received it when I thought I was entitled to it.

2. In regard to the general organization of the Force and control or enrolment, have you anything to say?—No.

3. Do you know that at the present time there is a difficulty in getting the proper class of men?—I believe there has been some difficulty; there might have been a better class got.

4. To what do you attribute that?—I think the pay is the cause of it, for one thing.

5. Do you hear grumbling in regard to it?—I have heard dissatisfaction expressed with the rate of pay, more especially among the married men. When I was in Christchurch, as a sergeant, it cost me more to live than I earned, both rent and the cost of living. I paid 17s. 6d. rent, and was allowed 10s.; my pay was 10s. a day. I have eight of a family.

6. How does that compare with Invercargill?—I think it is somewhat cheaper here.

7. If it costs you more to live than you earn you will get into debt?—That is so. Constables with small families are in the same position. I have been told on many occasions by the men that it takes them all their time to live.

8. Do you attribute that to the increased cost of living?—Yes.

9. You think the knowledge of this has an effect on recruiting?—I could not say.

10. I suppose if men in the Force were asked for an opinion by men who thought of entering the Force they would say "Keep out of it"?—That is my opinion.

11. To what extent could the position be improved?—I believe it acts most harshly with married men joining the Force.

12. There are not many married men joining now?—Well, men get married shortly after joining, but there are married men who join, and that has been their experience. They have complained to me about it.

13. How is the average married man in any other walk of life better off?—I do not know.

14. Is there much difference between the amount the average constable or sergeant receives compared with the average civilian?—Others may live in different quarters; we are expected to live in a respectable locality, and we pay higher rent.

15. What do you mean by better quarters? There are plenty of respectable quarters with small rents?—I could not find them in Christchurch. I have free quarters here, but married men on this station have told me they spent all they earn on living.

16. How could this be improved?—I do not know, unless married men were to receive a larger house-allowance and a rise in pay.

17. Your position is worse because you have a large family?—Yes.

18. What would you do to improve the position?—It would be hard to do that.

19. Are the men you come in contact with fairly efficient?—Yes; I have no fault to find.

20. Do you often have to report men?—On one or two occasions since I came here I have had to report for trifling things.

21. How do you find your position supported?—My complaints always receive consideration.

22. The general conduct of the men?—It is good.

23. Both in regard to soberness and morality?—Yes, I dare say there are a few exceptions.

24. I want those exceptions?—There are no exceptions here.

25. I want you to give me the names of any for my private information, not to be used for publicity unless I am satisfied they are undesirable men. These men you have in your mind, how did they escape being dealt with?—They have been dealt with.

26. But they are still retained?—Apparently.

27. Would you consider them fit to be in the Force?—I would not trust them out of my sight.

28. That implies they are not fit to be constables?—Yes.
29. They are the class of men you would always have to keep under watch if on your beat?—There is one I could name we have to particularly watch.
30. Have you even known of any political or other interference?—Not to my personal knowledge.
31. Have you heard constables boast of exercising it?—Only hearsay. Some one might say, "Oh, he must have got that by so-and-so."
32. Have you ever heard a man say, when ordered to transfer, that he would get that altered?—No.
33. Did you see anything of the general conduct of the Force in barracks when in Christchurch?—No; I was not much in the barracks.
34. Have you any views on promotion?—No, I have been fairly dealt with.
35. What do you think should be the reasons governing selections for promotion?—Seniority and ability.
36. General all-round ability as policemen?—Yes.
37. Is the standard of education an important factor in a sergeant?—I think so; I do not think he could undertake his duties if he had not some education.
38. What extra clerical work has a sergeant to do as compared with a man in charge of a station?—He has a good deal of clerical work to do.
39. So has a constable in charge of a station?—He is on the same footing, but he might have more to do than a sergeant.
40. If a man has sufficient education to justify his selection for the charge of a station, and discharges those duties for many years, would he not be equally qualified to discharge the duties of a sergeant?—Yes.
41. The standard of education is not important beyond that?—Those are the men mostly chosen for sergeants.
42. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say there are men in Christchurch addicted to drink: how many?—I can mention one particularly.
43. Any in the Force at present?—I should not like to say anything about one man who had one lapse and is now sober.
44. *The Commissioner.*] How long has he been sober?—Since about Exhibition time.
45. I want from you the names of all the men in the Force whom you have seen under the influence of liquor during the time you were there?—I could name two.
46. Have they both been dealt with?—Yes; one for drunkenness, whom I took off the street myself on night duty, and the other for entering a hotel when on duty and having a drink.
47. What service had these men?—One a very short time, and the other, I think, about fifteen years.
48. A man to be properly qualified as a sergeant must have something above the ordinary education required for a constable?—There are some men on beat who are very well educated.
49. Any education you may have is of assistance to you as sergeant?—Yes, and to the Inspector.
50. Have you anything to say as regards promotion?—No.
51. You believe in efficiency as well as seniority?—Yes.

JAMES KERR SIMPSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 9.)

Witness. I am stationed at Invercargill. I joined the police from the Permanent Artillery in 1895, and was sent to Greymouth, where I did duty as foot constable for two years; I was then mounted there for three years; and was then transferred as second man to Kaiapoi, and held that position as mounted constable for four years; I was then appointed in charge of Kaiapoi for four years; was then appointed sergeant, and transferred to Auckland; remained there for twelve months, and was then transferred to Invercargill, in 1909.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you formed any opinion as to the organization, control, and enrolment of the Force?—I have nothing to say in regard to that.

2. Are you aware whether there is a difficulty in properly recruiting the Force owing to lack of suitable men?—That has existed for a considerable time. I attribute it to the increased cost of living and the low rate of pay, together with the high standard of wages ruling for manual labour, which is 8s. or 9s. a day.

3. Wet and fine—seven days a week?—I will not say that.

4. You think the rate of pay too low: are you taking a special class of constable or the average constable, because as a rule they come in as single men?—It is too low to command a good sample of men; you can get any amount of men with the present rate of pay.

5. But it would not attract first-class men?—Not at present.

6. How ought it to be improved?—I think constables should start at least at 8s. a day after going through the school.

7. Would you improve the pay of all grades or only of constables?—6d. a day might be added to all.

8. What does it cost you, a single man, to live?—I live in barracks, and it costs me 15s. a week for board alone.

9. Would you say the Force is fairly efficient?—Yes.

10. What about their general conduct?—I should say it is good, with exceptions that have been before the public lately.

11. Have you come into personal contact with any exceptions?—In Auckland I noticed several little cases, but they were promptly dealt with by the Inspector. In some cases dismissal followed; they were breaches of regulations, and in some cases drunkenness.

12. How many were dismissed while you were there?—As far as I can recollect, there were three in the twelve months.

13. Are there any men, to your knowledge, at present in the Force who are addicted to drink?—I cannot say I know of any.

14. Were there any who were dealt with for drunkenness while you were in Auckland?—I do not think so.

15. In regard to morality?—The men I have come in contact with in Southland are all of good moral character.

16. What about Auckland?—There were some exceptions there amongst the recruits, but in all cases they were dealt with.

17. To what extent was this immorality?—I do not say I know of any immorality or grave breaches of propriety.

18. Do you know of any instance in which political or other influence has been used on behalf of constables or sergeants?—No, I never heard of any. I have heard it mentioned that So-and-so had a good "pull."

19. Was that understood to be political "pull"?—I understood it to mean that.

20. Do you think that exists?—Not to any extent; I cannot say of my own knowledge that I know of any case where there has been any.

21. Do you think it exists?—It is only human nature that if a man has friends at court he should try and make use of them.

22. Have you any views on promotion?—No, I have been fairly dealt with myself. An examination has been lately instituted, and the Commissioner stated that those who went up and were otherwise qualified would be considered for promotion. I passed the examination in general knowledge of police duties and in certain statutes.

23. And you received promotion soon afterwards?—Yes.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What service had you when you were promoted?—Thirteen years and over.

25. It was not simply because you were examined that you were promoted?—No, I was otherwise qualified.

26. Do you find amongst probationers and young constables we have some trouble as regards drinking?—Yes.

27. Do you know any senior constables who are addicted to drink?—No.

28. Do you really believe influence obtains to any extent?—I have suspicions of it.

29. What makes you suspect it: what you hear?—Yes, from the man in the street.

30. Have you seen anything you could not account for in any other way than by political influence?—No, I know of nothing myself.

31. *The Commissioner.*] Can you name any one you have heard boast of it?—I have heard others speak of it, but not the ones concerned. There is one matter I might mention: when sergeants of police are travelling they have to travel steerage.

32. You think they should be allowed to go first-class?—I think so. All branches of the Railway service, for instance, are supplied with first-class passes.

33. Up to what grade do they travel steerage?—All constables, all sergeants, and all detectives except Chief Detectives—any one below the rank of Sub-Inspector.

34. Have you travelled steerage?—I paid the difference myself. Steerage accommodation is not fit for the Force, especially in the case of married men with families, particularly as regards the people you have to associate with.

35. Men like you prefer to pay the difference?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I may say the regulations are being altered in this respect.

DUNEDIN, MONDAY, 12TH JULY, 1909.

JAMES FREDERICK ARNOLD, Member of Parliament, examined on oath. (No. 10.)

Witness: I should like to preface anything I have to say by reading a communication sent to me by the Minister of Justice on the 1st of this month. It is as follows: "Sir,—I have the honour to transmit, for your information, the accompanying copy of a Commission under the hand of His Excellency the Governor, appointing Mr. Bishop, S.M., to inquire and report on certain allegations and statements respecting the administration, efficiency, and control of the Police Force. The Commission will open its sittings in Dunedin early next week, and I have no doubt that you will facilitate its proceedings in every way, and furnish it with the fullest information concerning the cases referred to by you in your recent speech in Parliament.—I have, &c., J. G. FINDLAY." I read that because the Minister refers to a speech I delivered in Parliament during the session just ended, also to show that it is partly at his wish that I am here to give evidence. I should like to say also that I am delighted that you, sir, have been appointed to conduct this mission, and I am pleased to be here this morning to help you in every way I possibly can, not only to-day, but during the whole of your mission. It has been suggested that, having taken an active part in this matter, and having been interested in police matters for years past, I should accompany the Commission through its travels; but after making full inquiry, I am satisfied the Commission can itself ascertain the full facts as to the position of affairs in the Police Department, and I am satisfied that neither I nor any other individual can get evidence before the Commission from members of the Force itself to prove the true position. I trust, however, the Commission will be able to ascertain those facts in other ways. There are various departments of the public service which it is necessary public men should interest themselves in, and it is necessary they should be ready to conserve and to protect the members of those branches of the service; and from my experience I have felt that if there be one branch that requires the sympathy and co-operation

of public men more than another it is the branch of the Justice Department which we speak of as "the police." That is clearly shown by the statement I have just made as to the difficulty of obtaining evidence. I may say that during last week, although I think every member of the community knows that any communication sent to me is absolutely confidential, yet I have received scores of letters either under *nom de plume* or without signature at all. The Police Department is a department which, if it is to be successful and do the work it should, must have the full confidence of the general public. While it is necessary that our Judges and our Magistrates should be men who have the sympathy, co-operation, respect, and confidence of the public, I think the ordinary member of the Police Force hardly comes second to the people holding the high positions I have just referred to; and after my travels through the Dominion during the last few months I have come to the conclusion that the Police Force of to-day has not the confidence of the general public, and that the confidence which the general public had in the Force is gradually being lost; and if that position is continued or becomes more acute the result will, I believe, be serious. It is not necessary for one to emphasize the fact that when we are in a strange city we look upon the ordinary policeman as our friend when we meet him in the street, and when we leave our home we leave feeling a certain amount of security, not only as regards our property but also as regards our wives, and daughters, and our families generally, because we realise there is a Force of straightforward, clean, honest men who are there prepared to sacrifice themselves for the protection of that which is ours. Immediately the confidence of the general public is lost the position becomes most lamentable. Now, if that be the case, there must be a reason for it, and I will go further presently, and strive to show that the Force itself is in a state of dissatisfaction—that there is an undercurrent of unrest amongst the members of the Force. I have already said it is difficult to get members of the Force to prove this, but I trust the Commission itself will find the proof. The public know it is a fact. Individual public men know it is a fact; and I myself, though I cannot call dozens of witnesses to prove it, on my oath, say it is so.

Mr. Dinnie: We shall see how many more say so.

The Commissioner: I would ask you not to interrupt, Mr. Dinnie.

Witness: If the Commissioner can prove that it is not so, I shall be delighted. I am not here this morning to act as prosecutor of the head of the Department, or of any other member of the Department; but what I do want to see is justice done to the members of the Department, and also to see the confidence of the general public, which I say is being lost, restored. That is all I ask. If I am quite wrong, if the public have confidence, and if the members of the Force are quite satisfied, then I myself shall be delighted. Certain things, however, have arisen, and I will say that in all probability in Dunedin we have as little discontent and as little public mistrust in the Force as there is to be found anywhere; but it is an open secret that things have happened and have appeared in the public Press that have caused this public unrest to some extent. For instance, the fact of certain constables rowing amongst themselves in the street of a city, and, as a result, making an assault upon certain private individuals, is public property. The fact that a constable goes out of the barracks at 9 o'clock at night, and at 10 o'clock at night is ordered home in a state of intoxication, is public property; and the public not only want to know why that is allowed, but they want to know where he got the drink between 9 and 10 o'clock at night; and I shall be glad if it can be proved that the constable was not in a state of intoxication when he left the barracks at 9 o'clock. If he was, then I want to know who is responsible. I need not enlarge upon those things, which have been made public, but they are quite sufficient to cause the unrest I have alluded to. Now, with regard to the Force itself, what do we require of members joining the Force? In the first place, a man must be physically fit; he must be a man with certain educational attainments; he should be a man of good moral character; he should be a man possessing something above the ordinary intellect; and he should in most cases be a man who is prepared to sacrifice himself at the call of duty. Now, if the Department can secure such men as that—and in all probability they can—when those men are in the Force they should receive the very best consideration and treatment it is possible to give any large body of men. Now, it has been suggested that, in consequence of laxity of inquiry in respect to candidates for the police, those individuals who have been alluded to, and others, have entered the Force—

Mr. Dinnie: Not suggested. It has been openly stated by yourself.

The Commissioner: I would ask you, Mr. Dinnie, to refrain from making answer to Mr. Arnold's statements while he is speaking. You know he is here at the express request of the Minister. Such interjections cannot have any possible effect upon the final decision I shall give upon the matter submitted to me. It is inconvenient, and it is disconcerting to interrupt a speaker when he is giving a connected narrative.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not quite see, with all due respect, the reason for this opening speech at all.

The Commissioner: That is for me. I do not recognise your status in connection with the Commission at all, unless it may be in respect of any charges made against you personally. I cannot allow you to make any reference to the manner in which I think proper to conduct this inquiry. It is for me, as Royal Commissioner, to say when any witness is travelling outside the order of reference.

Witness: Thank you, sir. It is of little consequence to me, because if the inquiries were made which should have been made, and still those people entered the Force, which certainly they did, I can only say there must be something very radically wrong somewhere. Now, I do not think it is a fair thing for any man to be asked to quote the names of individuals referred to, and I do not intend to do so. If a man is not in the Force to-day, there is no reason why I, in referring to something in connection with his character, should injure him; and if a man is in the Force to-day, such as men I shall presently refer to as having received promotion, it is not wise that I should publish the name of that man so that the general public will be in a position to say, "Ser-

geant So-and-so was promoted over so many other people," because it is not for me to say as to whether that man was qualified or not; and if he has got his promotion, well, I say, in the language of the boy in the street, "Good luck to him." I do not want to say a word against him. So if you will permit me I will simply allude to these seven cases as numbers 1 to 7, handing in to the Commission the names of the people I refer to.

The Commissioner: That is the course I adopted in Invercargill. Where any constable, or sergeant, or detective was referred to by a witness I have asked that the name should be handed in to the secretary, so that I may make further inquiry. It is possible that allegations may be made against some individual in the Force at the present time which ultimately will not be found to be supported by evidence, and it would be unfair to the individual that his name should go forth to the public in that connection.

Witness: These are the cases referred to in my speech in Parliament. I regret I have not a duplicate copy.

Mr. Dinnie: I should like to have a copy, so that I may clear the cases up.

The Commissioner: It is for the Commission to clear them up.

Mr. Dinnie: Am I to be allowed no time to look into them, in order to be in a position to reply to Mr. Arnold? It will not be fair to me. I may want to cross-examine upon them.

The Commissioner: I cannot allow you to refer to anything I may do as being unfair. If you will represent to me any matters you may wish considered I shall be glad to consider them. I am under no obligation to you at all as an individual. In connection with this Commission, all I am required to do is, where there may be specific allegation made against you or anybody else, to give you twenty-four hours' notice of the fact, so as to enable you to reply to that allegation. In connection with this, there is no allegation at the present time. If there is an allegation, when I find it to be based on sufficient material I shall at once afford you an opportunity of dealing with the matter.

Mr. Dinnie: Twenty-four hours' notice is scarcely sufficient.

The Commissioner: That is the time mentioned, but if in connection with any allegation you want a week, a week you can have.

Witness: Of course, I do not know Mr. Dinnie in these matters at all. It might be any Inspector in New Zealand who is affected by this reference, because Mr. Dinnie may have made the promotions on the recommendation of an Inspector in charge of a district. Perhaps before I quote these cases I had better say I did not understand that Mr. Dinnie was here to cross-examine witnesses, and if that is so, of course, it appears to me there should be counsel on the other side, and I might have reconsidered my position in coming here at the request of a certain number of people. If there is counsel on the one side only, I think it is hardly a fair position.

The Commissioner: This raises rather an important question. I may say the Department is on its trial. This is a Commission set up particularly to inquire into certain allegations made against the Police Force, and the Police Department must be held to be responsible for the present condition of things if they do exist. The Department being on its trial, it may be said that the Minister at its head is also on his trial politically: and it seems to me the permanent head of the Department must necessarily have some reflection cast upon him in connection with the administration, and it would be only justice to allow the permanent head of the Department, without introducing any personal feeling into the matter at all, an opportunity from time to time of clearing up any matter which may be brought before the Commission by the various witnesses.

Witness: It has been suggested, I repeat, that a number of people whose names I have supplied to you were received into the Police Force without due inquiry as to character, and as a result certain things have taken place which have caused unrest amongst the members of the Force itself, and which have caused certain members of the Force to feel they do not care how soon they get out of it, if they are going to be associated with such people, and which have made it more difficult for the Department to get recruits from the right class of men. No. 1 was a man who was concerned in the assault case of which I spoke as taking place in the streets of Wellington recently. No. 2 is a man who left England in company with his wife's sister, who came to New Zealand and joined the Police Force. How much inquiry there was remains to be proved. His deserted wife made inquiries, and it was discovered that he was here in the Police Force, living with his wife's sister, by whom he had two children. He was found at the Lower Hutt. No. 3 came from England, joined, and went to Auckland. He was transferred for fighting, and then he cleared out with a married woman. As a matter of fact, he had been boarding with a certain person, and, although the police may not have known for certain, other people did know that things were not as they should have been. No. 4 was a man who was working on the tramways. He was dismissed from the tramway service in one of our New Zealand cities for making immoral suggestions to lady passengers, and he joined the Police Force. No. 5 was in the Glasgow Police Force. He was dismissed from there for an assault on his sergeant. He came to New Zealand and joined here. What his papers showed I am not in a position to say, as, of course, I cannot get at the file. No. 6 is represented to me as being perhaps the most extreme case. He was an Australian, and I do not think it is necessary for me to say from what part he came. He was a notorious thief. His photo and his finger-prints were in the Police Department in New Zealand.

Mr. Dinnie: No.

Witness: Well, if they were not, so much the better. In any case, he came here, and he was what I have stated. That will not be denied. He joined the Police Force. Whether his finger-prints were in the office when he joined or not, they certainly were afterwards, and while he was still in the Force.

Mr. Dinnie: His photograph only.

Witness: Well, his photo; and while certain people—and amongst them, I understand, Detective Cassells—were at the window looking at the photograph they recognised this person on

beat opposite the station. I mention Detective Cassells for this reason: that it has been largely suggested in Wellington that he has given me certain information, and, as he is not in New Zealand, he cannot protect himself if the matter is mentioned. Now, I am speaking on oath, and I can say that, so far as I am aware, I have never spoken to Detective Cassells nor he to me in my life. If I have seen him or spoken to him I am not aware of the fact, and I certainly can swear that I have never received one line from him by way of any communication. I want to make that clear. No. 7 is a man also from the "other side." He came over here and joined the Force, and whilst there was an assault being committed on members of the Force in Cuba Street, Wellington, he was amongst the crowd in plain clothes, urging on the civilian as against the police. There are the seven cases, and I say that if 50 per cent. of those cases are authentic, it is sufficient to cause the unrest which I say does exist amongst the members of the Force. In my speech in Parliament I also spoke of some of the scenes which took place in the Wellington barracks. I shall not, unless I receive other communications urging me to do so, accompany the Commission to Wellington, but will leave the Commission to find out whether those statements are correct or not—whether it be a fact that two sergeants had themselves to go into the barracks and make peace amongst the constables upon one evening within the last few months. I should like, also, the condition of the sanitary arrangements in connection with those barracks looked into. Then, here is the circular I have alluded to: "In future applications for situations outside the Police Department are not to be made without the sanction of the Commissioner first being obtained." That circular was issued on the 26th August, I think, of last year. Now, that is an extraordinary position. It does seem absurd to the ordinary individual, and I know it does seem ridiculous to many members of the Force, that they are not to be permitted to apply for positions outside the Force without first going to the Commissioner and getting permission from him. That circular alone has caused a great amount of feeling amongst members of the Force. There is a suggestion as to the reason, although I am not going to touch upon that at the present moment, and in any case I do not think it is correct. It is alluded to in my speech, and I hope the Commission will be able to clear it up. Then there is this other question which I alluded to in my speech, and which the Premier, I think unwisely, made apply to the Commissioner. I did not do so, and that must be recognised at once. It was the case of a constable who applied for thirty-six days' leave in order to go to Australia to get married. His application was refused, as he was only entitled to twenty-nine days' leave. It was then pointed out that under a circular which had been issued from the Commissioner's office special provision had been made for those desiring to visit Australia, and when that was pointed out the thirty-six days was granted, but seven days' pay was stopped. As to the question of whether a point should have been stretched, and whether the man should have been paid for those seven days when he was going to get married, perhaps the financial strain on the Department and on the Government would have been too great, and I would not like to suggest that such a thing should have been done; but I should be glad if the Commissioner would clear up this point, because members of the Force certainly do believe that another person was granted six months' leave of absence on full pay in order to go to Great Britain to get married. Now, Sir Joseph Ward said in the House that from information he had received only one month's pay had been given, and five months had been deducted. Well, I can assure the Commission that members of the Force are of the opinion that that six months' leave of absence was granted on full pay.

Mr. Dinnie: I have the file here.

Witness: I shall be glad if the file proves otherwise; but I would emphasize this now, and would ask the Commissioner to clear it up, because it does affect him. The belief now is that that six months was granted on full pay, but that, in consequence of certain criticisms by a paper previous to my speech, and which I had not then seen, the authority had been altered from six months' full pay to one month's full pay, the leave of absence still being six months. Perhaps I might allude to one or two other cases. Here is one of the circulars which have been issued by the department. It is with regard to examinations, and was issued on the 27th October, 1908. It states that the next annual examination will be held at district headquarters in January, 1909, the subjects being the Lunatics, Coroners, Industrial, Criminal Code, and Police Offences Acts. Now, the Legislature had passed a new Coroners Act, which was a most important alteration of the law, and the circular went on to say that any amendment that had been made in the law that year need not be considered, as the questions would be based on the law as it stood in 1907. Well, to the man who is passing an examination, to be told that the examination is upon a law which does not exist—I do not know how it appeals to his mind or to the minds of some of those recruits, but I do know how it appeals to my mind as I read it in the *Police Gazette* and in the *Gazette* itself. The only explanation that can be given is that perhaps at that time, in January, the Act was not printed, but if that is the explanation it seems a peculiar one. It is true that solicitors and others, unfortunately, do not get their statutes until a later date, but we know that separate copies of those statutes can be obtained from the Printing Office if required. Here is one other case I should like to have cleared up, and then I will pass on. Here is a constable, whose name I will hand in to the Commission, who was stationed up north. He was charged with robbing a drunken man. The charge was made by another constable, and an inquiry was held. Whatever the Commissioner thought of it, the constable believed the case was proved right up to the hilt. The person who was supposed to have committed the robbery was promoted and transferred to a more important position down south. As, however, he preferred not to go south, he was sent further north. The person who made the charge was sent into the backblocks on the Main Trunk line, and when he protested against his treatment he was severely fined.

Mr. Dinnie: Have you the date of that?

Witness: No, but I am supplying the Commission with the names. Now I come to the question of promotions, and perhaps these promotions cause as much feeling as anything among

the members of the Force, and one of the regulations is considered to be very unfair. It was that clerks in the Police Department having ten years' service might be promoted to be sergeants on application. I do not say that what I am now going to outline is actually done, but if a constable has been nine years in the service, and the higher officials wish to get him promoted, they have only to take him off beat, place him in the office, and in twelve months he would get promotion. It is felt very strongly that the clerical staff should be placed upon a different footing from that of the men who are doing the active practical work of the Police Force, and that there should be no regulation by which a man who is doing clerical work and who has not had practical experience should be entitled to get promotion over the heads of those who are doing the harder and more practical work. If it is convenient, I intend to allude to these promotions under the letters of the alphabet, and will hand in to the Commission a full list of the names immediately. "A" was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st March, 1905. When in a certain district up north he was transferred on account of being mixed up in a drunken row in which a young man who was a draper lost his life. He was transferred to Auckland, and since then he has been promoted to the position of sergeant over 116 senior constables. "B" joined on the 1st July, 1899, and was promoted on the 1st October, 1906, over 273 men senior to him. "C" joined on the 1st April, 1903, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st April, 1909, when there was another man who had joined in 1902—twelve months previously—and who had been passed over, although he had done extraordinarily good work in the Force. I have some of his record here before me. "D" joined in 1897, and was promoted on the 1st April, 1906, over the heads of 182 seniors. "E" joined on the 19th September, 1898, and was promoted in 1908 over 221 who were senior to him. "F" joined on the 16th January, 1896, and was promoted on the 1st April this year over 140 senior to him. "G" joined on the 15th January, 1896, and was promoted on the 16th March, 1909, over 139 seniors. "H" joined on the 13th September, 1890, and was promoted on the 15th February this year over 100 seniors. "I" joined on the 14th November, 1895, and was promoted on the 15th February, 1909, over 136 seniors. "J" joined on the 10th October, 1891, and was promoted on the 1st July, 1908, over 108 seniors. "K" joined on the 18th April, 1896, and was promoted on the 10th June, 1908, over 154 seniors. "L" joined in December, 1898, and was promoted in 1907 over the heads of more than 200 seniors. We know there is an examination that constables recently have been asked to sit for so that they may prepare for promotion, and this is supposed to help them to promotion. As a matter of fact, however, numbers of the men—the great majority of them—never have passed this examination, and some who have passed it have not been promoted. I wish the Commission to understand the reason I have not mentioned these men's names—I do not say they are not qualified to fill the positions—I do not know; but I do say, and it is held by the members of the Force—I do say it seems to me absurd to say there is not one man out of 100 or 150 or out of 233 who is qualified. Surely there must be one out of that number, or else the Police Force of the Dominion is in a very bad state indeed. Sir Joseph Ward also referred to the fact that a certain man named Dart was promoted because he had passed a solicitor's examination. As a matter of fact, he was promoted over the heads of about 300 others, and his case was not quoted by me in Parliament, nor do I quote it this morning, because if there is a case—I do not say there is—that could justify the Department in making a man a sergeant simply because he had passed a solicitor's examination—I do not say this—it was the case of Dart. And as he is now doing the educational part of the instruction of the recruits in Wellington no doubt he is well qualified for the work he is doing. I only make this allusion because Sir Joseph Ward mentioned the name in the House.

Mr. Dinnie: You make no complaint about this case?

Witness: No.

The Commissioner: When you say you make no complaint do you mean that his having passed the examination was sufficient excuse for promoting him over 300 others?

Witness: I do not say so, but I say if there were a case that might be justifiable this would be the one. In conclusion, I have told the Commission what I consider the public mind to be in regard to the Force, and I have told you what I think the feeling is internally amongst members of the Force themselves; and I am sure the Commission and Mr. Dinnie, together with all, will be very glad to have this condition of affairs removed if it exists as I have said I believe it does. How is it to be done? In the first place, if you are to restore public confidence you must remove the old larrikin element from the Police Force, if it is there. The right class of men must be induced to join the Police Force, and if you are going to have the right class of men in the Force your conditions must be such as to attract men of that class. I need not point out to this Commission what a policeman is and what he has to be. He is always on duty seven days a week. It may be said he gets paid for it; so he does, but he does not get paid double for Sundays. If he is on night duty he has to be up in the morning, if he has a case to attend in the Court: he must be always ready to be called upon, day and night, in case of rows, fires, or anything of that kind; he has to handle dead bodies and lunatics, and—I was going to say filthy drunks, but this is so common as to be not worth mentioning; his work is not the most pleasant in the world. His pay is 7s. 6d. a day—that of an ordinary labourer; and yet he has to be a model man if he is to come up to the requirements of the Department. That is the remuneration he gets to commence with. If he is a married man, speaking of constables, he gets 1s. towards his house-rent. He has to live within a quarter of a mile of the depot, and every one knows the difference in rent if you have to live close to the congested population. He has twelve days' holiday on full pay every year; but a man in an ordinary commercial house would have ten days on full pay, and in addition all the holidays that are going. When a policeman is on leave, if he is travelling by train or steamer, and is called upon by a guard or other person to interfere with drunks, &c., he has to leave his wife and children, and is on duty, although supposed to be away on leave. If a man is married and has children—rightly so, we do not complain—if a transfer is necessary, he has to pack up

his goods or sell them, and away he goes, but unfortunately some of the members of his family who may be just commencing to do business have to be left behind, and that is a hardship. I spoke in the House with regard to the travelling-expenses of the Detective Force. Personally, I do not think it sufficient, and I am sure it is not a fair thing for a man away on duty to ask him to go down into the steerage—particularly in some of the smaller steamers—and rough it with the same class of criminals he is always doing duty among. My opinion is that if the Force is to be placed on a better footing these conditions will have to be improved, and there will have to be a rise in pay. The conditions will have to be made more attractive than they are at present. And, above all, the men will have to be made to feel, if they are to belong to a class which the Commissioner and all of us wish to see in the Force, that on entering the Force they are going amongst a community of men who are their equals intellectually and morally as well as physically. I have to thank you, sir, for listening to me so attentively. I have alluded to the fact that I am satisfied you will have great difficulty in getting the evidence I would like you to have. I am quite satisfied that any communication you may receive confidentially, without my stating where I got my information from, from time to time as you go on your tour, you will look into; and I am quite satisfied, whatever the Force or the public may think of the appointment of this Commission, that, as a result, good will be done, not only to the general public, but more particularly to the members of the Force.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you given any thought to the conditions of pay, &c., necessary to make the Force more attractive?—I have not, because I do not think I should suggest what increase there should be.

2. Do you think the Force is insufficiently paid?—I do.

3. The whole question comes under the head of recruiting, in connection with which the Commission is asked to make suggestions?—I think you will find in your travels that recruiting is not only falling off, but that the class of recruit is not as acceptable as those of a few years ago. I have reason to believe, and I know, that reports have been received by Inspectors that recruits who go on night duty are not men fitted for the position of constables—not in this town. I should be glad, the training depot being in Wellington, if the Commission, while sitting there, will ascertain how many of these recruits have been reported by the two sergeants in charge of the station as being fully qualified for appointment as constables. In regard to pay, I think the pay of a constable joining should be increased by at least 1s., and there should be a general rise.

4. Do you think the standard of education required is too high?—Yes, I do. I think the Fourth would be quite sufficient, providing you permit Sergeant Dart, who does this class of training at the depot, to state that he considers the educational qualification of a candidate is sufficient. There are men at the age of twenty-five or twenty-six who cannot readily get a Fifth Standard certificate, yet since they left school and have improved their education all round are well qualified for the position of constables.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] They do not have to produce a certificate if they pass an examination equal to the Fifth Standard?—I know, but they have to pass an examination either under a schoolmaster or one of the School Inspectors, and frequently the passing in this way is more difficult than the Sixth Standard examination in an ordinary school.

6. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to ask Mr. Dinnie any question, Mr. Arnold?—I do not intend to take up the position of prosecutor in any way. At first I did. I was communicated with by a large number of members of the Force, and thought of going through with the Commission, so that I might receive communications from them constantly, if necessary, and represent their case. However, I do not see that much is to be gained by that course.

7. The only thing to be gained would be that they would give you information which they would not give me personally?—Exactly, but perhaps if they knew that anything I receive from them I will forward to you—not the documents, but the information—that may be of some help. I do not intend asking Mr. Dinnie or any other person any questions at the present juncture, and the reason I took action in Parliament was that I felt the time had arrived for some action to be taken. It is very well for a person like myself to be told “You should communicate with the Minister,” but constables know if they communicate with the Minister that would be in itself an offence. If a man communicates with the Minister he may be marked. I do not say such things are done in New Zealand, but it might happen, and in any case the Minister gets a reply from the Department, and that is sent to the man, and the whole thing drops at that. I felt the time had arrived when something more should be done, and that was the reason I made the speech in Parliament, which I believe has been the cause of the appointment of the Commission. In future, if I find there is any necessity for me to follow the Commission up north, I shall be pleased to do so. In the meantime I am not prosecuting the Department, but I want to see it placed on a satisfactory footing in the eyes of the public, and for the sake of the men themselves.

8. Have you any clear opinion as to whether there is any political or other interference?—I have not. I do not think there has ever been political influence so far as this town is concerned, either in the appointment of constables or promotions. I do not know of any.

9. If a constituent comes to you and makes a complaint in regard to the conduct of any local officer, what would you do?—If a constituent who is not a constable came to me and complained of the action of any constable I would go to his superior officer.

10. Would you communicate direct with the Minister? My reason for asking this is that on going through the file the other day—which I intend to do in connection with every case that comes under my knowledge—I found that there are no less than three letters from a certain member of Parliament addressed to the Minister, forwarding complaints made to him by his constituents with regard to a certain constable. It seemed to me by going to the Minister direct a political aspect would be introduced, while it is open to the member to go to the immediate superior officer or to the Commissioner. In the latter case it becomes a departmental matter.—

Mr. Dinnie. I am not supposed to answer any member of Parliament. That answer must be sent to the Minister.

Mr. Arnold: That is quite correct, not only in connection with the Police Department, but all departments. If a complaint were made to me about a constable, in all probability—it would depend upon what the case was—I should come down and see the Inspector, but I would not write to him. If I had to put my name to paper I should go to the Minister. The same thing applies if I were to write to the General Manager of Railways, and in all probability I should receive a communication from the Minister telling me the communication should pass through him. That will explain why the file contains these letters from members of Parliament.

The Commissioner: Then, Mr. Dinnie, if you received a letter from Mr. Arnold forwarding complaints from certain of his constituents you would lay them before the Minister?

Mr. Dinnie: I would cause inquiry to be made, and give the result to the Minister. In cases of complaint by the public they should come to me, and I would see that it was properly investigated.

The Commissioner: I have repeatedly made complaint to an Inspector, and would not think of troubling you if satisfied of the way they were disposed of.

Mr. Dinnie: But I am anxious to know what is going on.

TUESDAY, 13TH JULY, 1909.

WILLIAM WALKER, ex Police Constable, examined on oath. (No. 11.)

Witness: I was at one time in the Police Force of New Zealand. I joined in February, 1878, in Dunedin. I joined as a constable and left as a constable. I was stationed in MacLaggan Street for three months, then in King Street for three months, at Port Chalmers six months, and was then in charge of Oamaru Gaol for two years; transferred to Ngapara in charge of that station, and remained there eighteen months; transferred back to Oamaru, not at my own request; transferred from there to North-east Valley, where I remained twelve years; transferred from there to Riverton, where I remained seven years; transferred to Invercargill, where I remained twelve or fifteen months, leaving the service on pension in 1903. I desire to make the following statement: In placing this statement before the Commission I am afraid it will not be of much weight, as anything that I can state is hearsay from the police all over the Dominion. My own injuries that I received I leave out: they are too old, and those that did me the injury could have no chance of reply. In regard to political and private interference, this is a sore grievance with all members of the police, and from what I have heard from members of the Force it is freely used, especially in Wellington and Auckland; but how to prove one case I know not. I know the men have got to think that if they have not got the political "pull" on the Commissioner they will not get on, but be passed over in promotion by those that have. The removal of that impression from the minds of the members, and thereby making the men contented and more careful of their employment, should be taken in hand at once. I take it that this is the object of this inquiry, and, as you have invited suggestions for the improvement of the Force, I, with some knowledge of this political or private "pull" and its pernicious influence, offer mine. I would suggest that at once the office of Police Commissioner be removed from under the control or influence of the Minister of Justice, or whatever Minister it is under, and be placed under the control of one strong man. I know of two men who would fill that office with satisfaction to the public, and in whom the police have every confidence, and this confidence is much required at the present time. The two men I refer to are Mr. J. W. Poynton, Wellington, and Inspector Mitchell, Invercargill. Failing these two get back the old Commissioner, Tunbridge. Give the Commissioner full control, and let him be responsible to Parliament only, not to the Government in office, no matter of what party. With either of these men in charge this political and private influence used by members of Parliament and others would be at an end. I want it to be clearly understood that I have not one word to say against the present Commissioner. I have heard his men speak of him as a kindly gentleman, but I am afraid their trust in him is gone. And why? His Minister has done it. By making this alteration, the New Zealand Police Force would be ruled the same way as the Royal Irish Constabulary; and I know I do not require to say anything to the Commissioner about that Force—the model for all Police Forces. As I said, this is all hearsay, but it has been gained in various conversations with members of the Police Force and others in various parts of the Dominion. I hope you may find it of use. In regard to the pay of the Force, I say with every confidence and a practical knowledge of what I say that the members of the Force are not sufficiently remunerated for their services—especially the married men—to enable them to live in any comfort, and put by something for old age. These men must give their whole time to their duties: they are practically employed the whole twenty-four hours, and eight of those at as fatiguing work as need be. I should like to point out that the cost of living has nearly doubled within the last fifteen years. The married constables are compelled to live near the central station, where the rents are always higher than in the suburbs, the excuse being that they can hear the fire-bell. I think the pay of married men should be raised at least 1s. per day at once. In regard to fire-alarms, I think that constables in their beds, and especially married constables, should not be compelled to attend fire-alarms unless in cases of serious fires, and should be allowed to live where they choose, and, if compelled to live near the central station, houses fit to live in should be erected for them. In regard to concessions, I think when a constable goes on leave he should be supplied with a free railway pass for himself and his wife if he has one. It was in years gone by, and for various reasons it should be renewed. Constables cannot make a tour of inspection and a holiday fit into one another. In regard to constables doing duty near their friends, I think

the practice of transferring constables to be near their relations should be stopped at once. How can a man do his duty amongst his friends? From my personal experience, I would suggest that departmental inquiries be done away with, and all inquiries be held by a Magistrate in open Court. The pernicious practice of obtaining written statements from suspected persons, which has lately crept into the Force, should be stopped: it is unfair, un-English, and does not give a suspect a fair chance of defending himself if he is brought to trial. A practice has crept into the Department of employing newly appointed constables to detect sly-grog sellers. This practice should be stopped, as it lowers the members of the Force in the eyes of the public, who are too ready to believe that a conviction is necessary to an appointment. I know this view of the matter is not correct, but still it exists. Men employed for such a purpose should not be admitted into the police. The act of one tells on all as well in the police as in other bodies of men. Great care should be taken in the selection of candidates for admission to the Force, and the whole of the responsibility should rest on the Commissioner, the selection to be made from country candidates; and more reliance should be placed on the certificate of the officer in charge of the sub-district where the candidate comes from than all others. I remember hearing of a candidate being sent by a Cabinet Minister to the Commissioner's office a few years ago for admission into the police. The Commissioner rejected the candidate, but a few days after he came back with an order from the Minister to the Commissioner to take him on at once, and he was taken on. I believe this was in Mr. Tunbridge's time. This one case alone bears out what I say—namely, take the control out of the Minister's hands and put it in the hands of a man whom the members of the Force will have confidence in. If something is not done, I know that some of the best men will leave very shortly. In regard to travelling-allowance, I think all expenses out of pocket should be allowed, and that the officer incurring the expense should be made to show the work he was performing, and that he was not out to make a cheque. I will give a case in point: A few years ago an Inspector used to come to my station monthly. He would arrive about 8 p.m., go to his hotel, remain all night, come to my office at 8.30, and leave at 9, just signing his name. At another station I was in charge of the Inspector would arrive in the evening, remain all night, go to one of the outlying stations from mine, visit another station next day, and come back to the town I was in, and, as a rule, took a whole week to do this, that could easily be done in two days. I have been on duty with Inspectors, and lived in the same hotel, and sat at the same table, and the Inspector got 12s. per day and I got 6s. I am of opinion that work done for other departments should be stopped or paid for, as it takes up a lot of time that should be otherwise employed.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are the opinions you express in regard to the present administration of the police, and the feeling of dissatisfaction amongst them, based on information you have received in Invercargill or Southland alone?—No; all over New Zealand. In the last six or seven years I have travelled half a dozen times to Wellington, three times to Christchurch, once to Auckland, and if there is a policeman about I always have a conversation with him.

2. And they speak their mind more freely to an ex-constable than to another?—Yes.

3. When were you last away?—Last year, at the time of the visit of the American fleet, I went to Auckland.

4. You think the feeling of dissatisfaction is deep seated?—It is.

5. When did you first notice it as a serious factor?—It has been going on all along; as long as I have been in the Force there has been political and private influence, but the consequent dissatisfaction is more serious now than formerly.

6. Do you trace it mainly to the existence of what is called "political pull"?—I do—political and private "pull." I never used it. I would not join the police under present circumstances.

7. Without political "pull" a man cannot get beyond the rank of constable?—No.

8. Do you think this "pull" is being exercised more in connection with the present Commissioner than previously?—I do not say so for a moment.

9. But you are prepared to get rid of the present Commissioner, while the previous one was in just the same position: why?—The previous Commissioner was a man of more firmness and backbone than the present. I never saw the present Commissioner till the other day at Invercargill, and I have never spoken to him, but from what I hear he is completely under the control of his Minister, and does whatever he dictates without question.

10. But you instanced a case in which Mr. Tunbridge, who you recommend should be brought back, took on a man because the Minister told him to?—But he refused in the first instance.

11. How do you know Mr. Dinnie would not do so?—I cannot tell. The man in question came from the West Coast, and was ineligible in every way.

12. I notice, in suggesting suitable men for the position of Commissioner, you limit your choice to Invercargill or Southland?—I am personally acquainted with them. I never exchanged ten sentences with Mr. Mitchell in my life, but I judge by what I see.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any case at all since I took charge of the Department in June, 1903, where political influence has taken effect?—No, I could not give an instance.

14. Do you know anybody else who can give an instance?—I do not.

15. But police constables have been talking a great deal to you: have they not told you?—They may have, and no doubt they have, but I cannot give any names: if I recollected them I would not give them to you.

16. *The Commissioner.*] What would happen if you did?—What happened to me when I went before a Royal Commission ten or twelve years ago. I have heard from time to time from policemen all over the colony that if they could get some person to go to Mr. Dinnie they would get what they wanted.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think there are a great number of constables who could get influence if they wished?—I am quite satisfied of it.

18. Yet you do not know one who has tried or succeeded?—No.

19. You have no evidence whatever to show that this influence has taken effect?—I know of no actual evidence.

20. Do you know what inquiries are made at present when candidates are selected?—No.

21. Do you know what the present travelling-allowance is?—No.

22. Do you know that members of the Force are allowed what expenses they incur?—I expect they are.

23. That is what you suggest?—Yes. What I wanted to show was that some Inspectors go on tours of inspection to make work for themselves; and where an Inspector or Sub-Inspector was allowed 12s. I was allowed 6s.

24. Have you any suggestion as to how political influence could be stopped?—I have made it as clear as I could: by taking your office—no matter who is in it—from under the control of the Minister.

25. But we have a Minister now who is not in the lower House?—But he is there for members to get at, and get what they want, and he controls you.

26. But members could go to the Commissioner of Police?—I expect they could.

27. I want some proof that influence has been exercised?—I have no proof, but such is the impression amongst the public and the police—that unless a man has friends in office he will not get on.

28. *The Commissioner.*] That is generally held throughout the Force?—Yes, and if you could get the men to come before you they would tell you so. I am afraid, however, you will not get them to do so.

29. Do you believe a man would be punished for giving evidence?—I do.

30. What would happen to a constable who came forward and gave evidence?—He would remain as he is all his life, and he would be shifted from here to the back-blocks.

31. Who would instigate that treatment?—It would be thought it would be as well to get rid of him. If I were a constable in uniform, and made the statement I have made, passing over Inspector O'Brien for an Inspector of inferior rank, it would be natural to think that Mr. O'Brien would shift me out of Dunedin, or pass me over for promotion. I think it would occur.

32. But he has no direct control over promotion?—But he would never recommend me. If a constable made himself obnoxious in any way to his superior officer he would pay the penalty.

33. According to your idea, it will be hopeless to try and get evidence from the constables?—Yes; you are hardly likely to get the information necessary to make a report which will be of any use.

34. What do you imagine to be the object of the Government in setting up this Commission?—Well, I do not know; probably to gloss over their own doings in some way.

35. This is a whitewashing Commission?—I am satisfied you will not use the brush, and so is every member of the Force.

36. Probably the fact that the Government did me the honour to appoint me Commissioner was due to the fact that the men are more likely to trust me than perhaps they would another?—Yes; I know they are thoroughly satisfied your report will be as much in their favour as you can gather from the evidence. But the difficulty will be to get men to come forward.

THOMAS RYAN SONNTAG, Nurseryman. (No. 12.)

This witness was sworn, and entered into a long rambling statement. As he refused to put his statement into concrete form, the Commissioner suggested he should put it in writing. This he refused to do, and the Commissioner ordered him to stand down.

FREDERICK MALLARD, ex-Inspector of Police, examined on oath. (No. 13.)

Witness: I am an ex-Inspector of Police, and also ex-Inspector of the provincial police. In 1872 I assisted the late Inspector Weldon to reorganize the Force. I come forward on this occasion to speak impersonally. I know none of the Force here with the exception of ex-Sergeant O'Neill. My sympathies are entirely with the Force. I know the difficulties a police officer has to contend with, from the highest to the lowest grade. I look upon the police as a social sewer—not using the word in an offensive sense—through which we have to carefully sift all kinds of complaints, and we should try to keep the sewer as clean as possible. I can only say to Mr. Dinnie, as I did to Mr. Tunbridge: it is our duty to help you as much as we can, consistently with discipline. I take a great interest in police matters in all branches, and I interest myself in criminology. I hold very strongly on the subject of the Westport murder case, and I believe in that case there has been a very palpable blunder. I hope the Commission will read all the departmental reports in connection with that case, from its inception to the finding of the jury. Who is responsible for the blunder it is impossible to say. I have read the evidence at the trial, and I am afraid there was no loyalty: there was evidently some cross-purpose in working up the case, and the only way to get at that is to read the departmental reports. Touching another phase of the organization of the Police Force, I am much surprised that the present Minister of Justice (who, by the way, should have a seat in the lower House; I have looked up all the papers I could, and never found a Minister of Justice anywhere else in an upper House)—I was surprised that the present Minister of Justice altered the decision of his predecessor in regard to the promotion of men from plain clothes to the uniform branch of the service. Mr. McGowan said that promotions were to be kept in the uniform branch, but when Dr. Findlay became Minister this was altered, and plain-clothes men were promoted to the rank of Inspector.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How about Inspector O'Brien? It was not Dr. Findlay who promoted him?—I am not referring to him; but I am proud to say Mr. O'Brien was one of our own men: his conduct was exemplary, and he has been a uniform man. So was Mr. McGrath. The rule was, however, departed from, and, I am sorry to say, for political reasons.

2. But this was not the first time a plain-clothes man was promoted to a higher office?—No; but what brings about disorganization is this: One Minister of Justice will lay down one rule—that promotions in future are to be made from the uniform branch; the next Minister comes and tears the whole thing up, and says, "Promote them from either branch." This saps discipline and the confidence of the men in their superiors. There should be no vacillating discipline. In my opinion, when a man once chooses the plain-clothes branch, it very clearly follows that he should always remain in plain clothes. He should simply aspire to the rank of Chief Detective. The uniform men, who have to do the disagreeable work, should look forward to promotion to Inspectorships. Another point: Too much has been made of these allegations of Mr. Arnold—far too much. I have known instances where men have got admission into the Force who have served sentences; I have one case in mind now—a trivial offence. He turned out a good policeman, and did good work, and we were sorry to part with him; but when we found out he had entered the Force after doing two or three months' "time," we had to ask him to resign. I can only say, if Mr. Arnold went round and did duty with these men, he would sympathize with them.

3. *The Commissioner.*] Everybody does. That does not point a moral. We know their responsibility, and the disagreeable duties they have to perform, and we want to secure that those doing them should be as efficient as possible?—The cases Mr. Arnold refers to have been investigated.

4. I do not care: I am going to investigate them?—But you see how it interferes with discipline.

5. We cannot question the right of Cabinet to set up a Commission. Certain statements have been made in regard to the administration of the Department. Cabinet has weighed those statements, and, in the exercise of their discretion, have decided there is sufficient warrant for the setting-up of a Commission to get at the root of the matter. There is no reflection on the Commissioner?—My references are quite impersonal, and I am here to help Mr. Dinnie; but it strikes at the root of the organization if there is any conflict between plain-clothes and uniform men. A great deal has been said about political "pull." Well, there are political "pulls" in all Police Forces, and every one knows the Home Secretary is king, and the Chief of Police has to do as he is told. I was retired owing to what you call political "pull," and junior officers to myself were kept on. Afterwards a Cabinet Minister told me it was absolutely impossible to avoid it owing to political "push." Mr. Dinnie cannot be free from it: he must do as he is told. I could give information in regard to the matter in private. But I say political "pull" has been here since I can remember to an outrageous extent, and you cannot stop it. The police have got votes, although we fought against it.

6. Would you disfranchise them now, as a matter of policy?—I would not like to answer that question till after the investigation. In regard to a man being taken on who has done some three or four months in gaol, I suppose he tried to do his best. There is on record in the annals of the Victorian department a case where a Stipendiary Magistrate got the appointment after doing three or four years.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any particular case in New Zealand where political "pull" has existed recently?—No; I have been in commercial life lately.

8. But having been an officer, you take an interest in the police, and have spoken, I suppose, to the men occasionally?—Oh, no, except to my friend Mr. O'Neill, and we never refer to police matters. I think the division of responsibility between the uniform branch and the plain-clothes branch is wrong. Mr. O'Brien, vigilant officer as he is, cannot be everywhere. There may be a murder at Clutha, and he goes down there. The Sub-Inspector takes his place, but he knows nothing about the criminal reports coming through the detective branch. I believe the Chief Detective should consider himself subordinate to the Sub-Inspector, and the latter should be held responsible. If he is not competent, then get some one who is. In regard to promotion, constables should qualify themselves for sergeants, and sergeants for Sub-Inspectors; after that promotion should go by seniority. You should never make an invidious distinction between officers. An officer is an officer, and when you make distinctions you break his heart.

9. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Do you think detectives have no heart to break?—But the moment a man joins the detective branch he should be instructed that right through he will be subordinate to a Sub-Inspector, which is not the case. I do not see that should break his heart at all.

10. You think he should remain for ever subordinate?—Certainly; the moment he enters the detective branch the Sub-Inspector should be his senior.

11. How many detectives have you known in your experience in this country, outside Dunedin?—I was never outside Otago.

12. Were you a member of the Victorian police?—Yes; I did night duty at Sandridge and Williamstown.

13. You came here with that experience and joined the Force in Otago, and were never out of Otago?—Yes.

14. And all your experience under officers extended only to Mr. Branigan and Mr. Weldon?—Yes.

15. Do you tell the Commission that detectives are unfitted for promotion to Inspectors?—No. What I say is, when a police constable elects to become a detective he should remain in that branch.

16. Why should I not be entitled to be promoted to the rank of Sub-Inspector, notwithstanding my being in plain clothes, if I am eligible in other respects?—I am only giving my opinion.

17. Why do you say that when a man is a detective he should always remain so?—Because it is a separate and distinct branch.

18. Unfortunately nearly all the uniform men hold the same views as you, and I shall endeavour to show the Commission there is no ground for it. Did you join in New Zealand as a constable?—Yes.

19. In what rank did you leave Victoria?—Constable. I was there about seven years.

20. You became Sub-Inspector in time?—Yes; I was always treated as more than a constable.

21. In a very short time?—No; I think in 1871.

22. Your only qualifications were what you learned in Otago and in the water police as constable in Victoria?—Yes.

23. You consider with those qualifications you were rightly promoted as Sub-Inspector?—I must leave that to my superiors; I do not want to blow my own trumpet.

24. I rely principally on the evidence of people like yourself to prove our case to the Commission: I rely on the unconscious prejudice that a long experience in uniform such as you and others have had engenders to do more than I could by pleading our own cause?—Your cross-examination seems a personal one.

25. Do you recognise the Victorian Police Force as being up to date in your day and since?—I have not followed it.

26. You know they have a real up-to-date and live Force there?—They did not come very well out of the last Royal Commission.

27. Are you aware that out of ten superintendents in Victoria five have passed through the detective department?—Yes.

28. And that the present Chief Commissioner O'Callaghan never was a constable?—Yes.

29. Do you say, in the face of that experience, it is a wrong system?—What I say is this—there is no feeling in the matter: If the Minister of Justice vacillates in the way he has done, it is not good for discipline of the service.

30. Do you know the Police Force to-day has unbounded confidence in the present Minister of Justice?—I should say so; but you put the Minister over your chief. Mr. Dinnie is your head. The Minister is your political head, and he abrogates the law laid down by Mr. McGowan.

Chief Detective Herbert: The Commission will have the experience of Scotland Yard as well as that of Victoria, and there is not a detective in New Zealand to-day who has not had experience in uniform for years.

OWEN PATRICK BROSNAN, Porter, examined on oath. (No. 14.)

Witness: I come before this Commission to lay complaints against certain members of the Police Force. In taking this step I do not seek notoriety, nor do I wish to create the impression that I have personal spite or animosity against the police as a whole. As a matter of fact, I have received consideration at certain times from some of the officials. My grievance consists of the treatment accorded me by individual members. Before proceeding, I may say that I have a number of convictions recorded against me which almost make me eligible to be adjudged a habitual criminal, so that in the light of recent events I am almost compelled to adopt this course as a means of facilitating my future reformation, also to receive, if possible, immunity from future unjustifiable acts by the police. After completing a sentence of hard labour I was released on the 9th June last, experiencing the usual difficulty of persons such as I in obtaining employment. I at last succeeded, but took the precaution of acquainting my employer with my past, and started work on the 22nd of the same month. From what Detective Mitchell subsequently told me, a number of robberies were enacted in this city lately. The police were unable to locate the author of these crimes. Although they possessed not one iota of tangible evidence that I had been connected with these affairs, it was thought necessary I should undergo investigation at their hands. On the 2nd of the present month Detective Mitchell visited the house of my parents. My mother, not caring to have the detective standing outside, invited him into the house. He then stated that I was wanted in connection with robberies at Shearers' and Crown Hotels, and inquired of my whereabouts. My mother told him I was at work. He told her I was deceiving her, as he knew for a fact I was not at work, and that I would have to explain my movements to him. Without legal authority he proceeded to search and ransack my room. On leaving he bound my mother over to secrecy concerning his action, saying that if she divulged the fact of his visit, or communicated the fact to me, or visited any member of the family, he would be under the necessity of shadowing her for the rest of the day. Mitchell's next step was, in company with Thompson, to visit my employer with, I positively assert, the object of disclosing my past to him, and probably also having me ousted from work, in which, fortunately, he did not succeed. They would not be content with a private interview with me, but most unnecessarily visited me in the presence of others. He started to cross-question me, and I then got permission to leave my work, with the object of consulting Inspector O'Brien as to the legality of their action. Mitchell prevented me from doing this of my own free will, and took me into custody. On the way to the station I told him what I thought of his action, and said if he required any information respecting my movements I was quite willing to supply him with the same if he cared to see me apart from my work. Arriving at the police-station I was not allowed to see the Inspector, but was escorted to the detective office at once and searched, they reading my private letters. I was then asked to give an account of my movements on the previous Saturday, and also the day before—the 1st July. Happily I was able to account for every moment of time. Had I not been able to do so I should probably have been in the unenviable position of other persons who have found themselves unable to establish the fact of their whereabouts, and if an unscrupulous official has charge of a case he does not hesitate to adopt unprincipled methods in the sometimes falsely called interests of justice. Mitchell instructed Thompson to ring up the Crown Hotel, and send a person down

to identify me. On his arrival they adopted a course which I understand is quite illegal, for I sat in a chair with three officials present while this person scrutinised me without result. I interviewed Inspector O'Brien, and made a plain and straightforward statement of my complaint, after which he—I may have been unduly affected by my trouble—remarked that I appeared to be drunk, and he did not care to go into the matter. I can with all truthfulness affirm that I do not drink, and that I certainly had no drink that day. I told him that if I did not get a promise of redress, in order to prevent future unjust annoyance, I should interview some higher official than he. He then told me that if I put my complaint in writing he would inquire into the matter. As I did not think I would receive much consideration from that quarter, owing to the insults heaped on me, I have taken the occasion of appearing before the Commission fully convinced that these wrongs will be righted. Speaking as one who has had dealings with the police officials, if such an opinion as mine will be accepted, I desire to make the allegation that there are those in the Force who adopt unprincipled methods to secure convictions as a stepping-stone to promotion, and who, instead of being guardians of the public welfare, are not only a menace to society generally, but are manufacturers of crime. Were I not confident of my own ability of reforming myself I should do what many another has done in the same circumstances—lose heart, and sink into the old groove again. But I demand as a free citizen, as long as I am living an open and honest life by my own exertions, be the past what it may, I demand I should not be subjected to the hounding-down methods of despicable members of the service—those few who cast discredit and bring opprobrium on the honest members of the Force.

1. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Did you call at my office on a certain day?—Yes, at 3 in the afternoon.
2. Before that you had been in the detective office?—Yes.
3. You were greatly excited when you arrived at my office?—I may have appeared unduly affected.
4. As a matter of fact, you were greatly excited?—I dare say I was.
5. You told your story in a very excited manner?—Not necessarily in an excited manner; I told it plainly and straightforwardly. I was no more excited than I am now.
6. What was the suggestion made about your being intoxicated?—You said I appeared to be drunk.
7. What were the words I used?—That I appeared to be drunk, and you did not care to go into my story.
8. Were not these the words I used, “Brosnan, have you been drinking to-day?”—So far as I remember, you told me I appeared to be drunk.
9. Do you remember everything that passed on that occasion?—Yes, the facts of the case made such an indelible impression on me.
10. Did I not tell you to put your complaint in writing?—Yes.
11. Have you done so?—No; I did not consider I should receive proper consideration, as insults had been heaped upon me. I wrote to the *Dunedin Star*, and the sub-editor consulted with me, and told me he had communicated with Mr. O'Brien, and his advice was to give evidence before the Commission, so I did not consider it necessary to put my complaint in writing.
12. You decided to appear before the Commission, instead of placing it in my hands?—Yes. It has been promised me that my name shall not be divulged.
13. Why did you not give me a trial first, and if I failed you would then have your remedy before the Commission?—You told me I was drunk, and I might have been told I was doubly drunk the next time I came before you.
14. *The Commissioner.*] Are you in respectable employment now?—Yes, in a grain-store. I have been there since the 22nd of last month.
15. Has this prejudiced your position?—In a certain sense.
16. Will the fact of your coming before the Commission affect your position?—I should not think so. I understand my employer interviewed Mr. O'Brien in respect to the police action.
17. Were you actually arrested by Mr. Mitchell?—I was taken into custody.
18. But if a man is in custody he can only be released by a Court?—Well, I would not say I was arrested exactly, but I was taken in charge, and escorted by him.
19. Compulsorily? What did he say? Tell me exactly whether you were arrested or not?—I will tell you what took place. I was working, and Mitchell and Thomson came along and asked me about a bike I was riding. Mitchell told Thomson to go and look at the bike, and then said he wanted to ask me a few questions. Knowing police methods, I refused absolutely to satisfy him.
20. Had you any previous knowledge of them?—No; they had been in no way connected with my previous trouble. I knew Mitchell by sight. My employer was standing alongside, and my fellow-workmen were looking at me in wonder at these two detectives speaking to me. I went to my employer, and asked him to allow me to go and speak to Mr. O'Brien, as I wished to ask him whether this was legal. I got on my bike. Mitchell said, “Where are you going?” “To the Inspector,” I said. “No, you are not,” he said. A scuffle took place.
21. Did he lay hands on you?—Yes, and prevented me going of my free-will, and escorted me to the detective office.
22. In the presence of other persons?—Yes; four persons I could name.
23. Why did you not prosecute him yourself?—I am in no circumstances to prosecute.
24. He actually laid hands on you?—Yes.
25. Who were present?—Four persons.
26. I should consider it very improper if you were laid hands on by any officer without sufficient warrant, but you must be supported by evidence, and I shall want the names?—I will give you the names privately.

27. *Inspector O'Brien.*] You declined to answer any question when the detectives first visited you?—Yes.

28. Did you not tell them at once, "I shall not answer any questions; I shall go with you at once to the detective office"?—No, that is a lie.

29. Will you also say it is a lie if any one says you walked to the station of your own free-will, without being in any way pressed, pushed, forced, or anything else?—They compelled me to go; I wanted to ride on my bike, but they would not allow me.

30. What do you mean by "compelled"?—Compelled me to go in their company.

31. But what do you mean by the word "compelled"?—I knew it was inadvisable to resist two constables who say, "You can't go unless we go with you." That is where the compelling came in. They forced their presence on me, and compelled me to walk with them.

32. Did they put hands on you, and force you?—No; but in the first instance Mitchell prevented me from going on my bike.

33. What became of the bike?—I wheeled it to the police-station.

34. Would you be surprised to hear that some one else wheeled it, not you?—Yes; Thomson may have said to me, "I will hold your bike for a few minutes." He wheeled it while I smoked a cigarette, and then I wheeled it myself, as far as I remember.

35. Oh, you smoked a cigarette comfortably on the way?—That does not say I was not under compulsion.

36. But what did the compulsion consist of?—In my not being able to please myself about what I did; they persisted in coming with me to the station.

37. They did not invite you to go to some quiet place to converse with you?—So far as I recollect, they said, "You had better explain to us," and I went and got my employer's permission to go to the police-station. I thought the best thing would be to consult a lawyer, but I had not the means to do so.

38. Describe the compulsion?—It wants no describing: they would not leave my company.

39. How did they prevent you from going of your own free-will?—Mitchell assaulted me, and prevented me from going by laying hands on me, and, as I did not wish to make matters worse, I allowed them to compel me. It was a case of passive resistance.

40. To what extent did you carry it out?—When Mitchell laid hands on me I went under compulsion.

41. You say Mitchell laid hands on you?—I do.

42. Was it not on your bike he laid hands?—On me also: he pushed me against the wall, and laid hands on my bike also. I got on the bike, and he pulled me off.

WILLIAM HENRY HIGGINS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No 15.)

Witness: I am sergeant of police stationed at Lawrence. I entered the Force on the 8th October, 1878, and was made sergeant on the 1st August, 1898—after twenty years' service.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make any general statement with regard to the matters under inquiry?—No.

2. Have you any opinion with regard to the general organization of the Force at the present time as compared with any other period of your experience?—My opinion is that the Force is just as well organized now as it was formerly. In Mr. Weldon's time—thirty years ago—discipline was very strict, but I believe it is even stricter, if anything, now.

3. And is the control fairly effective?—I think so.

4. How many men have you in your district?—Three men, and they are all men of some years' service. I have been out of touch for over three years with the general body of men at head centres. I have been at Lawrence for three years on the 13th June last.

5. How do the men at the present time entering the Force compare with those who used to come in formerly?—A good many inquiries have gone through my hands with regard to applicants for the police, and I believe there is more searching inquiry made now than ever has been made previously. In fact, from the very time the applicant leaves school until he makes his application his history is looked into.

6. How do you account for unsuitable men getting in?—I have never heard of a case. I am only speaking from what correspondence has passed through my hands.

7. You are prepared to say that from your knowledge any inquiry has been searching and effective?—Yes.

8. What is the discipline as compared with past years?—Quite as strict and quite as good.

9. And the general efficiency is as good?—Yes.

10. Now, with regard to the sobriety of the men?—Well, I am out of touch with the great body of the men, but those under my charge are sober men. They are men of long service, and I have never known of anything against them in that way. I believe the general sobriety of the Police Force is better than you could get in most walks of life.

11. And as to the general morality of the Force, is that as good?—Yes, I think so.

12. Is there any way you could suggest in which the Force could be made more attractive, say, to recruits?—I think the pay should be a little more. I think 7s. 6d. a day—and it used to be only 7s.—is not enough for a man joining the service. He may be a married man with two or three children, and for the first twelve months after he joins he gets no house-rent. He has to live as close to the station as possible, and he is lucky if he gets a house at as low as 15d. or 18d. a day. Then he has to pay 5 per cent. or 6½ per cent. into the Provident Fund. He has to pay £2 for the making of his uniform, and all those things mount up. Then he is at the beck and call of the service. He is not like the ordinary labourer, who only works for eight hours a day.

A policeman is never free. I think he should be given 6d. a day more. These men have a certain position to keep up; they cannot live in any hovel, but must try and live in a respectable locality.

13. Do you think the pay at present is sufficient for the single men?—I do not.

14. The married men are surely the worst off?—Quite so. I have eleven of a family, and I am in a place where living is high, and there is no employment for my family. However, I have made no complaint, and I will get out of it in time, I suppose. Nine of my family are girls, three of whom are in work, but there are four for whom I cannot get work. I cannot send young girls to town away from home.

15. You have no particular complaint to make, I suppose?—No.

16. You have had no experience of political or other interference?—I have heard it spoken of as long as I can remember, but I do not think there is much in it. I have never asked for anything since I joined the service, and I was five years in the Armed Constabulary before I joined. I have never asked any one to advance my interests, and I have only made one application for a station in twenty-eight years, and I did not get that.

17. You have heard it mentioned as being used?—I have heard it spoken of among the men. It has been said that So-and-so has had political influence, but I do not know that there was any truth in it.

18. Have you ever seen cases of promotion which seem unaccountable except on that basis?—No. You might hear some man say So-and-so got a certain station through some influence being used, but it is only hearsay, and hardly worth repeating.

19. With regard to the methods of promotion, have you any opinion?—Of later years they have been promoting men who have not the same amount of service as was the case in Commissioner Tunbridge's time. Then we had to have about twenty years' service. It is not so now, and that is the only difference; but it never bothered me.

20. You were never asked to pass any examination?—No.

21. Do you think the men who are promoted at the present day are as efficient as the men used to be?—I suppose they would be, but I have seen very little of the men generally for over three years.

22. Should there be a limit of age in the promotion to a sergeant?—I dare say that would be a good thing.

23. What should you say should be the limit?—I should say forty-five years—that is, if it was for street duty. I have done a good deal of street duty in Dunedin, and it is hard work, especially on the feet. You require to be strong to go through it.

24. What standard of education should be required of a man to qualify him for promotion?—I could not say. The Fifth Standard is supposed to be the standard of entrance, but I consider that too high. I have seen some of the best policemen in Otago thirty years ago with very little education, but with a good deal of common-sense.

25. Have you any opinion in regard to promotion from the detective branch to the higher offices?—I think the detective has just as much right to get advanced as any other man. I have never known a detective who was not at some time a uniform man, and why should he be debarred from promotion; and if a man gets to the rank of Chief Detective, I do not see why he should not aspire to the rank of Sub-Inspector.

26. Do you know of any feeling in the Force contrary to that?—No.

27. You have been in the backblocks practically for some time?—Yes.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have nothing to complain about?—No.

29. You say the Force is as well organized as it was before?—Yes, to my way of thinking.

30. Equally strict as regards control?—Yes.

31. You say political influence is spoken of?—Yes, ever since I have been in the service.

32. It is not recent only?—No; when I was in the Armed Constabulary the same kind of thing used to be spoken of.

33. You have had several investigations to make as regards candidates for the Force: do you consider those investigations to have been strict?—Very strict. In fact, there was one case of a young man who backed out of it eventually, but his papers went backwards and forwards for some time, and it seemed to me the investigation was too strict for him. A man would have to have a real good character to get through.

34. When the reports were not satisfactory they were returned for further inquiry from you?—Yes.

35. Have you ever heard allegations made that in respect to single men there was no inquiry made into their character, and do you believe that?—No, I do not, because I know I have made inquiries myself.

36. As regards promotion to sergeant, you think the age-limit should be forty-five years. The age at the present time is fifty?—I should say forty-five for street duty.

37. Do you approve of the present system of promotion as regards placing the men promoted in a city?—Certainly.

38. And then, according to seniority, be placed in charge of a station?—Yes.

39. That system has not been in vogue very long?—No, I know it is only of recent years.

40. And it seems to give satisfaction?—Yes; I never heard any remarks passed about it.

41. As regards the detective branch being promoted to the uniform branch, suppose there is a Chief Detective senior to the uniform man, and better qualified in every way for promotion, should that senior detective remain as he is and the inferior man be promoted?—I should say he should not.

42. I suppose you do not know the system obtaining in other Police Forces?—No, all my experience is in Otago. I think those of the detective branch should be given the same chances as are given to those in the uniform branch.

TERENCE O'BRIEN, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 16.)

Witness: I am Inspector of Police in charge of the Dunedin district. I entered the Force in the month of October, 1874, as a constable. I was appointed sergeant in 1877, and in the month of March, 1881, I was appointed detective. I continued in that branch of the service, finishing up as Chief Detective in 1899. I then became Sub-Inspector, and at the end of 1900 I was appointed Inspector. I have been in charge of the Dunedin district about seven years and three months.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make any general statement before I ask a few questions?—I think I am only voicing the feelings of the Force throughout the Dominion when I say that each and every one of them has full confidence in the Minister of Justice who is now the head of the Department. I think, if matters are fairly and impartially presented to him, any cause for dissatisfaction that may now exist amongst the members of the service will soon disappear. I desire further to state that I have neither directly nor indirectly communicated with Mr. Arnold, Mr. Taylor, or any other member of Parliament respecting matters in connection with the Police Department recently mentioned in Parliament. I think that little explanation necessary, as some of the remarks I am about to make will be on the same lines as some of those referred to by Mr. Arnold. In the first place, I think it only fair to the present Commissioner of Police to tell him that there is a general impression amounting to a feeling of unrest prevailing amongst the members of the Force—I might say from the extreme north to the extreme south—that he has stationed in each centre some member of the service who is known as a useful man, that man's chief function being to convey to the Commissioner through some channel or another the names of members of the Force who speak in praise or in dispraise of him. I know nothing of such appointments myself. I do not say there is one word of truth in it, but I think it is only fair to the Commissioner that he should have an opportunity of denying it on oath.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have heard it, you say. You know nothing of it yourself?—No. If there should be anything in that opinion, all I can say is that I am afraid some of the constables stationed in my district have not been speaking very favourably of the Commissioner. For some reason or another, there is little or no promotion amongst the constables stationed in the district, nor has there been for some years. I have recommended constables whom I thought would be efficient, honourable men—men deserving of advancement in the service—and to my surprise those men have not been promoted. There may, of course, be very good reasons for that: it is for the Commission to say.

3. I shall get those names from you subsequently, of course?—Yes. I think also it is desirable, in the interests of the service, that the Commissioner should take more notice and give more effect to the recommendation of his District Inspectors. I have made other recommendations which, to my surprise, have not been acted upon. I contend that the Inspector in charge of a district has the best opportunities of knowing the requirements of that district. He is continually amongst the people; he is conversant with them, meets them both in town and country, and he knows their wants. He also knows the men who are stationed under him. He knows their capabilities; he knows the stations they are fit for and the stations they are not fit for. Those are advantages that the Commissioner does not possess. Therefore, if the opinion or recommendation of the Inspector is worth anything at all, when he makes a recommendation some weight should be given to it. I contend that transfers in the Inspector's own district should be absolutely made when the Inspector recommends them; and in the matter of recommending constables or appointing constables to no-license districts I think the Inspector in charge of the district should have his absolute choice. The Inspector knows what his men are capable of doing, knows what class of offence they are most likely to be keen in detecting, knows where they are likely to give satisfaction to the residents and where they are not. In the matter of recruiting constables, I think it would be far better if Inspectors in charge of districts were allowed to enrol a good man when they see the opportunity without asking that man to go to Wellington and present himself there for enrolment. In the days of the Provincial Councils each provincial district had a separate Force of its own, having either an Inspector or a Superintendent at the head of affairs in each of those districts. To my mind, in those days, when each Inspector or Superintendent, as the case may be, enrolled his own men, they had a better class of constables and sergeants than we have now. I have lived long enough in the service to realise that a clean-handed, pure-minded, and efficient Police Force is one of the most valuable institutions that any civilised country can possess; and if we are going to have such a Force in this Dominion I think it is highly necessary that we should offer more inducements to the better class of young men to join the service than we are doing at present. I consider the pay of the constable joining the service is at present too low. He should, I think, commence at no less than 8s. a day, and, instead of his increment of 6d. a day every four years, I think that increment should come about every three years. Again, in the matter of house-allowance, which now stands at 7s. a week, I consider that is far too little for a constable who has to perform duty in a city and reside there. I think his remuneration in the way of house-allowance should be at least 10s. 6d. a week, and that he should have added to the free list of uniform which he is now receiving one pair of boots per annum. At present no boots are supplied with the uniform. I think the sergeants stationed in cities should have equal advances in pay, and that their house-allowance should be increased to 14s. a week. I believe the time has arrived when the Chief Detective at each centre should attain the rank of Sub-Inspector. That would not, I think, entail any increase in pay, as in all probability the Chief Detective now receives as much as a Sub-Inspector, who may be appointed from the general Police Force; and I think the Chief Detective, when he attains to the rank of Sub-Inspector, should receive the same house-allowance as the Sub-Inspectors are receiving at present. Detectives serving under the Chief Detective should, I think, after a certain number of years, attain to the rank of sergeant-detective, and then junior detectives might be styled detectives only; the plain-clothes

constables to remain as they are at present, receiving, of course, the allowance they now receive for plain-clothes work. I think it would be a cruel thing to say that because a man elects to join the detective branch of the service anybody should say to him, "Now you may go on until you attain the rank of Chief Detective, but there you must stop." Well, to begin with, the detective is selected for his work simply because he shows more intelligence, more tact, and more ability than the ordinary constable. Then, why should he be debarred from attaining higher rank in the service—even that of Commissioner—provided he has the ability to fill the position? There is one other little matter I desire to refer to, and that is the number of defaulters from other districts who have been sent to this district during the last four or five years, which has occasioned me great surprise, so much so that I begin to look upon the Dunedin district as a common dumping-ground for defaulters. On the other hand, as is the case in all other districts, I have my defaulters here, but my defaulters in about nine cases out of ten are left with me. They are not palmed over on to the Inspectors of other districts. There may be a reason for that—I do not know. I have had a constable sent to me not long ago whose defaulters sheet gave me very great concern. It was anything but creditable to the man, and the question that arose in my mind was, Why was this man not discharged from the service in the district from whence he came? I scrutinised the sheet very carefully, and I asked myself three very serious questions: what the man could have been doing at a certain place at a certain hour of the night, or, rather, I should say morning. I do not know what the explanation was, but no doubt the matter must have been investigated. The explanation may have been a feasible one, leaving upon the mind of the investigating officer perhaps an innocent impression; but I have not had an opportunity of perusing the papers.

4. *The Commissioner.*] I am calling for the papers in that particular case?—Then, I think you will realise what I mean, sir. However, I shall not proceed further on that subject. As to the mode of recruiting constables at present, I must say I am not in agreement with it. I have had constables sent to me from the depot to this district whom I could not conscientiously recommend to a master chimney-sweep for appointment. When those men got into the service I can only think there was either bad judgment or neglect to scrutinise, to say the least of it. By that I do not mean to convey the impression that their general character had not been inquired into. Very probably it had; but the physique and the general intelligence to be found in those men was something very terrible indeed, for neither physique nor intelligence could be found there. There is one other little matter which has also given dissatisfaction in this district, and that is the apportioning of rewards for special services, such as convictions in the matter of sly-grog selling. I shall only quote one instance where a conviction for sly-grog selling took place in a no-license district. The person convicted was a notorious sly-grog seller, and he gave a great deal of trouble for, I think, over a year. In that district I had a very zealous constable stationed, who I know of my own knowledge had worked very hard indeed both day and night for months and months in order to bring this offender to justice. Finally he succeeded, and a heavy penalty—£50, I think, and costs—was imposed. In that case I recommended that the full reward—that is to say, £5—should be given to the constables responsible for this result. The full reward was not given. I recommended that four-fifths of the reward should go to the constable stationed at the place where the conviction took place, being the constable who had done the major portion of the work. The duties of the only other constable who was concerned in the matter extended to assisting in executing a search-warrant which took him from a quarter of an hour to twenty minutes. The reward was apportioned in this way: £2 10s. was given to the constable who did the major portion of the work and £1 10s. to the constable who did practically nothing at all. It is needless for me to say that the constable who did the work was somewhat disappointed. I wish also to recommend that, in the matter of departmental investigations, the Inspector holding the inquiry should have the power to swear his witnesses just as they are sworn in a Court of justice. Every Inspector of Police is a Justice of the Peace, and I see no reason why he should not be empowered to administer an oath at these inquiries. It would be a safeguard to the constable accused or the sergeant, as the case may be, and it would be a safeguard to the Department. As we know, there are some people very good-natured and very obliging, and if a constable should happen to get into a little trouble, and he should go to one of those people and say, "There is a little trouble in connection with which I may be fined or punished, but if you come along and tell the Inspector so-and-so I will get out of it. You need not fear any consequences. There is no oath to be taken. You have only to mention the matter to him; that is all." I think that should be discontinued as early as possible. Officials of the Railway Department who are not Justices of the Peace have the power at present to take evidence upon oath—that is, the evidence of any witness at an inquiry—and I think it is quite as desirable that the same practice should obtain in the Police Force.

5. Have you verified that statement with regard to the Railway Department?—I have, sir. I did not believe it until I actually saw the thing. I discussed the matter with a railway servant, and he convinced me of it. I do not know that there is anything else I desire to refer to specially.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have had occasion to have a little grievance?—I am not aware of that.

7. We had a previous Commission here?—That is so.

8. What was the result of that Commission as regards yourself—I am sorry to have to be placed in this position. What recommendation was made—

The Commissioner: That is on record. I have a copy of the report.

Mr. Dinnie: I simply want to show that the witness—

The Commissioner: If I remember rightly, that recommendation did not provide for Inspector O'Brien being here, so that evidently the recommendation was not carried out.

Mr. Dinnie: Well, I shall not proceed with that any further.

Witness: I will say this in answer to your question: that, whatever recommendation was made by the Commission at the time, it was, I think, brought about by the evidence you gave in Wellington at the last moment, before the curtain dropped on that inquiry.

9. *Mr. Dinnie*.] Do you really think the Commission would not take into consideration the evidence they had obtained here?—I do not think there was anything in the evidence obtained here to justify the Commission making any recommendation which would be at all to my detriment.

10. Then, I am sorry for the Commissioners if they would not take into consideration the whole of the evidence obtained here, together with that which I gave them. The Commission would be a farce otherwise?—Then, I should be very sorry that any Commissioner of Police should think it proper to make a charge behind an Inspector's back which he dare not make to his face. You refrained from giving evidence in Dunedin while I was present—while I had an opportunity of asking questions and of calling evidence to disprove any allegation you might make. You went away to Wellington, when neither Sub-Inspector Green nor myself were present, and you made, according to the newspaper account, sweeping statements which we were never given an opportunity to contradict or disprove.

11. Did I arrange in any way how the evidence was to be taken?—I do not know what you arranged. I only know what you did.

12. Did I not give my evidence when I was asked to?—Probably you did. You say that notice should be taken of something that transpired in Dunedin in evidence. Why did you not, then, in Dunedin give your evidence, and give Sub-Inspector Green and myself an opportunity of saying something in reply?

13. I should have been pleased to do so, but I was not asked to do so. My evidence was kept to the last. I was bound to give my general evidence at Headquarters?—You were not bound. It was open to you at any moment to step into the witness-box in Dunedin and give what evidence you chose.

14. I do not know whether that can be called a fault of mine or of the Commissioners?—It was evidently the fault of yourself.

Mr. Dinnie: It was due to an arrangement by the Commission that my evidence should be taken at Headquarters.

The Commissioner: I was not sitting alone on that occasion. I have a perfect recollection of what took place, so far as Mr. O'Brien's position is concerned. That particular Commission had no idea of the lines on which the Commissioner would give his evidence. It was merely a matter of convenience that he should give his evidence in Wellington, to finally clear up the proceedings of the Commission. Very likely if we had been aware that in that evidence there would be statements reflecting upon any officer who had already given evidence we should have heard those statements in the districts in which the officers were stationed. I propose to adopt that practice throughout this Commission. The Commissioner of Police will be sworn once for the whole of the sittings of the Commission, and at each locality where any individual is affected he will be asked to give his evidence, so as to clear up the matter once and for all.

Mr. Dinnie: I think you will remember, sir, that it was in answer to a question from yourself that I said anything in respect to Inspector O'Brien at all.

The Commissioner: Naturally, I would want your opinion as Commissioner of Police as to the manner in which the Inspector had discharged his duties. I did not know what your answer was going to be. Possibly a mistake was made in not hearing your evidence in Dunedin, but I will see that the same difficulty does not arise again.

15. *Witness*: No; but I think I have your assurance now, sir, that you did not in any way prevent Mr. Dinnie from giving evidence in Dunedin.

The Commissioner: All he had to do was to come forward and give it. We expressed the opinion that it would be more convenient that he should close the Commission by giving his evidence in Wellington. Of course, we could not anticipate what the nature of his evidence would be.

Witness: Well, I feel quite satisfied there is no other Commissioner of Police in the British dominions who would have done what he did on that occasion.

16. *Mr. Dinnie*.] That is a matter of opinion?—Yes, and I put it forward boldly.

17. So that you have a little grievance?—No, I am not a man with a grievance at all.

18. *The Commissioner*.] At any rate, the grievance is not a matter which is likely to affect your evidence now?—I have no grievance, sir.

19. *Mr. Dinnie*.] You suggest I have placed a man in each of the centres as a sort of spy?—I did not suggest anything of the kind. I said it was a matter commonly talked about by men of all ranks from the north end of the Dominion to the south.

20. Will you give any instance of any one telling you so?—I will mention no names.

21. I mean, to the Commissioner?—I will say I have heard it from all ranks of the service.

22. I shall be very glad indeed if you will give the Commissioner the names of any persons who have given you this information. You say you have recommended a number for promotion, and that none of those recommended have been promoted. Are you sure of that?—I am sure of everything I say, Mr. Dinnie.

23. I think you have recommended very few for promotion. Who have you recommended during the last year?—I presume you have the papers there. I might say that, in consequence of these failures to promote, there has been a tendency for men in my district to apply for transfer to a neighbouring district.

24. *The Commissioner*.] On the supposition that they would not get advancement here?—I do not know. Probably they thought promotion would come about quicker in another district.

25. *Mr. Dinnie*.] Here is your last list. Here is Constable McIntyre, who is acting Inspector of Weights and Measures. Is he fit to be promoted to the rank of sergeant?—I think so, otherwise I should not have recommended him.

26. Are you aware he has been to see me?—No.

27. Are you aware he says himself he is not fit to perform street duty?—I am not.

28. We will call him later on. Then, you recommended a man named West: what is his length of service?—I should say, considerably over twenty years.

29. What is his age?—I do not know exactly, but I know you have promoted men who are very much older than he is.

30. I have not promoted a man of over fifty years of age, and West is over fifty?—I do not know what his age is, but still I will assert that you have promoted a constable to the rank of sergeant who is older than West.

31. *The Commissioner.*] Will you give us his name?—Sergeant Donovan, at present stationed at St. Albans.

Mr. Dinnie: That requires explanation.

Witness: Does Mr. Dinnie say that Sergeant Donovan was not promoted in his time, sir?

Mr. Dinnie: No, I do not.

The Commissioner: How did he come to be promoted?

Mr. Dinnie: He was offered promotion before I came here, and he accepted it.

Witness: I thought the promotions were usually made by the head of the Department.

Mr. Dinnie: He was promoted by the Minister of Justice, but not on my recommendation. It was very much against Mr. Tunbridge's wishes.

The Commissioner: Did you protest against his appointment to St. Albans?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, I explained the position, and stated I could not recommend him, as the papers will show.

32. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The next man you recommend is Matthews: do you know what has become of him?—Yes; he is now at the Chatham Islands. He is an excellent man undoubtedly, and deserving of promotion. I am aware he had only eleven years' service in 1907, but I have known constables of only ten years' service promoted.

33. District clerks, I suppose?—Yes; but why?

34. Because of their special qualifications. The next man you recommend is McKenzie, a man of similar service?—Yes, another man deserving of promotion, to my mind.

35. Your recommendations are not very strong. In the case of West you say he is a steady, reliable constable, has a very good general knowledge of police duties, writes a good report, and is not likely to place himself under obligation to any one. As regards Matthews, you say he is a steady intelligent constable, with a good knowledge of police duties, writes a good hand, and frames a most intelligent report; further, that he has passed the late police examination. As regards McKenzie, you say he is a good constable, has a fair knowledge of police duties, writes a fair hand, formulates a good report, is active and always ready when definite duty is to be faced?—Well, I think that is a good recommendation.

36. But you know there are recommendations from other districts?—No doubt.

37. You will recognise that men of more than eleven years' service are recommended by other Inspectors than yourself, and perhaps better men?—That may be so. In connection with a point you referred to a little ago, I shall name another constable who was promoted to the rank of sergeant some considerable time after he had attained the age of fifty years. That is Sergeant Morgan, of Canterbury.

Mr. Dinnie: I have not the files here to show his age, but I do not think he is over fifty.

The Commissioner: I know he is a most excellent officer, and I think he is more than fifty years of age.

Witness: If I say he was over the age of fifty-five at the time of his appointment will the Commissioner of Police contradict me?

38. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There may be special cases where men are promoted, and I think it is only right. Your recommendations have been few?—You speak of 1907 only. There have been recommendations later than that.

39. How many did you recommend last year?—Three, I think.

40. One was West again, I suppose?—I believe so.

41. And the other two were Taylor and McKenzie?—Yes.

42. What service had they?—I do not know exactly.

43. What service had McKenzie?—Ten or eleven years.

44. What is the length of service for which men are promoted now, barring special cases, such as district clerks, for instance? Is not the least about fourteen years?—No, I think there are some promoted whose service does not amount to that.

45. And who have not special appointments?—I know nothing about special appointments.

46. Who was the last man promoted, do you remember?—Eccles.

47. He was a man who came to your own district?—He was not in my district when he received his promotion.

48. What was his service?—I do not know.

49. Now, fourteen years' service is the lowest I have recommended for promotion. With regard to these men of yours, West was over fifty years and the other two had only twelve years' service?—Yes, but the question arises, why is West, who you say is over fifty years, not promoted, in the face of the promotion of a man who was about sixty at the time of his promotion?

50. I do not know of any man of sixty, but if there is such a man I suppose it would be because that man had better qualifications than West, for instance?—I have had experience of both, and, if I am any judge of qualifications, the man who has not been promoted is by far the better qualified of the two. Both have been stationed under me, and I have had good opportunities of knowing them.

51. That apparently is not the opinion held by others?—Of course, opinions may differ, but I assert it boldly. I do not speak at random. I think before I speak.

52. You think transfers should be left to the Inspectors to deal with as regards their own districts?—Yes, I think the recommendations of the Inspector should be given effect to without fail.

52A. Do you not know that there are a great many transfers that must take place as the result of misconduct and other reasons, and that certain men are qualified for certain stations?—That is what I have been trying to impress upon the Commission. The Inspector has the best opportunity of knowing who are qualified for certain stations.

53. Suppose you wanted a man transferred from your district to another?—If I thought it was in the interests of the service that he should be transferred I should submit the matter to the Commissioner, giving my reasons, and let the Commissioner deal with it as he thought proper.

54. Suppose there was no vacancy in the other district for him?—Then let him wait.

55. Would you keep the man waiting about for a vacancy?—No, I think the Commissioner should wait until he can find a vacancy. The Inspector has control of his own district only. Outside that he has no control, and that is why I suggest those transfers should be left to the Commissioner. He knows where the vacancies are and the stations most suitable for the men. But I referred only to transfers from station to station in my own district.

56. You know there are not always vacancies available, and it is almost impossible to carry it out in that way?—It is quite easy, Mr. Dinnie, changing constables from one station to another.

57. You know we have frequent applications from men for transfers from one district to another, owing to ill health and all sorts of reasons, and owing to the difficulties we meet with in effecting transfers, do you not think it is best left to the head of the Department? We have also men to be transferred on account of bad conduct, and I am afraid if the matter were left to the Inspectors we should be in serious difficulties as regards transferring men from other districts when there was no vacancy for them?—Quite so, but I spoke only of transfers within the district itself.

58. I am afraid constables would not always accept transfers in that way?—If I had my way, constables would have to accept what was given to them. I was transferred to two or three different stations during the time I was constable, sergeant, and detective. I never objected to go to either of those stations; in fact, I dare not object. I think that system ought to obtain to-day.

59. Do you not think we should get better work out of a man if he is pleased to go to a station instead of his having to go against his will?—That may be, provided you have a station vacant, but I am speaking of where there is no station vacant, but where a transfer is desirable in the district. It may happen that a man was unsuitable for a certain station because his hands were tied and for other reasons; the Inspector, being in the best position to know those reasons, should have the power to change that man with some other man who would be more suitable for that particular station.

60. Is that not frequently done?—It is only done by sanction of the Commissioner. That sanction may be readily granted in some districts, but in other districts the recommendation is given a deaf ear to.

61. In what other districts would you suggest that applies?—The Dunedin district for one.

62. Any others?—I do not know of any others.

63. The question of transfers is a matter of opinion, and I shall not press it further?—With regard to junior constables who have been promoted to the rank of sergeant, I omitted to mention that a constable named Muggeridge, in Wellington, whose service had not extended much beyond ten years, if at all, was promoted to the rank of sergeant.

The Commissioner: I see he entered the service on the 1st July, 1899, and he was promoted on the 1st October, 1906.

64. *Mr. Dinnie.*] He holds, I think, a special position, does he not?—He holds a very nice snug position. He is departmental storekeeper.

65. Well, that is a responsible position. He has to deal with all the clothing, he has to collect money, and he is responsible for everything there, is he not?—I think we have other constables acting as Clerks of the Court in towns who also collect money, and who have responsibilities very much greater than those of the sergeant in charge of the stores in Wellington. That man has so many suits of clothes, so many pairs of boots, and so many blankets to take charge of, and he has a safe place to keep them in. If he does not properly account for those things he is easily detected, and where does the responsibility come in any more than that of the constable who is acting as Clerk of the Court in a country township, where he may have to receive as much as £200 a week, and account for it?

66. Do you know anything about this constable's qualifications as regards education and otherwise?—No; but whatever his qualifications are I consider he has no right to be promoted over other men who are equally as good, and whose service is, at any rate, five years longer.

67. You think, whatever his qualifications may be, it should not affect his promotion?—It should when the proper time comes. Not before.

68. You have spoken in disparaging terms of some of the men who have been sent here and placed under your charge?—I have stationed under me in this district some of the best constables that any Inspector could wish to have under him—men who would be a credit to any Police Force in the world. On the other hand, I have some who, to put it mildly, are not quite so good.

69. What does your annual report say about the conduct of those men for the last three years?—There is one annual report for each year.

70. What have you said in your reports for 1906, 1907, and 1908?—Fairly good.

71. You have said more than that. Here are your own words. I will take the report for the year 1906: "The conduct of the members of the Force has, with a few trifling exceptions, been exemplary, and considering that the majority of them are but young in the service, they have, on the whole, proved themselves fairly efficient"?—I did not say there were not exceptions, you see.

72. This is your report for 1907: "During the year the conduct of the members of the Force, with very few exceptions, has been exemplary, and very few punishments have been found necessary. They have performed their various duties in a manner conducive to the public welfare and to the credit of themselves." This is for the year 1908: "During the year the conduct of the members of the Force has, with very few exceptions, been most exemplary. Only in very few cases has it been necessary to inflict punishment. Their duties are multifarious, and, on the whole, they have been performed in a satisfactory manner." Those are very good reports really as to the conduct of the men?—I spoke of them as a body. You see, I refer to exceptions.

73. Have you made representations about this at any time?—Many a time verbally. There are many things one does not care to put in an annual report. There should be confidence between the Commissioner and the Inspector, and they should discuss between them many little things in connection with the Force which should not be placed upon paper.

74. Why should not this be placed upon paper? What is the annual report for?—I have given you there the general conduct of the men as a body, and, as you see, I say there are a few exceptions.

75. I believe in records putting everything in black and white, and then we should know what you are talking about. Now, as regards pay, the last rise in pay was 6d. a day all round, practically at the end of 1907?—Yes.

76. Do you know what recommendations as regards pay have been made by me recently?—I do not know what you have recommended.

77. Nor as regards lodging-allowance?—No.

78. With regard to Detective McGrath, was there anything wrong in promoting him to the rank of Sub-Inspector?—Certainly not. Knowing his capabilities, I consider him a very suitable man.

79. And you think promotion ought to be open to the detectives?—Yes, to the highest rank, even to that of Commissioner.

80. You also believe there should be the rank of sergeant amongst the detectives?—Yes.

81. As in other Police Forces?—Yes; that rank obtains, I think, in other Forces, including those of Australia, I believe.

82. Have you ever compared the pay and allowances of our own Force with those of other Forces?—Not for some considerable time.

83. You spoke of a constable who had a bad defaulter sheet: do you know the circumstances under which that man was appointed?—No.

84. Perhaps you know his service?—His service was very short indeed. I saw his defaulter sheet.

85. *The Commissioner.*] I have it, and I know it struck me at the time I saw it.

86. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You mentioned a sly-grog selling case, in which a reward of £2 10s. was given to one man out of a total reward of £4?—I did not find fault so much with the amount of the reward as with its apportionment. The man who did practically nothing was rewarded nearly as well as the man who did all the work.

87. There was 20s. difference. Without the file I cannot go into that?—Perhaps I might be allowed to mention another case of promotion of a constable who, I think, was over the age of fifty at the time. I do not for a moment infer that he should not be promoted. I simply raise the question of his age, to show that there is in reality no uniform age for promotion, although the circular says we are to recommend men between the ages of forty and fifty.

Mr. Dinnie. I think it says "men of over ten years' service who are under fifty years of age."

The Commissioner. We can get the circular afterwards.

Witness. With regard to a district clerk, I do not think he has any more claim for promotion after he has attained ten years' service than has any other man. I think he should wait his turn. When he becomes district clerk or clerk in an Inspector's office he is allowed 1s. a day extra, and he has a good many privileges that the ordinary constable has not. He has every night in bed, and his hours range from 9 o'clock in the morning till 5 in the evening. He gets off on Saturday afternoons and on Sundays, also on a good many public holidays. I will say this for my own district clerk, that between 8 and 9 every Saturday night he collects the mail from the Post-office, opens the letters, does any minuting he considers he is capable of doing, and places the correspondence on my desk. He is not, however, compelled by any instructions from me to do so. He is a most zealous and attentive man, and takes as much interest in the work as I do, and I take this opportunity of thanking him, and showing my appreciation of his services.

87A. Do you know that your opinion as to promotion of district clerks to the rank of sergeant is at variance with that of all the other Inspectors?—That may be so, but it does not alter my opinion. Of course, after a man has been fifteen to twenty-five years a district clerk he should be appointed a sergeant when the proper time comes, but not before. I say there should be no cast-iron rule laid down for the promotion of a man doing work in a district office after he has served ten years. It engenders a spirit of discontent amongst the men who are out in the street in all weathers, and who have to handle any drunken roughs who may be misbehaving themselves.

88. Do you not think a man requires to have special qualifications for duty as district clerk?—His education should be above the ordinary constable.

89. Is he not the right-hand man of the Inspector?—To a certain extent, and he gets his 1s. a day extra for that up to the time—say, fourteen or fifteen years—when he should in his proper turn be promoted to sergeant.

90. Do you know how clerks are treated in other Police Forces?—No.

91. This is the memo. as regards promotion: "Constables under fifty years of age with over ten years' service are fit for rank of sergeant": do you remember that circular?—Yes; and recommended constables over ten years' service, and they were not promoted.

92. But they had not fourteen years' service?—They were approaching it, and some had a great deal more. I will give you another instance. I remind the Commission of Constable Lees, at Roxburgh. His qualifications are very good. He is a very fit man to be promoted, but he has not been; he is about fifty-three or fifty-five, but he was much younger when I recommended him.

93. You recommended a man name Dale?—I did not strongly recommend him, and he was promoted. Regarding the standard of education, I should like to say that, in my opinion, the standard should be kept up to the Fifth. I think the man whose degree of education is less than that is very likely to shirk duty which entails the writing of a report. You very often find a constable would rather not see a thing that would entail the writing of a report if he can possibly get out of it. If we can get physique as well as a degree of education up to the Fifth Standard it would be well. But discretionary power might be given to the Commissioner, where a man's physique and other surroundings are good, to enrol him although he has not passed more than the Fourth Standard.

94. *The Commissioner.*] You are then liable to open the door to complaint by aggrieved people that they were not accepted under similar educational conditions?—I would simply give the Commissioner power to reduce the standard in certain cases.

95. Would it not be better to lower the general standard to the Fourth?—I would be very much against lowering the standard except in exceptional cases.

96. I am not in favour of lowering it, but if you cannot get sufficient candidates who can pass the higher standard you must necessarily reduce it?—I am told there are excellent men in the back-blocks who have only passed the Fourth Standard, but who would make very good men.

97. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You do not know the number of application forms we send out to men who apply for enrolment which are not returned?—That goes without saying.

98. Nor the number of men who apply to me at my office, and when they are told they have to pass the Fifth Standard nothing more is heard of them?—No.

99. Do you not think we are apt to lose a great many men of the farming class who might turn out the very best constables, but are not eligible owing to the Fifth Standard requirement?—I do not think there is much excuse for young men not being able to pass it.

100. *The Commissioner.*] But the fact remains that—I am not speaking by the book—the great majority of lads in the country leave school after passing the Fourth?—A great many do.

101. *Mr. Dinnie.* The Fifth Standard is only on its trial, so far.

102. *Witness.* I am a great believer in farmers' sons as candidates for the Force.

WEDNESDAY, 14TH JULY, 1909.

JAMES NEIL, Botanical Chemist, examined on oath. (No. 17.)

Witness. I reside in George Street, Dunedin. I have a small grievance against the police. I do not think they are sufficiently zealous in trying to protect the liberties of public speaking. I have been at public meetings, from which I have been glad to escape with my life, where there were three or four thousand people, and seats and things were broken, and it was a wonder heads were not broken too, and there were only two policemen. After a time I succeeded in getting outside, and saw five constables and a sergeant, and I asked them if they were going to do anything to save people from getting killed. The sergeant asked what they could do, and I said, "You can go and let the people out, at any rate." They did go, and in a quarter of an hour the place was quite orderly. Some men fear neither God nor man except a policeman, and as soon as they see one they are cowards. I have known of a man paying £5 for the rent of a hall, and not being allowed to speak one word owing to roughs taking possession, and I noticed two policemen at the back of the hall enjoying the fun. My personal grievance is that policemen do not like open-air preaching.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What have policemen to do with that?—Well, a number of young men come along, and have not the sense to go away if they do not like to listen, but make mischief, and prevent people from speaking. I have been preaching at the Fountain for five or six years, and sometimes they come and throw water over me, and knock my hat over my eyes, and even push me down. I have complained to the police of it.

2. To whom?—Not any one in particular—the Force as a whole—and I have been told I ought to take a hall for preaching. I said, "The people I want to speak to will not go to a hall." The law allows liberty to speak in the open air. I have preached in Glasgow, Belfast, London, New York, and Melbourne, and have never been handled so roughly as in Dunedin. I thought there was a law preventing juveniles from smoking, but in my experience numbers of young senseless lads get behind me and smoke me off the place. I was told by the Inspector that there is only one man from the Octagon to the Monument, and he could not be everywhere. I said he did not want to be everywhere, but he could put in an appearance occasionally, and if there were any complaint he could attend to it. So long as open-air preaching is allowed by law, policemen should try and stop senseless disturbance. I would suggest that one or two plain-clothes men should attend sometimes, and make an example of one or two of the disturbers. As a citizen, I consider I have a right to have my liberties protected so long as I say nothing blasphemous, galling, or personal.

3. Have you made any complaint to the authorities?—Yes.

4. To any responsible head?—I have complained to the Inspector. My complaint was that I was maltreated by these roughs.

5. What was his reply?—One time a mob followed me to the police-station, and one came behind me and pushed me down. I was told by the Inspector that all I could do was to summons him.

6. Do you suggest that the Inspector or person in charge of any district should send constables to protect the local preachers throughout New Zealand, because that is what it would amount to? In Christchurch it would take half the Police Force?—Those who go out in companies represented by organizations with drums to drown the trouble are all right, and are left alone, but when one like myself is not backed up by authority the trouble arises, especially when politics are mixed up with it. I find my platform now being taken by the socialists, and they get a good hearing, because if any boys make trouble they let them have it.

7. You suggest that a constable should be handy to take notice of all who interfere with you?—If they maltreat me.

8. If they do that it is the duty of the police to take action if they see it. You want the police specially told to watch?—Yes, I have offered to pay for a plain-clothes man to take names of one or two.

9. Did you see the Inspector or Sub-Inspector?—Both.

10. What was the reply given by each of them?—The Inspector said he would protect us as long as we did not interfere with the traffic.

11. When were you last interfered with?—About four months ago.

12. You have been preaching every Sunday?—Yes, weather permitting, every Sunday evening.

13. Your grievance, then, is not a very grave one?—No, but it is pretty hard to get one's hat knocked off. One reason I have not been interfered with lately is that the nights are too cold, and the boys do not come out.

14. Where do you get your audience from?—Men will stand for some hours listening to me, and some thank me very much for what I say.

15. Perhaps it will meet your views if I ask the Commissioner to instruct the Inspector to occasionally have a man round this place to see that if there is any physical interference proceedings are taken to protect you?—Just so; but I would like to ask whether freedom of speech is not to be protected.

16. In what way?—Roaring and shouting and throwing crackers amongst the crowd.

The Commissioner: The latter is an offence under the Crimes Act.

Witness: I thought I was justified in making these complaints.

The Commissioner: This will probably have the effect you desire.

WILLIAM RICHARD LUBY, Commission Agent, examined on oath. (No. 18.)

Witness: I am a commission agent.

1. *The Commissioner:* What kind?—Connected with the bookmaking fraternity. I live in George Street, Dunedin. I have no grievance against the police in general, only against one constable in particular, who was recently stationed in Dunedin. His name is Malcolm. I wish to ask whether any evidence I give will receive the same consideration as that of any other person.

2. Why not?—Because I have been in trouble.

3. I am prepared to attach the same importance to the matter as if you came into Court with clean hands; but when it comes to a conflict of evidence I should have to regard the evidence as being on one hand that of persons without a record and on the other of a person who has deliberately placed himself in the position of having some question attached to it. You can rely on anything you lay before me receiving full consideration?—I should like to call a Magistrate.

4. He probably would decline to give evidence on a matter that has come before him judicially?—I wish to make a complaint against this constable for the despicable methods he used in endeavouring to obtain a conviction against me.

5. Has the charge he brought against you been judicially disposed of?—Yes, the conviction was quashed on appeal. The constable, in giving evidence, committed perjury.

6. If he did so, there is no limitation of the time in which you can charge him with it as a criminal offence. It is, in fact, your duty, in the interests of the community as well as your own, to do so?—Is it not the duty of the police authorities to charge him? The Judge commented on the fact of my witnesses being respectable.

7. If it were in the knowledge of the Inspector that there was *prima facie* evidence of a constable committing perjury it would be clearly his duty to institute proceedings? Is that a sufficient answer?—Yes, but proceedings were not taken.

8. The Inspector is not here to-day. I think this evidence should be given in his presence?—Yes. The reason I asked the question was because I know a case in which the police arrested for perjury a man against whom a charge of indecency was dismissed by the Magistrate. If the Commission is open for suggestion, I wish to say that about three years ago I was staying at a boardinghouse which was under suspicion as being a sly-grog shop. While I was there there was a constable named Ross who should be in gaol for his carryings-on in that house.

9. Did you make a complaint at the time?—No.

10. Where does your suggestion come in?—That a man who has to inform and secure a conviction before he is put in the Force should not be there. A man who would do that would do anything.

The Commissioner: You are within your rights in making the suggestion, and I will not say I disagree with you in regard to the employment of probationary constables as informers.

Witness: I come before you on behalf of the women who gave evidence. I was staying with a woman who was separated from her husband. I was arrested, and charged with being a rogue, and when I was arrested a constable went into the house and told her the house was under suspicion, and asked if she knew she had been harbouring one of the worst criminals in New Zealand

—a rogue, perjurer, and liar. When the evidence came out he denied saying it. Further, when the woman went to the Magistrate to apply for maintenance he said he did not think he would give it her. The police had been to him and told him her daughter had run away with me to Melbourne. I never did so. That is why I wanted the Magistrate examined.

11. Probably if you went to Mr. Widdowson he would tell you what you want to know. Have you been to him?—No. The Judge commented on the respectability of my witnesses. If the constable went to the Magistrate and told him that, he does not deserve to be in the Force.

12. Did it affect the Magistrate's judgment?—Well, he said he did not feel inclined to make an order for maintenance, as she had me in her house. I must live somewhere. If I go anywhere, they will say I live in a house frequented by thieves. It is ridiculous to charge a man with living in a house frequented by thieves if there are forty rooms in it.

13. But you have to consider your record. Knowing that you are at all times under suspicion, if I were you I would get a small cottage, and try and build up your reputation again. Your complaint is that this constable committed perjury?—Yes.

14. Then it is your duty to lay an information against him, and not come before this Commission, which has no jurisdiction in the matter?—But this man has been promoted to acting-detective in Auckland. If I had given the same evidence as he did I should have been arrested at once.

15. The Court has power to direct prosecution for perjury, and the Court, if it thinks there is material to justify it, never hesitates to do so. It would seem as if the Court did not think there was justification in this case. Why did you not prosecute?—Because I did not think I should get any satisfaction. I have seen a lot of prosecutions for perjury, and know what the result is. I must say every time I have been to Mr. O'Brien I have got redress. But I submit, if it can be shown that a constable has committed perjury, the fact of his being in the Force should not stop the Inspector from laying an information against him.

16. In my experience, Inspectors never direct a prosecution for perjury as the result of a judicial investigation: they always take it for granted that that duty lying on the Judge, he will do it; and if he does not, I doubt very much if an Inspector would, as a matter of expediency. I would not make a complaint against the Inspector on that account?—I am not making a complaint against him.

FREDERICK MATTHEWS, Ironmoulder, examined on oath. (No. 19.)

Witness: I live in Walker Street, Dunedin. A few months ago I put in an application for a license for a billiard-room, and I have a grievance against the police in that the Town Clerk told me the police had put in a report and the license was refused. There was nothing against my character, and I want to know why it was refused.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you apply to the Inspector for information?—Yes; he said, "The police report is in, and I can't help you."

2. Did you ask the Town Clerk to let you see the report?—Yes; he would not show it me. I want to know what the police have to say against me.

The Commissioner: The report can be produced, if you wish.

Chief Detective Herbert: This man applied for a license, and the police reported on his fitness generally to have a place resorted to by large numbers of very young men and boys. Reasons were given to the Council which they considered good and sufficient to refuse the license.

The Commissioner: Personal to him?

Chief Detective Herbert: In regard to his having the conduct of a room—general fitness.

The Commissioner: What was the principal objection?

Chief Detective Herbert: His association with bookmakers and that class. The files will show the reasons of the police.

MICHAEL MASON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 20.)

Witness: I am stationed at North Dunedin. I entered the Force in July, 1905. At a meeting of members of the Force held at the central police-station on Friday last to discuss matters in connection with the service that were causing dissatisfaction I was appointed one of three delegates—Constables Butler and Fox being the others—to bring these matters under the notice of the Commission. We consider the rate of pay is not sufficient, owing to the present cost of living, and we have reason to believe that other departments are better treated, such as the Railway Department, which contains men similar to ourselves, and the Prisons Department. We think married men's house-allowance is not sufficient, being only 7s. a week. We have got to live in the city, and it is necessary to live in a decent house. The majority of married men are paying from 11s. 6d. to 14s. a week for a four-roomed cottage. Now, in the Prisons Department—similar to our own—the men get more pay, and £30 house-allowance as against our £18 5s. We suggest that the pay be increased by 6d. a day and the house-allowance by 6d. a day. In regard to uniforms, we think we should get our uniforms free. We have to pay for the making of our uniforms, which averages about £2 5s. We get an allowance of material for making two pairs of pants and one tunic every eighteen months. The Prison Department, we have every reason to believe, provides two sets of uniform every twelve months free of cost, and, in addition, provides two pairs of boots a year free of cost. Boots are a big item to the police, and they get none allowed them. I suggest that uniforms should be granted free, and also a pair of boots or two a year. In regard to annual leave, we are granted twelve days a year. We think this is not sufficient, owing to the fact that the police never get public holidays, and have generally got to work every day in the year. In some cases we get Sunday off and in some cases we do not.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You get no interim holidays at all?—No; we have the option of taking our holidays every year or of taking them all together every three years—thirty-six days. In the Prisons Department I understand they get fifteen days a year, and, in addition, they get ten days public holidays and every other Sunday off and every other Saturday afternoon, making about eighty-odd days a year, as against our twelve. In some cases we get a Sunday off, which means one holiday a year. I work 365 days a year, except the annual holiday leave. We suggest that the annual leave for all classes of the police should be increased by two or three days, which would give great satisfaction.

2. Have you made any inquiries as to the treatment of the staff in mental hospitals?—No. In regard to passes on the railways, we do not think we are treated liberally enough.

The Commissioner. I understand the Minister for Railways has declined to grant any concessions, and it is a matter for his discretion. The only possible way by which passes could be obtained would be by the Police Department paying for them, which is a big order.

Mr. Dinnie. I applied specially for them, and the reply was that the Department could not see their way to grant them.

Witness. I should like to say this: Owing to the fact that we can seldom get our annual holidays during public holidays we are unable to take advantage of cheap fares, and passes would be a great consideration. Railway men get passes for themselves and families at any time of the year. Then, again, when we are on annual leave we are liable to be called on for duty at any time.

3. *The Commissioner.*] Your holidays are granted subject to the requirements of the Department?—Yes. The Inspector in charge of a district may find, although your holidays are granted by the Department, that it is inconvenient for you to have them at the time. I think we should be granted a free pass when on annual leave, or, indeed, at any time of the year when we might want to go for a day.

4. When away on duty you get a pass?—Yes. The next question is that of promotion. I have no grievance in this respect, but I wish to say, on behalf of the meeting, that one or two promotions that have been made of young men in the service have given great dissatisfaction among the junior members of the Force. I am prepared to give one or two instances, and there are others, I understand, who will have something to say about it. One case is that of a young man who was promoted to the district clerk's office. There are men, I have reason to believe, who had seen as much service, if they were not actually superior to him, who applied and were overlooked. Ability seems hardly considered. I am not saying anything against this man, and do not say he is not fitted for the position, but it seems strange that some of the men who applied have passed the police examination, whereas he has not; yet he has been promoted.

5. By promotion you mean he gets certain additional emoluments?—Yes, such as every Sunday and every Saturday afternoon off. His name is Lennon.

6. Has it caused general dissatisfaction throughout the Force?—Yes, among the junior members. Another case is that where a constable was taken off the street and given a position two months after he joined in the district clerk's office: his name is Chalmers.

7. Was he exceptionally well qualified?—He is a particular friend of mine, and I have an idea as to his ability: he is just an average man, and has not passed the police examination. I do not say he could not if he went in for it. Any number of men could if they went in for it, but they do not bother about it.

8. Is there anything underlying that?—I do not know that there is, but there are many who may be fairly educated and yet be unable to pass the examination, because there are a certain number of catchy questions in it. I will not say that many appointments are not made in the best interests of the Department, but I wish to bring under your notice the fact that promotions have been the means of causing dissatisfaction amongst the junior members of the Force.

9. You contend that men of longer service and of equal qualifications should have the preference?—Quite so; if a man is sensitive it only needs a case or two like this—(if the Department do not consider it promotion the men do)—if this sort of thing goes on the young men will get disheartened and will leave the service. I cannot give any cases where they have done so, but I am sure they will. If I saw one or two cases where a man with no more ability than myself was promoted to a rank I had applied for while I was overlooked it would cause me to leave the service, because I should consider I had no chance. I have no reason personally to complain at all. I applied for promotion eighteen months ago, and have no reason to believe I have been overlooked.

10. You applied for promotion as what?—As acting-detective. I have reason to believe I shall get it when my turn comes. Although I quote these cases it is not because I envied the men at all.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards present pay and allowances, you do not mention what are the men's prospects: how long are they in the service before being entitled to a station, provided their conduct and qualifications are satisfactory?—From what I understand, from four to six years.

12. And then their position is pretty good?—I understand so.

13. Free rent, a good house, and other emoluments outside their duties in many places?—I have that to learn yet.

14. You get an occasional Sunday off in addition to your twelve days?—I have never got one off for three years.

15. How many men are there with you?—Five and a sergeant.

16. If it is the practice, you should come in with the rest?—I believe there must be some reason why it is not granted; these men may never have applied for it; I never asked for it. If I applied, I have every reason to believe the Inspector would grant it.

17. Do you know the qualifications of Lennon?—Not personally.

18. Do you know the qualifications of the other man you refer to?—Yes; I went through the depot with him.

19. Is he a good writer?—I do not think so.
20. Do you know he was recommended by his Inspector for the position?—I do not mean to say he was not.
21. Do you know he was selected from others because he was well qualified?—I fail to see it. Every man in the Force would respect this man—Chalmers—but he is no better as regards education than an ordinary man. There was one man at the time doing street duty who had four or five years' service, of very great ability, and I understood from himself he would have been very pleased to get the appointment.
22. Did he apply for it?—I cannot say.
23. Do you say men leave the service through dissatisfaction in this respect?—I say they are apt to do so.
24. You do not know of a case?—No.
25. You have no complaint yourself?—No.
26. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion in regard to the employment of probationers or young constables in connection with the detection of sly-grog selling?—I would not like to have anything to do with it as a probationer intending to remain in the service; but there are men who do not mind it. If I were a constable I would not mind it any more than any other duty.
27. You do not think it would be a sort of brand on you in the future?—No, it does a man no injury at all.
28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It is not desirable work?—No.
29. Not desirable to employ private individuals on?—No.
30. It is desirable such men should not be known?—Yes.
31. If an old constable were employed there would be danger of his detection?—Yes.
32. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any objection on the part of the police to coming into the general Superannuation Fund?—No.
33. You cannot tell me why they as a body think it more desirable to have their own fund?—I think one of the reasons is because they feel their own fund is pretty safe financially. The young members of the Force would prefer to go into the general fund, but the old ones do not.
- Chief Detective Herbert:* The handing over of £31,000 is one strong objection, and also the extra charge on men who have been ten years contributing. I would go up myself 1 per cent.
34. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] It seems to me it would be very preferable to have one general fund. Did you hear Mr. O'Brien's evidence?—Yes.
35. Have you heard anything about what he called the "useful man"?—I can say nothing about it: it has never been discussed at all. If there is one, I do not know him. I have not been very long in the Force, and have not come in contact with many except young recruits.
36. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The subject was not discussed at your meeting?—No.
37. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think the standard of education requisite for enrolment is high or low?—I think it is rather high, although I am satisfied a man wants to be able to pass the Fifth to be able to do his duty in a proper manner, though there are men who have only passed the Fourth who would get on just as well.
38. Assuming there is a difficulty in obtaining the right stamp of man for recruits, would you urge as an attraction first to increase the pay, and secondly to lower the standard of education?—I think if the pay and concessions in the direction I have mentioned were increased suitable recruits would be forthcoming.
39. How do intending recruits know of these conditions?—Well, before I thought of joining the Force as a single man my first inquiries were as to the pay and general conditions, and when I heard of the pay I decided not to have anything to do with it. As a married man, the occupation I followed—shearing—in Australia and different countries was not altogether suitable. I was married when I entered the Force. As shearing led to my having to leave my wife when going shearing to Australia and elsewhere I decided to apply for enrolment, as there was a living in it. Men in the country who think of joining first inquire from men in the Force as to the conditions, and if these conditions were altered I think intending candidates would get to know of it.
40. Are you aware, apart from the facts you have mentioned, of any general feeling of dissatisfaction in the Force with the existing order of things?—That is the only dissatisfaction I know of.
41. Have you ever heard constables speaking of political influence being used on their behalf?—No; I have heard the matter discussed.
42. With what result?—They seem to think such things do go on.
43. Have you ever heard any one boasting about having such influence?—No; men who would use it would be likely to keep it to themselves.
44. Is there drinking amongst members of the Force?—Not to any extent; individual members might drink. I think the majority—the young constables especially—are very respectable men.
45. How old are you?—About thirty-one.

VYVYAN RICHARD TAYLOR, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 21.)

Witness: I am in charge of Palmerston. I entered the Force in November, 1897. I would ask that constables should be allowed first-class travelling-allowance for their wives and families. I believe the higher officers are allowed it. If a man is transferred, for instance, from here to Auckland the Department compels him to travel by steamer for the sake of economy. He has a wife and family dumped into the steerage, and given a couple of frowzy blankets. I consider the wives and families of all members of the Force are entitled to as much consideration as those of any officer, from the Commissioner downwards. I would ask also that circular 1408 be cancelled, applying to men applying for positions outside the Force having to apply to the Commis-

sioner first. It is a free country, and I consider any man has a right to apply for any situation he likes if he thinks he can better himself without first applying to the Commissioner of Police. The Commissioner is reported to have said a short time ago that the duties of the men in the office are of a highly important and confidential nature, and that they must not be overlooked when promotion comes round. It appears to me as if the ordinary constable has not very much of a show. The men in district clerks' offices have more show than ordinary constables, being always under the eye of their superior, and uniform men are at a disadvantage. In the case of a man being brought into a district office or the Head Office he sits there for ten years and is promoted as a sergeant. There is a case in the last *Gazette*. A man named Cummings, who had just been ten years in the Force, and had not done six months' street duty since he had been in the service. He was nearly two years junior to me; and there are many whose qualifications are perhaps better than either of us. This sort of thing gives dissatisfaction in the Force. If there is a position for them, let them have a position of their own: put them into the Civil Service, or let them handle the lamp and baton and go out in the streets as others do, and take their turn for promotion. Then, I would ask that no man in the Force should have to answer charges brought against him by anonymous correspondents.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is that the practice?—I believe so; I have never suffered from it yet, but I take time by the forelock.

2. If it happened to you, would you decline to answer such a charge?—I could not question the Commissioner's orders.

3. Do you know it is a fact?—Yes.

4. Have they complained to you?—No.

5. How do you know?—I know men who have had anonymous letters written about them, and have been transferred—in fact, the man whose place I have just taken.

6. You believe that was the cause of his being shifted?—I cannot say that it was so. If a letter were written about me it would be probably sent to me, and the Inspector would come and make inquiries as to its truth. I say if a man has not pluck enough to put his name to a letter it should be put in the waste-paper basket. Another matter I should like to mention is the large amount of work entailed on constables in charge of country stations, who are Registrars of Old-age Pensions, for which they get no remuneration whatever. If the work were given to an outsider it would have to be paid for, and therefore the constable should have some remuneration.

7. Are you one?—Yes.

8. How many do you put through?—About seventy or eighty.

9. And you have to make all the inquiries?—Yes.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The circular you referred to reads, "In future, applications for situations outside the Force are not to be made without the sanction of the Commissioner being first obtained": Do you know that order obtains in other Forces?—No.

11. Do you not think it is desirable that the Commissioner should know your intention in such a direction, because he might have your name on the list for transfer or promotion?—No, I do not think it is right he should know.

12. Would he promote you if he knew you were going?—

The Commissioner: That might be an inducement to the man to remain, and that might be the reason for the circular.

Mr. Dinnie: If I knew he were applying for a situation I might let him know his chances and so retain the services of a good man.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In no case has an application been declined that you know of?—No, but I object to it on principle.

14. You quoted a Press statement about some remark I made: Press reports are not always to be relied on?—I said you were reported to have made them.

15. *The Commissioner.*] Under what circumstances were the remarks made?—I do not know; it was in the public Press.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any case in which a clerk has been promoted to the rank of sergeant, and sent out in the street?—No.

17. Then, does making him a sergeant interfere in any way with the men on outside duty?—I understand the reason the sergeantship came in was that in old times when an Inspector was away the clerk in the office had to forward correspondence and instruct officers higher in rank than himself.

18. But does such promotion interfere with the men on street duty?—Yes, because there is one more place which the uniform man has no chance of getting. I would put the clerks into the Civil Service.

19. But it does not interfere with the outside men?—Yes, because it makes one vacancy less.

Mr. Dinnie: Not at all, for there is no vacancy for outside men at the time.

20. *The Commissioner.*] The question with you is whether the clerks should not do a certain amount of outside work?—I think he should. I believe it was the practice once.

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to anonymous correspondence, do you not think it should be investigated?—I do not.

22. Do you know what the results of investigations have been?—I am only speaking of them as applied to men in the Force.

23. Do you not think it is my duty to investigate any correspondence I may receive from outside in respect to a constable?—No. I say the Inspector of the district will know if the man is what he should be, and if he does what he should do. There is no need for any one to write to the Inspector.

24. But supposing a man misconducts himself, and the Inspector does not know: he is not always with him; if he does so seriously, and an anonymous communication is received complaining of his conduct?—If he commits himself seriously all the world knows, and the Inspector first.

25. Supposing he commits a little indiscretion, do you not think the anonymous communication should be inquired into?—No.

The Commissioner: That is more an ethical question. I am not prepared to say I do not agree with the constable.

Witness: Any private employer would put such a communication in the waste-paper basket. I feel very strongly on this point.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You object to old-age pensions work being done unless the constable receives some remuneration for it?—Well, I cannot object. I am Clerk of the Court, and it is part of my duty.

27. You get £10 a year for being Clerk?—Yes, I am Clerk of the Court, Inspector of Factories, Inspector under the Food and Drugs Act, and Registrar of Old-age Pensions.

28. You receive other emoluments in addition to your pay—mileage, &c.?—That is infinitesimal. I should like to say it appears, and it is patent to every one, that for some time past, since the last Commission, Mr. O'Brien's district has been under a cloud—why we do not know—and promotions do not show out well in proportion to those in other districts.

29. *The Commissioner.*] Is this a matter of general remark amongst the police?—Amongst some of us.

30. It is felt?—Yes, and his recommendations are evidently not taken much notice of in the matter of promotion.

31. Have you ever heard about what he termed the “useful man”?—I cannot say I have.

32. But you know what he meant?—Quite well; and I believe he exists.

33. You have heard of it?—I cannot say I did until the subject was brought to my mind by what the Inspector said yesterday.

34. What accounts for your saying you believe he exists?—I fail to see why the district should be under a cloud for so long. There must be something radically wrong, or else the district is very inferior to other districts.

35. From what I can see it compares very favourably with any other district. You think a man is handicapped by being in this district?—Yes.

36. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What service have you had?—Fourteen years.

37. Do you know that the last constable promoted outside had fourteen years' service?—I cannot say.

38. And that no man has been promoted under that length of service outside?—Very likely. The recommendations of my Inspector have never been carried out.

39. Do you know how many men the Inspector has recommended in the last three years?—I am not in his confidence, and cannot say.

40. If I tell you that only one over fifty years of age, the rest being under fourteen years' service, has been recommended by him?—That may be.

41. Do you think that men with twelve years' service should be promoted when there are men with fourteen years equally qualified?—That rests with you.

42. *The Commissioner.*] Can you suggest any direction in which the Police Force could be made more attractive to recruits?—By better pay.

43. Is the standard of education required too high?—I do not think so.

44. How long is it since you have been out of touch with the main body of the police?—I have been in the country eight years; I do not know much about the central stations.

45. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have nothing to complain about in regard to your treatment?—No; but, speaking generally, there is a general feeling of dissatisfaction, especially in this district, and I think it is my duty to say so. It has been hinted that a man who comes here is a marked man, whose career is finished.

46. Who has said so?—I have heard it.

47. *The Commissioner.*] I have given the Minister's personal assurance to all the men that they need not be afraid of speaking out?—But the question is, can the Minister carry it out?

The Commissioner: I think you may disabuse your mind of that; all we want is the truth.

Witness: I forgot to say something in connection with railway travelling passes. When a constable is in charge of a country station, something may crop up which necessitates a detective being sent up to assist, and the constable and detective may require to travel somewhere together by train. When they get to the railway-station the detective gets into a first-class carriage, while the constable has to travel second class. The position, then, is somewhat humiliating to the constable, as superiority is not recognised in travelling. Then there was something mentioned in Invercargill in connection with sectarianism, when it was said we are all supposed to be tarred with one brush. Now, I happen to be a Protestant. I believe my Inspector is a Catholic, as are many of the other officers I have been under, and I should like to say for them that they have never allowed my religion to influence their treatment of me in any way whatever.

HUGH HENRY BUTLER, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 22.)

Witness: I am stationed at Dunedin Central. I joined the Force in 1905. I am one of three delegates appointed to make certain suggestions in the interests of the Force. We consider the rate of pay is not sufficient for the work we are required to do. We start at 7s. 6d., and after four years we get a rise of 6d., and so on till we reach the maximum of 9s. 6d., which is reached after sixteen years' service—practically half our service. We consider that uniforms should be provided free of cost. We are allowed material for the making of a tunic every eighteen months, and for trousers every nine months. Gaol warders, on the other hand, get two pairs of trousers and one tunic a year, and two pairs of boots free of cost. The making-up of our uniforms costs us about £2 10s. In the matter of leave, we get twelve days' annual leave, while

gaol warders get fifteen days, in addition to ten days Government holidays. They also get every other Saturday afternoon and every other Sunday all day. Married men should, we think, get a higher house-allowance. At present they are allowed 1s. a day, or £18 5s. a year, while gaol warders get £30, and they can live where they like, whereas we have to live within a certain distance of the police-station. We are liable to be called on at any time. In regard to passes on the railway, we get annual leave, but we can let it run on for three years. We are not allowed to take our holidays when it suits ourselves, but must take them when it suits the Inspector or the Commissioner. When we are on leave we are always on duty, and have to deal with drunks on trains, and so on; and if we see a row in the street, we have to take our part. Constable Mason forgot to say that if we cannot get free passes we would be satisfied with some concession. Every other member of the community can take a holiday at Christmas time or Easter when there are concessions on the railways, but we are not allowed to do so. We would be satisfied to be conceded excursion rates if we cannot get free passes. I wish to allude to a grievance on behalf of married men. There is a rule that all married men must go to and from their homes in uniform instead of being allowed as they used to be to keep a plain coat at the station to go home in. Some live at a considerable distance from the station, and may want to carry parcels home, or do some shopping, and it does not look well for a constable to do his shopping in uniform. Previous to the last Commission men were allowed to wear plain clothes going home. The married men feel this very keenly, as they consider they are put down as being as bad as the men who caused the recent trouble, and cannot be trusted to go home in plain clothes. Then, there are concessions in this respect made to certain constables who are allowed to go home in plain clothes. Not only that, but sergeants are allowed to go home in plain clothes. The married men feel very keenly about this matter, as it is very unpleasant for a married man to have to be seen speaking to his wife in the street in uniform, causing every one to take notice of a woman speaking to a policeman.

1. *Station Sergeant King.*] Are you aware of any instructions having been issued to the constables you mention authorising them to go home in plain clothes?—No, but I understand the Inspector has given them permission to do so.

2. Are you aware that the duties of one of them are partly plain-clothes duty?—My duties are very much the same as his.

3. Are you aware that instructions have been received from the head of the Department to the effect that men making old-age pensions inquiries must do so in plain clothes?—Yes. I am Court Orderly, and very often have to interview girls in reference to maintenance cases. The Inspector gave me permission to keep a plain-clothes hat and coat at the station for such purposes, but would not allow me to come to the station in plain clothes.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force apart from what you mention?—There is a general feeling of dissatisfaction, but I am satisfied. The last promotions in the district office caused some dissatisfaction: Constable Lennon was junior to myself.

5. Is there any reason why the clerks in district offices should not get a show?—No; but every third or fourth constable is capable of going into the office to-morrow.

6. You think the clerks should be given a turn at uniform duty?—Yes.

7. You have a lot of clerical work to do?—Yes; I was recommended by the Inspector for the last position, but I was passed over.

8. Do you know anything about political influence?—No.

9. The men in Dunedin are fairly sober?—They are very steady.

10. And bring no discredit on the Force?—No.

WILLIAM THOMAS BANDY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 23.)

Witness: I am a constable at the Central Dunedin Station. I entered the Force on the 1st March, 1908.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You desire to make a statement?—Yes. It is to the effect that when a sergeant reports a constable for any breach of the regulations, the evidence of the sergeant is given greater weight than that of the constable when neither have witnesses to substantiate their evidence.

2. Are you speaking as a delegate for others, or do you simply volunteer this evidence yourself?—I am speaking for myself only.

3. Have you suffered under this yourself?—Yes, on one occasion I was reported for alleged kicking up a row in the police billiard-room in Auckland. Sergeant Simpson reported me, and I knew nothing about the disturbance, as I was not in the room at the time. I had to produce five or six witnesses in order to save myself, while the sergeant had nothing to do but write out his report.

4. Did the Inspector hold that it was proved?—He said he would dismiss the case this time, but that he did not give much weight to the evidence of my witnesses. The sergeant said he saw me in the billiard-room himself.

5. Who were your witnesses?—Police officers.

6. We will call for the papers, and see what were the facts?—There was also another case, where a constable was fined for a breach of the regulations which he had not committed at all. It was the case of Constable Power, who was reported by Sergeant Anson for being off his beat; it was when I was stationed at Auckland. He was not off his beat, as I was speaking to him at the time.

7. Did you give evidence?—No.

8. Why did he not call you?—I suppose he had not the heart, or something.

9. Surely no man need be afraid of facing a charge when he is not guilty?—Lots of them face it and say nothing. A man is frightened of getting sat on, or of being marked afterwards.

10. For denying a charge?—Yes.

11. That is rather a grave reflection, because it practically means that there is almost a desire on the part of the superior officers to see their men get into trouble. I should have thought the contrary would be the case. Where is this man now?—In Auckland. He was fined 5s., I think.

12. It seems strange that he did not call you as the only witness who could have cleared him?—He could not call me then because I was away at the time.

13. Have you a clean sheet?—No, I have not.

14. When were you last in trouble?—In November, I think.

15. For some breach of discipline?—Yes.

16. Had the constable you refer to a good sheet?—This case was the only mark he had against him then.

17. I will look into the matter in Auckland thoroughly?—So far as you know, what is the feeling generally as to the administration of the Force?—There is objection to the way in which promotion is carried out. I have heard it spoken of amongst the constables in the district generally. Otherwise I have no complaint to make. I have not been here very long.

18. Were you in the depot in Wellington?—Yes, I was there six weeks, I think, after I had accepted.

JOHN FOX, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 24.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at the central station, Dunedin. I joined on the 1st September, 1906. I was appointed with two others by a meeting of constables to lay the views of the meeting before you, sir. The meeting was attended by the constables of the central station, and also of the North and South Dunedin stations. First of all, every constable in Dunedin considers that the present rate of pay is too low, and that this fact is in itself sufficient to prevent desirable men from applying for positions in the Force. Considering the unpleasant work a constable has to perform, and the risks he is exposed to, and the fact that morally and physically he is supposed to be almost perfect, and that he must have a fair education, he feels he is labouring under an injustice in being compelled to work for four years for 7s. 6d. a day. The ordinary labourer gets 8s. a day for work done between 8 in the morning and 5 in the evening. If he is called upon to work beyond those hours he is generally paid at the rate of time and a half, which would usually bring his pay up to about 12s. a day; while a great deal of the work of a constable is done outside those regular working-hours. Then, I think the Police Department is the only Department in which men have to pay for the making of their uniforms. This is considered an injustice by the men generally. Apart from the uniforms, the gaol warders are supplied with two pair of boots each year, and we consider we are just as much entitled to boots as they are, as there is no class of men so hard on boots as the beat-duty constables. It is also considered that when a constable travels on a train, whether on leave or not, he should be supplied with a second-class pass, as constables are always on duty in accordance with section 112 of the Police Regulations. Even if a constable is going on his honeymoon from Dunedin to Auckland, and some man commits an offence on the train, the constable has to attend to it under pain of a severe penalty. He may have to break his journey to have the offender dealt with. There is another little matter which, though it was not brought up at the meeting, some of the constables have asked me to mention. It is that a warrant card should be supplied to each constable to show who the bearer is, just as is supplied to constables in other Forces. It would be useful to a man in plain clothes, for instance, as a means of identification. Then, Regulation 128 makes it compulsory for single men residing at a central station to be in bed and have their lights out at 11 p.m. Well, it sometimes happens that a man may go to the theatre, and, as a play is not generally over before 11, if he remains to see the finish of the play he is liable to be fined. This regulation is strictly enforced. It is true that we can get late leave by making application in writing, but often a man may go out at 5 or 6 in the evening, and circumstances may arise which may make him wish to stay out later than 10 or 11. We suggest that the time should be extended to midnight. Beat-duty constables have only seven nights off in the month. On those nights they knock off at 5 o'clock in the evening, and are off until 9 o'clock next morning. There are some nights on which they go off at 9 o'clock, but they have to start work at 5 the next morning, and any constable of ordinary common-sense will not go out after 9 o'clock when he has to get up next morning at half-past 4. The men also complain of the system under which a sergeant visits each sleeping-room at 11 p.m. when the men who have to get up at 4.30 in the morning are generally asleep, and flashes his bull's-eye on the sleepers. It is, of course, not the fault of the sergeant, who under the regulations has to satisfy himself as to the identity of the sleepers. It is suggested that arrangements might be made for keeping a book in the ward room in which every man could enter his name before retiring for the night. Then, the beat-duty constables consider the lamps they have to carry are altogether out of date, and that something in the nature of this electric lamp which I have here might be supplied, and which was lent me by the firm of Turnbull and Jones. Not only are the present lamps inconvenient to carry, but they are dirty, and the oil soaks through on to the clothes and hands. This electric light seems to be quite as good as the bull's-eye now supplied, and I am informed by the firm that if some hundreds were ordered they could be supplied for 9s. or 10s. each—possibly less. They reckon it would cost about 6d. a month to keep them supplied, and they can be supplied wherever an electric-light station is in existence.

Mr. Dinnie: We have tried them, but they have not been found satisfactory altogether. They deteriorate as regards the strength of the light.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Something of the sort may yet be evolved, of course. Have you tested them at all?—No. With regard to holidays, at present we are only allowed twelve days' leave annually, and generally we have to take those days when it suits the Department. At Christmas and Easter time the constables are most required in the towns, and often we cannot get away when we want. Taking this into consideration, and the fact that the gaol warders are allowed more holidays, we think we are reasonably entitled to five or six days extra. The gaol warders, I believe, are allowed fifteen days annually, as well as eight or ten public holidays. We get a Sunday off every five or six weeks, and we think, if a different arrangement were made, we might get a Sunday off more frequently—that is, if the district clerks took their turn at Sunday duty. They are paid more wages than the constables, and they work only seven hours a day. They are off every Saturday afternoon and Sunday, and their work is much easier than that of the constable. Constable Butler, who is Court orderly, and Constable Edwards, the police photographer, do not have regular beat duty, but still they take their turn on Sunday, and we do not see why the clerks should not do the same. That would give the constables extra Sundays off. Beat-duty constables have a good deal of overtime to do. They have their ordinary eight hours on the street, and if there is an arrest made, or anything arises during the night which requires reporting, though they are not off until 5 o'clock in the morning, they have to get up at 9.30 and be at the Court at 10, and probably be at the Court for an hour, and, of course, their sleep is broken. They have to be on duty again at 9 o'clock at night all the same.

2. How do you propose to remedy that?—I can see it would be difficult to remedy.

3. Do you think that practice interferes with the discharge of his duties by the constable—that he may overlook things which he otherwise would not?—I am quite sure of it. He would prefer not to have his sleep broken. There is another grievance existing here. On the last day of each month there is pay and parade at 2.15 p.m., and there is drill from 3 to 4 o'clock, which has to be done in the constables' own time. They have to go on duty again from 5 to 9, and have to get up at 4.30 the following morning. The drill is ordinary squad drill, and most of the men think the drill unnecessary, as most of the movements that are necessary we repeat every time we go on duty. Then, the officers who are intrusted with this drill have been themselves drilled under the old system, and they get mixed up between that system and the new, and the result is confusion.

4. Who conducts the drill?—Sometimes the Sub-Inspector and sometimes the station sergeant. I do not want to cast any reflection upon those officers.

5. You think it would be better to have a special drill-instructor?—Yes, otherwise it is a waste of time. There is a certain constable here who has passed the age of promotion, and he and some others have asked me to suggest that the rank of senior constable should be again introduced. This would afford some recompense for long service.

6. Is it asked that there should be any increase in pay?—No, it is just a question of status.

7. Do you mean that every man over fifty years of age in the Force should rank as senior constable?—No, only those men whose conduct would entitle them to it.

8. In this case you are not speaking on behalf of the Force?—No, although I should not object to it myself. The matter has not been considered by the Force as a whole. Then, with regard to promotion, there is a feeling that the district clerks have brighter prospects than have the constables on the street; and, again, some of the constables consider they are looked down upon by these men when they are put into office.

9. They are comrades, are they not?—No, they seem to have been removed into a different sphere when they leave the ranks of the police. Personally, I have not experienced any different treatment from them, but the general impression is that they are considered above the men in the street. Many of the constables consider they are just as capable of carrying out the duties of clerks as are the men in the office.

10. Have you any ambition to be placed in the office?—I should like it, of course, but have never applied. There are constables senior to me who have applied, but there does not seem to be much chance to get in.

11. You seem to be well qualified. Your handwriting is good, and you are able to put your words together very well, and I wonder you have not applied?—I have never given the matter serious consideration. Perhaps it is want of ambition on my part.

12. Is it considered that there is any favouritism shown in the selection of men for district clerks?—I can give no personal grounds for thinking so, but it seems to me that generally there is favouritism shown. Concerning promotions generally, there is a very unpleasant feeling amongst the Force and some of the outside public that if a constable happens to be a member of a Masonic lodge or an Orange lodge his chances of promotion are brighter than they otherwise would be. I do not like to mention this, but, in accordance with the oath I have taken, I think I should. I do not know how this feeling originated. I think myself it may have originated in the columns of a newspaper widely circulating throughout the Dominion, and if the Commission will give an assurance publicly that there are no grounds for such a feeling it will ease the minds of a good many of the men in the Force. The newspaper I refer to is the *New Zealand Truth*.

13. In what particular direction is it considered this favouritism is shown?—In the appointment of men to what are known as soft jobs—office jobs, and so forth. I am not even prepared to say that there are any grounds for such an impression.

14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think 11 o'clock is quite late enough for the men to be in their quarters and have their lights out?—Generally I think it is; and personally I am in bed, as a rule, before that time.

15. Is it not necessary, do you think, that the men should be in by that hour—10.30—and have the lights out at 11, and that the officers should know they are there, if discipline is to be maintained?—Yes.

16. With regard to a constable wanting to go to the theatre, as you know, he can do so by applying for late leave; and I understand you have no special grievance in that connection?—No. I have explained the little difficulty from the men's point of view.

17. You suggest the men should enter their names in a book before retiring, in order to obviate the necessity of a sergeant coming round and flashing his bull's-eye on the men when they are asleep: do you think that would be a safe method of ascertaining whether the men are there?—It was only a suggestion. I do not know whether it could be carried out or not.

18. With regard to the district clerks, they, of course, wear plain clothes: perhaps that has something to do with the feeling of jealousy on the part of the uniform men?—I could not say. I have no feeling of jealousy towards them myself.

19. And the extra shilling a day to the clerks is practically plain-clothes allowance?—Yes; but I would point out that while our uniform costs only about £2 a year, the plain-clothes allowance to the clerks amounts to £18 5s. a year.

20. With regard to the constables having to appear at Court in the morning in the event of an arrest after they have been up all night, I suppose your suggestion is that they should sometimes be allowed off at night—say, the following night?—Yes; I would say that the officers here are very reasonable, and that sometimes a man is allowed off under such circumstances.

21. *The Commissioner.*] I suppose it is one of the drawbacks of the service. You cannot keep the business of the Court waiting until a man has finished his sleep?—Yes. I have no practical suggestion to make in regard to it.

22. With regard to Inspector O'Brien's evidence yesterday, do you know anything about what he called the "useful man"?—I had not heard of it before that. Since then some of the constables have expressed surprise that I had not heard of it. They evidently had done so.

23. Do you think the carrying-out of some of the suggestions made by you would tend to make the Force more attractive to recruits?—Yes; that was the object of my suggestions.

24. Have you heard the question of political influence discussed?—Yes, I know there is a feeling that political influence has a great deal to do with promotion, but I am not able to point to any instance myself. I have never heard any man say he had political influence. It is just an impression that exists; I cannot say why.

25. Are you satisfied with the local conditions—administration, and so on: are you fairly treated?—I am perfectly satisfied.

26. Are you married?—No.

27. Are you satisfied with your quarters at the barracks?—They are all right.

28. What kind of bed do you sleep in?—We have to supply our own beds now. We use some of the old bedsteads that are still there, and we supply the rest ourselves, including the spring mattress.

29. What does it cost you, on an average, for messing in the barracks?—About £2 12s. 6d. a month, or about 13s. a week.

30. Do you live well for that?—Oh, yes, fairly well.

GEORGE BENNET EDWARDS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 25.)

Witness. I am a constable stationed at the Central Dunedin station. I joined the Force on the 1st May, 1905. I am not here as a delegate, nor do I come with any grievance of my own. I am simply taking advantage of your invitation to come here and show that there is dissatisfaction in the Force in general. I do not think there is any use in my going over the questions which have been already threshed out. The dissatisfaction is most profound as regards promotion, and in the instances I am going to give I do not wish to mention names, but will hand you in the list. "A" joined on the 1st December, 1906, and was sent to Auckland a month or two later, and was appointed to the district office. When that man was in the depot in Wellington he was recognised by the men as the dunce of the batch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Educationally or intellectually?—Both. I have this from his depot mates. "B" joined on the same day. Commenced duty in Wellington, and was then transferred to Greymouth. I do not know what services he had at either place. He was then transferred to Dunedin, and on the 1st July, 1908, he was sent as mounted constable to an out station where there is only a sergeant and another constable. "C," who joined on the 1st September, 1907, after five or six months' service was transferred as second man to a country station. In the case of "D," who joined on the 18th June, 1907, at Auckland, he did not, I understand, go through the depot at all. I do not know when he was mounted, but he was nine months later to my knowledge. He was called upon to resign on the 28th February, 1909. The last two are constables, and this is connected with dissatisfaction in the Force generally, and has nothing to do with promotion. They came from another country, and when they had been a few weeks in New Zealand they were sworn in and transferred to some station. One joined on the 31st March, 1908, and left on the 30th November the same year; and the other left on the 22nd December the same year. It is a cause of dissatisfaction amongst the men, more especially the colonials, that ex-constables from overseas should come to New Zealand and get sworn in at a moment's notice, even when they have no credentials as to education and so on, while colonials who have had their applications in for two or three years fail to get taken on.

2. Can you give any instances?—In my own case, my application was in for only eight or nine months before I was appointed; but I consider myself fortunate. There are, however, three constables in my batch who had their applications in for something like two or three years; while another man who applied at the same time, and who had been only three months in New Zealand, was sworn in, and he is now second man at a country station. I would suggest that no man should

be eligible for admission to the Police Force until he had been twelve months in the Dominion. That would tend to remove some of the dissatisfaction. With regard to the district clerkships, I will only say that the position is looked upon as the plum of the service.

3. Are you married?—I am married now. I was single when I joined.

4. You get 7s. a week allowance for rent?—Yes. You cannot get a house within quarter of a mile of the station under 14s. or 16s.

5. Do you know anything as regards this dissatisfaction in the Force which has been spoken of by other witnesses?—There is discontent right through, practically.

6. What is it due to, in your opinion?—It is due to a feeling amongst the men that no one but favourites can get on.

7. Favourites of whom?—Of the officers and heads of departments.

8. The Dunedin Inspector's grievance is that his recommendations are not given effect to. Do you refer to Dunedin only?—No. I was in Christchurch during the whole of the Exhibition time, and came in contact with men from all parts of the Dominion, and from conversations I had with them I am in a position to say there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest. Another grievance is that defaulters coming from another part of the district are given the soft jobs. I refer more particularly to a certain man at a smaller station who was dismounted; he gets a share of the relieving and the soft jobs, and he is a defaulter.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have those defaulters been punished by being sent here—reduced in pay, or anything of that sort?—I know they have been fined. As to whether they are reduced in pay or not I cannot say.

10. Have any of them been appointed to special duties here?—I am not in a position to say that.

11. You know who has the placing of them?—One of them, I have no doubt, got his position through yourself. Whether he was recommended to you or not I cannot say.

12. With regard to ex-constables coming here from other parts, you know it is stated on the application form that the Commissioner has power to appoint any ex-constable provided his qualifications are satisfactory?—Yes, I am aware of that. I would mention one little instance to show that intending recruits appear to think they are better off in their present jobs. One young fellow who sent in an application made a few inquiries afterwards as to the duties and so on, and he came to the conclusion that he was better off at £1 5s. a week and found in his present job. He considered the wages were too low in the Police Force.

13. *The Commissioner.*] Why is mounted duty especially sought after?—The mounted man has greater liberty. He is not under the direct rule of any sergeant. He has practically every night in bed. The position is almost as much sought after as that of district clerk.

LUKE MULLANY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 26.)

Witness: I am sergeant of police, stationed at Port Chalmers. I entered the Force in June, 1885, and was promoted sergeant in December, 1904. I was just on three years at Port Chalmers.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any statement to make?—On the question of pay I should just like to say that if constables on joining were paid 8s. a day we should get a better class of men than we have been getting recently. I do not think the present educational test is too high or too severe. I think sergeants should start at not less than 10s. a day, and the increments should be as at present, or perhaps a little more, up to about 13s. a day. As regards the appointment of Chief Detectives to the rank of Sub-Inspectors, I have no objection to that, provided station sergeants are made eligible for the position of Chief Detective. If a sergeant wished to go into the detective branch I think he should be allowed to do so, and take his seniority in that branch.

2. Have you thoroughly considered the effect of that? A man before attaining the position of Chief Detective must have gone through a very long and trying experience. He would have to go through a certain routine?—The same thing would apply to Chief Detectives joining the uniform branch. He would have no more knowledge of the work of the uniform man than would a station sergeant have of the detective work.

3. But the detective would have worn the uniform before going into the detective branch, and would have gone through the ordinary routine?—Some of them would have had very little training there. I should not mind so much if a sergeant were allowed to go into the detective branch and carry his seniority with him, without disturbing the position of Chief Detective. A sergeant only receives 12s. a day, while a chief Detective receives 16s. 6d. a day. I think the length of time a sergeant is in the service should count—that is, from the time he entered the police itself. Some of the sergeants have brought their seniority from the Armed Constabulary, and I do not think that is right, as the work in the constabulary was of quite a different nature. With regard to travelling, I think sergeants or constables, when transferred, should be allowed first-class railway and steamer fares, as is the case in other branches of the service. I think, also, if members of the Force were given some little concession when travelling on leave it would be greatly appreciated by all ranks. With regard to the general physique of the men at present, I have been for a number of years at country stations, and when I returned to town I was greatly struck with the fact that the physique and general appearance of the men, as compared with those I had worked with twenty years ago, had greatly deteriorated.

4. To what do you attribute that?—A good deal to recruiting from the ranks of returned troopers from South Africa. Although I look upon some of those men as very good men, I think, upon the whole, recruiting from the returned troopers has been a failure, and I think it has been the means of introducing a good deal of what may be termed the larrikin element into the Force. As to influence, I cannot say that I know of any having been brought to bear so far as promotion

or anything else is concerned, but it is generally considered that when a man is passed over and then promoted years afterwards some political influence has been used. I do not know whether it is so or not.

5. When you speak of political influence, what do you imply by that?—That a man has friends in Parliament or elsewhere.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you aware that the uniform men have the same opportunities of getting into the detective branch as the detectives have of getting into the uniform branch?—I was not aware of that.

7. Do you know of any constables who have been appointed to the detective staff after very short service?—I understand they would have about four years' service.

8. They would then only be appointed acting detectives temporarily until they are tried?—I do not say anything against that.

9. Are you aware that very few returned troopers have been taken on since I came to New Zealand?—The time I refer to is nearly five years ago, and I know a number of them were taken on in Christchurch when I was there.

10. Do you think they have not been a success?—No, a dismal failure.

11. You say the physique of the men has deteriorated. You know they have to pass a medical examination, and must come up to certain measurements?—Yes; but still I do not think the physique is what it was.

12. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Have you only learnt to-day that if you had chosen to join the detective department, instead of remaining in the uniform branch, you would have had an opportunity of doing so?—Yes, as sergeant I mean.

13. Are you aware that Sergeant Siddells was transferred to the detective department?—Yes; but I am aware he is the only sergeant who has been so transferred.

14. Do you know whether any other sergeant has applied to join?—No.

15. You were in Dunedin for nearly four years on beat duty: did it ever occur to you then that you might have been a detective if you had wanted?—I was asked if I would take the position when I was in Dunedin.

16. Do you not think it would be fairer, if you wanted to be a detective, to get in at the bottom and gradually work up—say, in twenty-five years?—A man may alter his opinion a good many times in twenty-five years.

17. Would it be fair that a sergeant who had no previous detective experience should step in at once at another branch of the service with the same rank?—A man must have considerable experience before he is appointed a sergeant. He has had experience of the detection and prevention of crime and of all other classes of work connected with the service.

18. They have often to send for a detective, with all their long experience?—It is not on account of their inability to do the work in the district, or on account of the exceptional ability of the detective branch, that they send for a detective, but it is because the sergeant in such a district has other duties to perform, and they have to send for assistance. It is simply a question of time.

19. Is not one of the main objects in sending for a detective in order that the responsibility may be transferred?—No.

20. Do you say a Chief Detective is not properly trained or qualified for the position of Sub-Inspector?—No.

21. Do you think it would be unfair competition that he should come into the uniform branch as Sub-Inspector?—I think, if the position is going to be given to the Chief Detectives, the uniform branch of the service has little or nothing to look forward to.

22. Do you realise also that the detective or the Chief Detective has nothing to look forward to?—I have no objection to the Chief Detective being appointed to Sub-Inspector provided a sergeant is given an opportunity of getting into the detective branch.

23. Have you discussed this question with the other sergeants, or are you giving only your own opinion in this matter?—It is my own opinion only.

24. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think there is any feeling of dissatisfaction amongst the members of the Force with regard to the present conditions?—I have not been very much in touch with the police generally, but I have no knowledge of any dissatisfaction if it does exist.

25. You have no grievance yourself?—None whatever.

THURSDAY, 15TH JULY, 1909.

JOHN DOWNEY, Miller, examined on oath. (No. 27.)

This witness detailed circumstances which some twenty years ago led to his being charged with abusing a policeman and being fined £2 by the Magistrate. He submitted that he had been wrongfully interfered with by the policeman, and asked the Commissioner to endeavour to get his money back for him.

The Commissioner told the witness that it was impossible for him to review the decision of a Magistrate.

TERENCE O'BRIEN, Inspector, further examined. (No. 28.)

Mr. Dinnie: I desire to submit the report of the Commission held in 1905, specially calling attention to that part dealing with the supervision of this district. I make no comments, but leave the Commission to judge whether Mr. O'Brien's opinion is right as regards my evidence, and the result thereof.

The Commissioner: The unfortunate part of it is that I have not got the evidence. I have never even seen it. The reporter got so far behind with his notes that neither Mr. Poynton nor myself ever saw the evidence, our report being made solely on the newspaper reports, which were fortunately exceedingly full.

1. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You made a slight mistake the other day, Mr. O'Brien, as regards the promotion of Constable Dale: I think you did recommend him?—Yes, I intended to correct that part of my evidence the first thing. I did not strongly recommend him was what I should have said, and I wish that alteration made. There are certain reasons given in the report why I did not. I regarded him as an efficient constable, and a man of some energy, but there were certain matters over which he had no control which were sufficient reason for my not recommending him. The constable I had in my mind whom I did not recommend but who was promoted was Burroughs, station sergeant at Waikouaiti.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Were you ever asked to report in regard to him?—Yes.

3. And he was promoted?—Yes.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think in the last three years you have recommended six men for promotion?—The files will show I am pretty careful not to recommend a man I consider not deserving.

5. Were they West, MacIntyre, Matthews, Dale, McKenzie, and Taylor?—Yes.

6. West was about fifty years old?—Yes.

7. *The Commissioner.*] What is your general opinion as an old police officer of what should be the age-limit for promotion?—About fifty.

8. A man over that age should not be promoted, having regard to the duty in cities being heavy?—No.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The circular is not out of place in respect of age, requiring that men should not be over fifty?—That is reasonable. When I first recommended Dale I think he was under fifty.

10. Do you know that McIntyre refused to take up street duty, being unable owing to his health?—No; so far as I know he has never been offered promotion. He is employed in the Weights and Measures Office, Dunedin.

11. Why has Matthews not been promoted?—I do not know; I know he accepted an appointment in the Chatham's some time ago, but he was recommended for promotion some time before he was asked to accept that appointment.

12. What was his service?—Thirteen or fourteen years.

13. Dale was promoted?—Yes.

14. McKenzie and Taylor have not yet completed thirteen years?—I cannot say without the list.

15. Out of six, one, who is fifty years old, has not been promoted in accordance with your recommendation?—Yes.

16. In regard to transfers, do you know I have a list containing thirty or forty names applying for transfer from one district to another? If you were to adopt your system of obtaining men from your own district, how would you deal with these applications?—I do not ask that that should be done; I suggested my changing men already stationed in my district—sending one man to another station, and sending the other man back to where the first came from.

17. Supposing a man applied, because of his own or his wife's health, to get another district or climate, what are you going to do?—That is a matter for your consideration.

18. Then, that is a reason for transfers being left in my hands?—I do not suggest that every transfer should be taken out of your hands at all. I suggest that in my own district I should have the power to change a man from one district to another. Then if you afterwards think he ought to be sent away to another district and another man sent here in his place, by all means do so.

19. That would leave transfers entirely in my hands?—To that extent.

20. You know a good deal about the system of investigation as to candidates for enrolment in the service?—Yes.

21. You know the form that is used: do you think the inquiries are carried out carefully?—Yes, so far as I know.

22. Could you suggest any better system of investigation?—Yes. Very often these inquiries are made by practically inexperienced constables in charge of country stations. In my opinion, no man under the rank of sergeant should be intrusted with such inquiries; if a station sergeant, or Sub-Inspector, or even the Inspector, can do it, so much the better.

23. *The Commissioner.*] But how about the local knowledge the man in charge of the station has—though I quite agree with you theoretically?—His local knowledge might assist very much, but the sergeant could interview the local constable amongst others.

24. He should be specially detailed to go to the locality and make inquiries?—Yes, to insure thorough investigation.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Constables in charge of stations have considerable experience before their appointment?—Some of them.

26. *The Commissioner.*] Is service altogether the point? I know some in charge of stations I should be sorry to take the opinion of?—They would have a service of six years.

27. I want the matter of clerks appointed to do work in a district office made quite clear. What is their mode of selection? There is a great deal of dissatisfaction apparently in the Force?—First of all, you must have a good penman; that is absolutely necessary—a man who writes an ordinary legible hand. Then I want to be satisfied in my own mind that he is thoroughly honest. Then I want to be satisfied he is discreet, and that he will not go blabbing the contents of the correspondence to every Dick, Tom, and Harry about the station or in the street. Hitherto I know the service has suffered very considerably on this account—loose-tongued constables in the district office.

28. In taking an untried man you are liable to get a blabber?—That is so; but I say an Inspector should not be compelled to take any constable into his office to assist the district clerk until he has known him for a period of at least two years.

29. Is the selection of the men absolutely in your discretion?—No.

30. You recommend?—I do not recommend. If a constable makes application for appointment in a district clerk's office, I submit the application to the Commissioner, with my own remarks.

31. Why wait for the men to apply?—I do not if I have the selection of the men myself; but as soon as a vacancy occurs in my office the Commissioner sends me a man from some other part of the Dominion. The last two vacancies in my office, the Commissioner sent me two men from other places—strangely enough, they were two brothers: the first was an absolute failure, the second one I have not had long enough to say anything about.

32. You advocate having the right of selection amongst your own men?—It seems to me in every district the Inspector, if he keeps his eyes about him, can find suitable men for his own office amongst his own staff.

33. There is no difficulty whatever in adequately filling the position?—Not the slightest.

34. You know that this state of things has led to a considerable amount of dissatisfaction?—I know it does, and also causes embarrassment to the service.

35. It could be virtually overcome by giving the Inspector a free hand?—Yes, and a man should be known to the Inspector for at least two years before being allowed to go into the district office.

36. Let me quite understand: say a vacancy occurs in your office, and you are aware it is about to occur before it actually occurs; if simultaneously with your knowledge of the vacancy being about to occur you forward a couple of names of men you strongly recommend for appointment, what is done with them, or do you do it?—No; in my own case the Commissioner has filled the vacancy as soon as it became vacant.

37. But have you ever forwarded the names of any of your men to fill such a vacancy?—I think I have.

38. Have they been appointed?—I have one man in my own office now whom I recommended myself, and am pleased to say he gives entire satisfaction.

39. *Mr. Dinnie.*] That is Chalmers, is it not?—Yes.

40. *The Commissioner.*] How many are there in the office?—Two besides the district clerk, a sergeant, whom I regard as being thoroughly efficient and reliable.

41. Is there any reason why the junior men should not be occasionally shifted?—I think it very necessary.

42. Is it work that the men cannot easily pick up?—A man with any ability at all could soon pick it up.

43. The men could be shifted back into uniform again, and give other men a chance?—That would be regarded as a grievance.

44. Is there not as much grievance the other way?—Possibly.

45. The only point that would influence my judgment against the view I am taking would be the efficiency of the staff: if it would render it less efficient that would be the strongest objection: do you think the shifting of the junior men would prejudice the work of the office? How long would it take a man to get into the running?—Any man of any capacity could get into it in a week or a fortnight.

46. Does a man who gets into the office stop an indefinite time?—I think the longer he stays the more efficient he becomes: he knows where to place his hand on files, and returns, and records.

47. But I am speaking of the clerks in the office—not the district clerk?—They might be occasionally shifted.

48. It is a very valuable training for the constables, is it not?—No doubt; but when once they get employment in the office, if you were to put them into uniform again and make them go on street duty, they would dislike it, and regard it as a grievance.

49. If you put them into the office, and told them they would simply take their turn, with a view of qualifying for other work, they should not have any grievance in the matter?—I may mention that when the last man was sent to fill a vacancy in my office I had recommended a few very good men indeed.

50. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Senior or junior to him?—One had been appointed, I think, the same day; he was on the spot, and was a man I could be thoroughly satisfied about. But no option was left me, and I had to take the man who was probably a pet somewhere else.

51. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views with regard to the employment of young constables or probationers for inquiring into sly-grog selling, or that class of offence?—As we are situated at present, we have no option in the matter; as a rule, constables dislike it, and it is not in every case an agreeable duty.

52. Does it affect the subsequent efficiency of a constable?—I do not know that it does; the offence must be dealt with.

53. It is not desirable to employ local men: it is not desirable that a man should remain in the locality after doing this work—he becomes a marked man?—To a certain extent, he does; it depends upon how he comes out of it. I may say the man I recommended for a position in the district office was a man who had passed the police examination; the man who was sent to fill the position had not.

54. In regard to small breaches of discipline, what do you do when they are reported by the sergeant?—A great deal depends on the nature of the offence.

55. In regard to minor offences, say, on the part of a young constable?—It is sent to the constable for his explanation, if it is some trivial matter; if of a more serious nature, the con-

stable has to attend at my office to answer the charge. The charge is read to him, and he is asked whether he admits it or denies it; if he denies it, then the evidence of the officer reporting him is taken.

56. Who is present?—Usually the Sub-Inspector and whatever sergeant may report him.

57. It is a sort of formal court-martial from the initial stage?—Yes.

58. To a young constable this would be rather overpowering. Would it not be well, in the case of the more trivial breaches of discipline, for the Inspector to have the man quietly before him, and give him kindly warning and advice?—The course you suggest is often followed where the matter is trivial. I have adopted that course over and over again. I have told a man, "You have done such a thing in such a way; would it not have been better to do it this other way?" and have given him my reasons, and asked him to be more careful in future, and to consult the Sub-Inspector or sergeant in case of uncertainty.

59. What class of offence have you to report to the Commissioner?—Drunkenness whilst on duty must be reported to the Commissioner, with the evidence and the Inspector's recommendation. There may be a few other serious matters, such as serious assault or serious neglect of duty. Anything really serious is sent to the Commissioner, any such offence as is regarded as rendering a man liable to dismissal.

60. Any charge, after being disposed of by you, can be reviewed and reversed by the Commissioner?—Yes; very few of my cases have been reversed, although I have had a good many appeals. In the last twelve or eighteen months only one very small matter has been reversed; in that I only administered a caution to a man, and that was reversed.

61. The Commissioner decides on the material furnished by you?—Yes. There was another case where I inflicted a fine of 5s., and the Commissioner reversed it, and administered a caution instead.

62. Have you any views with regard to the length of time a man should be allowed to remain in charge of a country station?—No fixed time.

63. Does a man outlive his period of usefulness in some cases?—Some will and some will not.

64. That is the personal equation: how are you to differentiate?—The Inspector ought to know.

65. Does he always know?—He has the best opportunities of knowing.

66. There should be no limit?—I do not think so.

67. If you became aware of a man not being thoroughly efficient you would take steps to get him transferred?—Yes; some men you may leave ten or fifteen years in a station, and they may be still efficient, and their local knowledge makes them still more efficient. Others, again, it is necessary to shift within twelve months.

68. In regard to giving constables an occasional Sunday off, is there any method adopted by you in regard to this? Why should not the clerks in the district office be sent out to do their duty?—I do not see much reason against it. In my case, in order to give constables on beat duty a greater number of Sundays off, I made the constable who acts as Inspector of Weights and Measures come on duty on Sundays occasionally. That was overruled by the Commissioner, and now he does not take up Sunday duty.

69. Do the clerks in the district office do any Sunday duty?—No.

70. It would not hurt them?—I do not think so. They only work five days and a half a week, and get 1s. extra pay, and wear plain clothes.

71. One man has told the Commissioner he has not had a Sunday off for three years?—I am rather surprised to hear that, but Dunedin North is a small station where there are only a few men.

72. Does the Court orderly do any ordinary police duty?—He takes a beat on Sunday.

73. I do not see why the others should not?—I quite agree.

74. This matter could easily be dealt with by a circular from Headquarters?—Yes.

75. It would inflict no hardship?—No.

76. The clerk would still get his Saturday afternoon?—Yes; and every night in bed, which is a very great consideration.

77. In going over the police-station it struck me as a great defect that the Chief Detective has no separate quarters: have you made representations on the matter?—Yes, and an addition was put up, but when this addition, consisting of two small rooms, was finished the Chief Detective considered the rooms too small, and preferred to remain in his old office. They are really too small; but our room is, unfortunately, very limited. I consider it necessary that the Chief Detective should have a separate office.

78. Have you any views on the circular to which some objection has been taken, in regard to men applying for positions outside the Force only being able to do so after notifying the Commissioner?—It seems to me a man in the Force should always be at liberty to better himself if opportunity offers.

79. I gathered from some questions asked by the Commissioner when this point was raised that he might be considering the transfer or promotion of a man, and it was necessary for him to know whether he was an applicant for outside appointment before he took steps in either one direction or the other?—There is that to be considered.

80. Then, if a man had a reasonable prospect of promotion he could have the choice of either going or not?—Yes.

81. You do not attach much importance to this point?—No; if a man sees a way of bettering his position by being employed in another way, I do not see why he should be handicapped in the least.

82. A good deal has been said about the embargo placed on constables leaving the station in plain clothes: what is your opinion in regard to that?—It is only recently it has come into force in Dunedin.

Mr. Dinnie: It applies now all over New Zealand.

Witness: The rule was made at the time the trouble occurred here, and it transpired then that some constables, when coming from their residence to the police-station and also on returning to their residences, visited certain hotels. That, to say the least of it, is most unbecoming and most undesirable. Even when off duty a constable, while wearing uniform, should not be seen in the bar or tap-room of a publichouse, nor should he in any way associate with persons who are habitués of such places.

83. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] The constable whose name I now hand to you, who is now on pension, was under you for some time?—Yes.

84. You know his general character for sobriety for a considerable time before his retirement?—Yes.

85. Do you consider the pension fund should be——

The Commissioner said he could not allow that question to be gone into.

Chief Detective Herbert: I expect Mr. O'Brien to say he should have been dismissed from the Force for his offence.

86. *The Commissioner.*] You raise the question of administration generally?—Yes.

The Commissioner: I will not object to that.

Witness: The constable referred to was finally discharged from the service owing to intemperance.

The Commissioner: If he was discharged, I cannot inquire into the matter.

Witness: Speaking of this man, I may say during the time he was in Dunedin he was very intemperate in his habits. One day, to my great surprise, I got a telegram from the Commissioner saying he was to be put in charge of Green Island, which I regard as a very important station. I disobeyed the order for the time, and sent a telegram saying I considered he was absolutely unfit to have charge of that station. I was allowed to put another constable there.

87. *The Commissioner.*] Had the Commissioner, to your knowledge, such information as would enable him to form a judgment with regard to his qualifications?—He had been punished for intemperance and other matters before this. When a constable is punished his defaulter's sheet is sent to the Head Office, so the Commissioner should have had the reports in his office.

88. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards Constable Havelock, it appears from the defaulters' sheets that Mr. Ellison dealt with him entirely—I did not?—That appears so. The same remark would apply to that constable that would apply to Fretwell—that a copy of his defaulter's sheet must have been sent to the Commissioner, who ought to have known what the man's history was.

89. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Had you and I any conversation before this Commission sat regarding the nature of your evidence or of mine?—None whatever.

90. You have had considerable experience as a detective: what is your opinion in regard to the travelling-allowance of 8s. a day allowed to detectives?—It is insufficient. In my own case I have, when on detective duty, spent nearly double my allowance.

91. *The Commissioner.*] On board and lodging?—Yes; and endeavouring to get into company and obtain information I was seeking. I think the fixed scale should be raised.

92. What is the general tariff in Otago?—From 6s. to 10s. a day.

93. What would the extra allowance you suggest be required for?—Suppose one wants to interview a man in a country township; in all probability, the only place to obtain an interview would be at the local hotel. One might require to take a statement, and would ask the landlord for a private room, which one might occupy for an hour or so. I should consider a detective to be a very mean man indeed if he did not ask the man he interviewed to have a drink, and I think, by way of compensating the hotelkeeper for the accommodation, at the very least he would spend 1s. or 1s. 6d. I have done it times out of number, and probably I am not more liberal than other detectives. If a detective loses his own money in this sort of way it discourages him in doing his work properly.

94. But he could get a refund?—He would have to answer all sorts of questions.

The Commissioner: The 8s. is only to cover actual board and lodging; anything outside he can show a necessity for he would be entitled to have refunded.

Mr. Dinnie: That is the system.

Chief Detective Herbert: I might point out that men who are practically recruits in the service—the finger-print expert, for instance—who have not the same standing in the Force, get 10s. a day.

Mr. Dinnie: The whole question of travelling-allowance is being considered now.

95. *The Commissioner.*] I understand you are certainly not against the promotion of detectives to the uniform branch?—That is so.

96. Did you find yourself handicapped in any way as Sub-Inspector by want of knowledge of the uniform branch?—I did not. I had had previous knowledge in uniform, having served both as constable and sergeant.

97. Is there any analogy between the promotion of Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector and the promotion from station sergeant to Chief Detective?—No, I do not think so.

98. The sergeants would not mind so much the promotion of Chief Detective to the rank of Sub-Inspector if a station sergeant could be made a Chief Detective?—That would be an utter impossibility.

PATRICK HERBERT, Chief Detective, examined on oath. (No. 29.)

Witness: I am stationed at Dunedin. I entered the service about this time of the year in 1881 as a constable. I was transferred to the Thames, where I remained as constable, watch-house keeper, and clerk to the sergeant-major in charge. While there I was appointed specially out of the whole district to perform special plain-clothes duty at the Bay of Islands in connection with the Sheehan murder case. I performed that duty successfully in that case, and was given credit

for it, and a year after (in 1885) I was appointed acting-detective in Auckland, remaining there till 1890. My experience of detective duty was such as would have made most men abandon it, because it was very discouraging. I was acting five years before I was appointed, and during most of the time was only getting 7s. a day. At the end of five years, after various recommendations from superior officers, including Thomson, Shearman, and Brougham, Major Gudgeon appointed me detective. When Colonel Hume became Commissioner I was transferred, at twenty-four hours' notice, to Wellington, where I remained five years; I was then transferred to Invercargill; thence to Auckland and the Thames; then to Christchurch; thence to Dunedin. About six years ago I came to Dunedin as Chief Detective from Christchurch, and have been here ever since. I have been a detective for twenty-five years, although in name for only nineteen or twenty. I consider I am as well qualified as any man to express an opinion on general police matters. I have had no communication with Mr. Arnold in any way prior to the sitting of the Commission here. I have since. In regard to the present Minister of Justice, every one in the Force, so far as I know, hails his arrival as Minister with great pleasure. In regard to the detective and uniform police, I think the Victorian system might very advantageously be adopted in New Zealand. Detectives should not be placed at the bottom of the seniority list, as it has a bad effect generally. We come at the bottom of the list, after the junior constable appointed yesterday. This is calculated in some measure to make the uniform men look on us as outsiders, though I do not attach much importance to this point personally. This could easily be improved by altering the title of detectives in the same way as in Victoria, making them detective constables, detective sergeants, and so on. They should take their exact position in the list—that is, if a detective, by reason of pay and rank, is on a level with a sergeant of equivalent rank, but joined the day before, he should be on the list above that sergeant. Then the question of seniority, which is such a burning question with the whole Force, would be in a great measure settled. A man should be promoted from detective constable to detective senior constable or detective sergeant, and so on. Then he takes his true senior position in the sergeants' list. There is no need at all why he should be called a detective.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How is the Chief Detective rated in Victoria?—There is no such rank. There is a Superintendent of Detectives in charge of the whole Force, who is the only commissioned officer in the detective branch.

2. Who has local control of the detectives?—The detective force outside Melbourne is small, the whole force being practically in Melbourne. Outside they are under the local Superintendent of Police.

3. That would not be workable in New Zealand?—No, I do not propose that. I have here the Victorian *Police Gazette* for this year, and I wish to allude to two things to establish my argument. One is in favour of the seniority list, as I have described it; the other is that in Victoria the success of the detective department in reaching higher ranks has been very marked indeed, and I offer this as a reason in support of what I state—that a detective, owing to his experience, can make himself efficient, and has opportunities of making himself a better uniform policeman than a sergeant has—he has more varied experience, and a greater amount of it. The present Chief Commissioner of Police never was a constable; he joined as a detective, and everybody who knows him is aware of his great ability. Five of the ten Superintendents of Police in Victoria rose to their positions, some from uniform, but all through the detective office; one Inspector got there through detective work and one Sub-Inspector. Then there are numerous instances in the New South Wales police known to myself where detectives are now holding higher rank. For instance, Detective Roche, who was here at the time of the Duke's visit, and who was equal in rank with me, is now Superintendent of Police. I say I have an equal claim with him, and I leave the Commission to draw its own conclusions from the present difference in our ranks. I will now refer to the conditions under which we were placed during the time the last Minister of Justice held that position. He refused to recognise the right of a detective to higher promotion in the Force unless he first reverted to a lower grade, and competed with sergeants, station sergeants, and uniform men generally. That would have meant that if I wanted to be a Sub-Inspector I must leave the work I have been doing half my life, take up other work in a lower rank, and probably also take my place behind the junior station sergeant, and come in when the four station sergeants have passed out of my way. I need not elaborate this question in view of your Worship's experience. The present Minister of Justice departed from this rule, and promoted Chief Detective McGrath to Sub-Inspector.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] On whose recommendation?—I do not know, but I know something of the difficulties he had to get his claim recognised while Mr. McGowan was in power, and if the recommendation was made before and not after Mr. McGowan retired I take it the responsibility for his not being appointed at that time does not rest with yourself. I desire to point out that while Mr. McGrath was fighting to establish his claim to a vacancy a junior man to him and myself was appointed Sub-Inspector over both our heads, and he is now senior to Mr. McGrath. I would point out that if Mr. McGrath was entitled to be appointed Sub-Inspector to the first vacancy when Dr. Findlay came into office he was entitled to be so when his immediate predecessor was in office, and he now suffers the injustice of being junior to a man who should be junior to him. I desire to say I have the greatest possible respect for the man to whom I refer, and therefore do not wish to make his name public. This grievance—though not liking the word "grievance," I should rather call it "indictment"—against the enemy, whoever he may be, is equally my grievance. Twenty-five years ago I was appointed acting-detective, and nineteen or twenty years ago I was appointed detective, while the Sub-Inspector to whom I refer was a constable for seven years before he was appointed Sub-Inspector. I am not one yet, and I am not aware that Mr. Dinnie has yet recommended me. I have an extract here from a newspaper, which may or may not be correct, of what Mr. Mitchell said in Invercargill in regard to the question of station sergeants and Chief

Detectives. If Mr. Mitchell was fair he would have said a good deal more. In the first place, I submit he is no authority on the question, in spite of his high rank and experience. "Far more care is necessary in the promotion of a detective to Sub-Inspector's rank than in the promotion of station sergeant to Sub-Inspector." He does not say what entitles him to give an opinion at all; the mere fact that he is an Inspector does not make him any better judge. I ask you to look upon Mr. Mitchell's opinion as that of an ordinary police constable who has had considerable experience as a constable but practically none as an Inspector. Invercargill is one of the smallest districts, with the fewest men, in the whole Dominion. Mr. Mitchell is a great friend of mine, and we have spent many pleasant evenings together. I submit that if it had not been for me and Mr. McGrath, and for the fact that the latter is known to have been a success in his position, Mr. Mitchell would have said a good deal more; but he could not offend his old friends, so he thought it would not make much difference to us but it would kill all the others. I submit if I aspire to a Sub-Inspectorship, or if Mr. Mitchell is entitled to aspire to be Commissioner of Police, which is commonly reported if a successor to Mr. Dinnie may be required, then my aspiration is very humble indeed, considering that he and I were constables together in Auckland. His service is not worth a rap more than mine. As to his ability, I say nothing at all.

5. *The Commissioner.*] I do not know that he aspires to the Commissionership?—It is common talk. I think I had it from Mr. Dinnie himself. Then he said, "The class of duties is so essentially different that great care must be taken in promoting a detective to higher rank." They are only as different as the uniform the men wear; they are all under discipline; they are all prosecuting the same thief, the same by-law breaker, the same guesser; the duties are all the same, except that a detective has not to walk up and down a beat with gloves and a uniform on, and that does not justify his remark at all. His remarks are in favour of station sergeants as against Chief Detectives, and a strong argument in favour of my representations on the matter is that he knows nothing whatever about the merits of station sergeants at any rate, because he has never had a station sergeant under him. He was stationed for a great number of years in a country town—Paeroa—where there was a lot of work to do of a certain kind, but no police work; he was vegetating in the country all the time I was carrying on police work. It is a wonder to me, with his little experience, he is as good a man as he is. Supposing I were made a Sub-Inspector to-morrow, and there was something for me to learn to do—which I do not admit there is—what can it be that I could not learn in five or ten minutes? A constable comes in from the country, and is put on the street as sergeant; in many cases he has never seen an electric tram, but he manages to get along and keep out of the way of the trams. Surely an ex-detective could be competent to keep out of the way of motor-cars and accidents and official blunders and other traps as well as other men. Mr. O'Brien can tell you that when a man is arrested in a town the matter is handed over to the detectives at once. They perhaps arrest the man, make all inquiries, and get together all the evidence, piece it together, make out the brief, and go into Court; and now, since the last Commission, it is prosecuted by the Chief Detective, brought to a successful issue, and handed over to the Crown Prosecutor. We do all this serious work, and I am not afraid to say, if we do not do it any better than the uniform branch, we do it as well.

6. Sub-Inspector McGrath does not do it any worse because he is a Sub-Inspector than he did when Chief Detective?—No. He tells me his greatest difficulty now is with the people who go round street-corners at other than a walking pace. Now, I want to show how easily a man in our position may fall into serious trouble when doing what he considers his conscientious duty in the interests of the public when there is no need to do it, and he is taking a risk in obtaining admission of crime from a man accused. I do not consider I have any grievance in regard to the case I shall mention, because I am proud of the business, except that I leave it to the Commission to judge whether the Commissioner was right in saying to me what he did. A man was arrested here on a charge of arson in 1904—a poor silly lad, in connection with whose arrest or conviction no credit could be hoped for. There was no evidence against him, only suspicion; but I saw from the circumstances that he was very dangerous, as there were five cases, and I took the risk of having him detained. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that there was no evidence, but I charged him with the crime, and during the night told the constable on duty that I would take all the responsibility if he could get an admission of his guilt. I went out of my way to do this in the public interest—I could get no credit for it from the public. The man was convicted, and sentenced to a long term, on my evidence. The Judge who tried the case told me I was quite wrong—that I had done something I had no right to do, or a Magistrate had no power to do—that it was very improper to get an admission in this way, and wound up by saying something to the effect that he had never censured a police officer for doing wrong in the belief that he was doing right. I believe the remark was equivalent to paying me all the compliment he could under the circumstances. In forwarding my report to the Commissioner I made out what I considered a splendid case in justification of my conduct, and I considered the Commissioner would have been quite entitled to go no further than the Judge in view of the peculiar circumstances. What he said, however, was, "The Chief Detective's conduct is most reprehensible, and quite unworthy of a man holding the position of Chief Detective." I could not sit down under that, so I wrote saying I had not made myself clear, and asked for the file to be returned. I complain that the file was never returned to me.

The Commissioner: The doctrine of the end justifying the means is a dangerous one.

Witness: Quite so, but there are exceptional cases. I should like to draw a comparison between the Commissioner's treatment of those concerned in bringing this case to a successful issue and of those concerned in the Papakaio case. If they were entitled to be complimented and spoken of in flattering terms, then I was overlooked. In the police cases here I had all the responsible work on my shoulders; I had scores and scores of exhibits to take charge of; statements to take from an endless number of people, and other matters to arrange. The Commissioner, on his

arrival, said the arrest of these men (who were subsequently convicted and served long sentences) was a blunder; that they should not have been arrested, and that his intention in the case was contrary to mine and that of the Inspector, who felt that our only safe course to follow was to have no secrecy at all in the matter. I think the Commissioner's intention was to minimise the whole thing as much as possible for the general credit. I do not think that would be in the direction of the general credit. The cases were put through, and at the conclusion I did not ask for any recognition or credit, but I was never concerned in any case in the whole of my experience where I thought I was entitled to more recognition for what I had done. I am justified in holding this view when I know that men have been advanced in increment in recognition of special services in connection with other serious offences. In connection with the Papakaio case a memo. from the Commissioner is attached to the file very flattering indeed to the two detectives concerned. I do not say it was not fully justified, but I do say I consider the Commissioner is making fish of one and flesh of another. I should like to say that when that case came before the grand jury I was in attendance in charge of the grand jury, and, although the Commissioner was not a witness in the lower Court, he had his name placed on the back of the indictment by the Crown Solicitor, and gave his evidence before the grand jury on oath. I was present in the room, it being customary here. His evidence was reviewing the whole case, and giving the substance of the evidence of the witnesses.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Do you allege improper conduct on the part of the Commissioner?—I should like your opinion as to whether it was proper or not.

8. If the Commissioner was not a witness in the lower Court, how did his name get on the indictment?—It was placed there by the Crown Solicitor.

9. With what object, do you imagine?—The object speaks for itself, seeing that he gave evidence on oath.

10. Not of facts within his own knowledge?—I take it so.

The Commissioner: The facts stated by you, Mr. Dinnie, on oath were only gathered from reports made to you?

Mr. Dinnie: I was there throughout the whole of the inquiries. I opened the case to the Grand Jury.

Chief Detective Herbert: If you had not been Commissioner of Police I would not have allowed it. I had never known a case of the kind before. During the case the necessity for making some inquiries here in regard to the purchase of a revolver arose. Inquiries were made exactly in the terms asked, but the Commissioner was not satisfied that the inquiries were properly made, because when more information was obtained discoveries were made which we had no possible chance of making, and he promised when the case was over—I think this was in writing—that he would deal with us for our neglect. He has not done so so far. Of course, in connection with a serious murder such as the Papakaio case it is important that the best man capable of dealing with such a case should be on the scene as early as possible. Now, in Dunedin we are very much nearer to Oamaru than is Christchurch; and, while I offer no opinion derogatory to the ability of the men who were employed on the Papakaio case, I would point out that I have had very much more experience than they have, that I was much nearer to the scene, and that a man holding the position of Chief Detective of the district, who must have had some creditable record during his service, had a right to be sent there, in the best interests of the public. I am not complaining at not having been sent there, but there is a point I propose to make out of it. There was no reason in the world why the benefit of our assistance should have been considered not worth having, and it is one of the things that go to show—amongst others, which have been mentioned in previous evidence—that the Dunedin members of the Force were not popular with the Commissioner, and did not possess his confidence. I do not see any grounds whatever for the Commissioner taking up such a position. I know I am making a bold statement when I say that I consider, under the circumstances, I should have naturally expected that I might have been called to the scene, notwithstanding that the offence was not committed within the Dunedin Police District. It was committed in the Canterbury Police District, and I do not say that Inspector Gillies had a right to apply for our assistance; but I say the Commissioner of Police, who is in charge of the whole Force, and who must be presumed to know his men, knew we were there handy, and knew that we were never called upon nor consulted. I venture to say he did not trust us in connection with that case, and, if that was the position the Commissioner took, then he had no grounds whatever for his assumptions. With regard to the transfers of the general police and detectives, the manner in which they are carried out strikes me as being as detrimental to the best interests of the Force and to many of the individuals themselves as anything could possibly be. I propose to give some instances of transfer for which I cannot possibly account in any way. Take the latest one. There was a transfer from Wellington to Dunedin of Detective Cameron, and of Detective Connolly to Wellington to replace him. Just prior to that transfer, Detective Hill, who had been here for a considerable time, was offered a transfer to Napier, and he took it, and I believe he is there still. His transfer considerably weakened us here, and we were not what I would call strong before that. He was replaced by Acting-Detective McLeod, who had never done detecting work before. Then along comes soon afterwards the transfer of these other two men. Now, Connolly was a particularly valuable man in Dunedin, by reason of his extensive local knowledge—a particularly valuable acquisition in the performance of a detective's duties; it often enables him to find out more in five minutes than another man might find out in a fortnight. This transfer was ordered by the Commissioner without any reason being given at all. I protested against it in a report I made to the Inspector in what now appears to me stronger terms than I thought when I wrote it. I considered that the removal of two useful men who knew the town well, and who were doing good work, and replacing them by two strange men, however good they might be—and they were not better than the men who went away, for I do not want to criticize them beyond that—consider-

ably weakened our strength, and, having that in my mind, I, on the 3rd April, 1906, wrote this report to the Inspector: "I have to report that Detective Connolly's transfer would considerably weaken our staff; *in fact, he cannot be spared from here.* Constable Hunt has only been ten months here, Constable McLeod nine months, and Constable Mitchell a few weeks. They all came here comparatively strange to the city and to detective work, and it must be clear that we are at a disadvantage as compared with the other centres by having to work with four men, two of whom are perfect strangers to the city, while the other two are still new to the work. Our strength in number is below that of all the other centres, and I submit that is a reason why it should not be below them in other respects also. When Detective Hill was transferred I thought then that these facts should be represented. They have double force now that we are to lose Connolly, and I submit it is imperative that some protest should be made against his removal. He does not wish the transfer, but is satisfied to go if ordered; but he is a more useful man here than he could possibly be in Wellington for a considerable time to come. Our staff here during my time here has been very successful in keeping down crime and in detecting it also, and a very considerable portion of the credit of this is due to Detective Connolly's knowledge of the city and of the people, and, of course, to his energy also.—P. HERBERT, Chief Detective." That report the Inspector submitted to the Commissioner, with the following remarks: "I very much regret that you have seen fit to transfer Detective Connolly from Dunedin, as he is, with one exception, the only detective with a good local knowledge. It is only a few weeks since Detective Hill, who also had a good local knowledge, was transferred from here, and an inexperienced stranger was sent to replace him. Now it is proposed to replace Detective Connolly with an officer who has had no local knowledge. Under such circumstances it is quite certain that serious crime will go undetected. I sincerely trust that you will see your way to reconsider this matter, and not fill the detective branch with officers who will be practically useless for at least a year.—T. O'BRIEN, Inspector, 3/4/06." The Commissioner wrote in reply, and I will ask you, sir, to say whether—although my report was strong—his remarks relating to myself were not unduly severe, and did not show, together with what I have already said, that the Commissioner, to use an every-day expression, had no time for me: "Inspector O'Brien.—The transfer ordered must be carried out, notwithstanding your Chief Detective's dictatorial report, a repetition of which will be dealt with as merited. To have the detective work efficiently carried out at Dunedin it is evident to me that the change ordered is very desirable. You have now only one acting-detective, with short experience—viz., McLeod, nine months. Detective Cameron has had six years' experience, and is a superior man to Connolly in every respect. Acting-Detective Hunt, although only ten months acting-detective, is a man of fifteen years' police experience, and previous plain-clothes knowledge in South Island; and Acting-Detective Mitchell has had about three years' detective experience. Criminals of any note do not confine their operations to one district, and are consequently known in more cities and towns than one. This change has been ordered for the benefit of the service, and has not been decided upon prematurely. If you show me the necessity for the detective branch in your district being strengthened I will be pleased to consider the matter. You will find Detective Cameron a most reliable and efficient officer, and that you will be a gainer and not a loser by the change. Please report if you require an augmentation to the detective branch, giving reasons.—W. DUNNIE, Commissioner." Then I was ordered to instruct Connolly to proceed to Wellington, and the transfer took place. I do not propose to waste your time, sir, by referring to the dictatorial report that would be "dealt with as merited," if repeated. If I am not a mere figurehead, I submit I was entitled to make that report, although the remarks were strong; but I cannot feel strong without writing strong, and this was no trivial matter. I have never been told the reason of this transfer at all. It certainly was not because of anything against Connolly; but it has occurred to me within the last few days that there may have been a reason which I had never allowed myself to entertain—something which some people think exists in the Force to a greater extent than it really does. But I really do not entertain that idea, and I do not know what the reason was. I know the work is more serious, and that there is more of it to do in Wellington than there is here, for the reason that it is a different community, and if, as the Commissioner says, Cameron was a better man than Connolly, Wellington was the place for him; and if Connolly was not so good as the other, then he would be of still less use in Wellington by reason of his want of local knowledge. Then, where were the grounds for the change, unless it was with the idea of keeping us in a state of continual turmoil, or something equivalent to that, with new men? But as you, sir, have the papers you will no doubt be able to find out what is in it. There is not a detective here to-day who was here when I came about six years ago, and for a good period of my time there was not a man, including myself, who had been here five years. That is a very great disadvantage in a city, because every Inspector with detective experience will tell you that local knowledge is a very valuable thing for a detective in many respects. During my time we have had thirteen detectives here altogether. Our strength now is six, and during that time seven men have gone or come. Some of them were here only a very short time. One man was here a good number of years, and he went away on account of health reasons. His shift was justifiable; but it strikes me, from my experience of transfers, that the cost to the country must be something enormous in the Police Department alone, and this coming and going must be calculated to impair the efficiency of the service. In Australia young men who have entered the service often end their service in the same country town and in the same house in which they started. The longer they are there the better. I have known old men there who practically do nothing but lend their experience, as it were, to their comrades. They are able to say what somebody was twenty-five years ago and all about him. Why should not men who come here as detectives be left here as long as possible? Of course, there may be health reasons or other reasons for shifting him; but as regards conduct, he is not likely to conduct himself any better by being shifted. That brings me to Detective Connolly's case. He said

he was hounded here, and did not get fair treatment. He was transferred from Christchurch after having been punished. He reported himself here on the 10th February, 1909, and took up his duties shortly afterwards. Detective McLeod, who had been here for some years, and who knew the town well, was sent to Christchurch, where his local knowledge was simply wasted. I do not see why our staff should be broken up to make a vacancy for a defaulter, who was sent here for no reason that we can discover. Coming here did not improve him, because he was disgraced after he arrived. Possibly the reasons of his transfer may have done more credit to the heads than to the heads of the authorities responsible, and they preferred that their killing operations should be done here.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was he not transferred for misconduct?—But is misconduct a ground for transfer?

12. *The Commissioner.*] I can appreciate the point. It is that there is no reason why a defaulter should not be dealt with in the district in which he has misconducted himself?—Yes. Why should another district have to do the killing?

13. You are assuming that the man is hopeless?—This man while here was reduced, and shortly afterwards transferred to Invercargill. McLeod was transferred to take his place, and those three transfers must have cost something like £50. That is a question which must affect the taxpayers, including myself. If my contention is right, the money is practically wasted.

14. The question is whether the transfers are made with due regard to the efficiency of the Force?—I believe, if a table were made of the transfers that have taken place to and from this station during 1905, 1906, and 1907, not one in half a dozen would be found to be justified. And this tremendous expense is going on while a lot of fuss is being made of the difference as between 8s. and 10s. a day travelling-allowance. I would here mention that cadets in the Government service drawing £100 a year get 10s. a day travelling-allowance, and the Post and Telegraph boys get it. I leave it at that. As to Connell's case, I see he gave evidence to the effect that he is an injured man. Everything that I have to say about him is in the files. It is true there is nothing on the file to say that he was drunk, but one meets men whom you would not be justified in calling drunk, and yet would not be sober enough to perform police duty.

15. You seemed to arrive at that conclusion when he met with his accident?—Well, I know he would not have been where he said he was at that hour of the night if he were in his proper frame of mind. It is a place where a man would not dream of going in the middle of the night unless he had urgent duty to perform there, and he had not.

16. He does not look like a man who drinks, if appearances go for anything?—There are some men who get very red in the face when they drink; others get white; he is one of the white sort. I would refer you to the file in connection with his case. The papers refer to the impossibility of getting him to attend at the office during office-hours.

The Commissioner. Undoubtedly he was reduced; but with regard to this particular incident, he said when he met with his accident he lay for three hours unconscious on the ground, and the doctor said he did not think his injuries were consistent with—

Mr. Dinnie. He was reported as unfit for the position.

The Commissioner. There is ample evidence as to that.

Witness. Now I come to the question of Acting-Detective Lilley, a very intelligent, steady, sober, and successful young man of eight years and four months service. He has been two years and two months in Dunedin, and within the last three months he has had favourable marks placed on his merit sheet for duties performed. I propose to compare his case with that of Detective Quartermain, who has two years and one month less service than Lilley, and who is a detective in rank. Lilley is a constable in rank, "acting-detective" being merely an honorary title. Quartermain is what is known as a finger-print expert. Any experience he has had in detective work must have been obtained while he was a constable—I do not know how long—but he could not get any experience of detective work in his present position, working as a finger-print expert, unless he went out in his spare time with detectives learning detective work, if it can be learned by one man from another. Lilley, on the other hand, is a practical working acting-detective, and has been so for over two years, besides having six years' experience of police work—mounted, foot, and so on. Yet Quartermain is Lilley's senior, and will be so for all time unless, in the turn of the wheel, Lilley jumps over him, as has happened before to-day. Quartermain, I understand, gets 10s. a day as detective, 1s. 6d. a day for house-rent, and another 1s. or 1s. 6d. a day as expert; making a total of at least 12s. 6d. And he jumps straight into that after six years and two months as a constable. When I was nine years a constable, five of which I was acting-detective, I was only getting 7s. 6d. a day; and when I had been twenty years in the service, and was looked upon as an experienced detective, I was not receiving as much pay as Quartermain does now.

17. *The Commissioner.*] You were not a finger-print expert?—That is one of Commissioner Dinnie's hobbies.

Mr. Dinnie. An important one, too.

Witness. A very important one, but it would be more important if it were not boomed so much. The finger-print business is being practically killed with kindness. It is boomed so much in the newspapers and elsewhere that it is not to be wondered at if the criminal goes to work with his gloves on; then the finger-print experts may fish so far as discovery by that system is concerned. I admit the system is a very valuable adjunct, but I do not give it the prominent position that I believe is given to it by our Commissioner. When a criminal is arrested, I do not believe, simply because his finger-prints are identical with the impression kept in the office, that the finger-print experts should take all the credit for the discovery. Sometimes when we send a good finger-print to the office, it may be of only one finger perhaps, and, according to their system of indexing, they cannot find whose print that is, because, of course, the system is not

yet sufficiently perfect. When we send them a print, and they cannot find in the office whose it is, they ask us to send them the names of half a dozen criminals, any one of whom might have committed the offence. Well, we reply that at the time the offence was committed Smith, Brown, Jones, or Robinson were in Dunedin, and if the print happens to be of one of those men, all the credit goes to the finger-print department. I mention this to show that the system is boomed by the head of the department for all it is worth, while those who are not in favour are treated with more or less harshness, to put it mildly. While on that subject I might mention that we have in our office now about fifteen hundred photographs of criminals from New South Wales alone, and numbers are coming in annually, some of them of aboriginals, and our present indexing system is so out of date that it is utterly impossible, with all the aliases of the criminals, to turn up anything when it is wanted, and since the Commissioner visited Tasmania we have been flooded with photos from that country of boys who have been fined for leaving cabs unattended and things of that sort. In the finger-print department they have now a most up-to-date system of indexing, and I think we ought to have some such system in our office. It would appear that the success of the finger-print department is of far more importance to the Commissioner than the success of the detective department; at any rate, so far as Dunedin is concerned. I cannot speak as regards the other districts. Now, when Mr. Tunbridge was Commissioner no district clerk was appointed a sergeant unless he went out on the block, leaving a vacancy for somebody else.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But you do not know his views on that point?—I only know the effect of them. I do not offer any opinion upon it myself. I also want to point out that while the maximum pay of a Sub-Inspector is higher than that of a Chief Detective, the minimum pay of a Sub-Inspector is less than that of a Chief Detective.

19. *The Commissioner.*] Are not the Chief Detectives paid alike?—Yes; but only when they reach the maximum. We are all at the maximum now, I think, except Bishop. The point I want to make is this: that if the Department should at some time require my services as Sub-Inspector, and I had to start at the minimum pay of a Sub-Inspector, I should be getting what might be termed an Irishman's rise, and unless I reached the maximum before my retiring-age it would affect my retiring-allowance. When Sergeant Siddells came into the detective branch at the bottom of the list I understand he suffered no loss of pay, and he continued at that pay until his services entitled him to the next increment in the ordinary course; and what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. I may say the detectives in our department feel very sorely the position they are placed in with regard to this finger-print expert. If any one had told me before I started to speak on this Commission that I would have said all the things I have said I would have considered they were mad. I would have told them I would not dream of impeaching my superior officer in the way I have done, and I should never have done so had it not been for your Worship's statement at the opening of this Commission. In fact, I should have been an unwilling witness. I have abandoned most of the matters I felt most concerned about since Dr. Findlay took charge of the Department, and were I not sure that your remarks would carry full weight I would have hesitated to give the evidence I have given to-day, because at the last Commission I said things that were not popular relating to appointments from the lower ranks to the higher, and that evidence has helped to bring about the strained relations which I feel have existed between the Commissioner and myself since that time. Though your Worship may make all these promises with the greatest possible earnestness, and Dr. Findlay may support you in that, the next year or the year afterwards there may be no Dr. Findlay and there may be no Mr. Bishop—

Mr. Dinnie: And no Mr. Herbert.

Witness: Just so; and no Mr. Dinnie. We have to take such remarks at what we consider their true worth. But in this case your Worship's promise is something more than the ordinary departmental necessary introduction. I will finish with one more reference, and that is the question of the qualifications required by a man having control of a Police Force like that of New Zealand. I recognise I am presuming greatly when I propose to make any reference to that at all, but I am absolutely in your hands, sir, as to whether I have the right to make it. But it is not with the intention of reflecting upon any Commissioner past or present, or upon anybody who may be considered eligible for the position at present. I am sure, with all the boast you may hear from members of the Force as to their great experience, you will not find one who has served under as many Commissioners as I have; and I know, because it is a good billet, when once they get it they will hold on to it for a long time. Now, I presume to say that it does not matter a straw whether a Commissioner is a man with thirty or more years of the best experience a policeman can have, or whether he is a man who never was a policeman, but who by reason of his general life and occupation, say, as a solicitor, or somebody in some such calling, who is well in touch with the work, who has the brains and who knows how the thing should be run. Experience as a policeman would not have endowed him with something that we call a judicial mind, or with the power to influence men and to deal with them as only a man with a judicial mind can. If he is a policeman, and has that mind, so much the better; but if not, he is better than the experienced policeman who lacks the born qualities that go to make the judicial mind. I submit that the great thing in the management of a Police Force is to have a man at its head who has influence over the men; in the next place, who has self-respect; and in the next place, who is almost incapable of dealing unfairly with any man, however little he may deserve sympathy. I do not know whether your Worship will pull me up when I say this, but I know of no man in New Zealand who, in my experience, holds qualifications in that particular respect equal to your own.

20. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know what the emoluments of my office are, and what the emoluments of the Commissioner are? Do you think it would be promotion to appoint me Commissioner of Police?—I think the country will discover that it will be worth while to give no con-

sideration to the question of emolument. I think it would be a great saving of expense whatever they paid your Worship. I may not be entitled to say it.

The Commissioner: I think you had better not pursue that question further. Do you wish to ask any question of the witness, Mr. Dinnie?

21. *Mr. Dinnie:* As you know, sir, I have not the official files of papers by me now, and I rely entirely on the files in answering almost all the points raised by Mr. Herbert; but I should like to ask him this question: In cases arising in your own district, is an officer from another district ever sent to investigate?—Yes.

22. Has it been the system here?—I do not think so, but it was a system introduced by you when you sent Chief Detective McIlveney here in the case of the theft of the North Dunedin ballot-papers. It was at Christmas time when Detective McIlveney came here and interviewed me, and we made inquiry together. I submit that that inquiry could have been as well made by Detective Ward and myself, who, notwithstanding years, am still fit for such an inquiry; and it was needless to send a detective, at some expense to the country, to do our work.

23. Did that inquiry entail his going into other districts?—I do not think so; but suppose it did, we could very well do one part of the inquiry here, and other detectives could do the other part elsewhere.

24. Do you know of any case of a detective coming from Christchurch to take a matter in your district?—Yes. I remember Detective Ward, at the time of the Papakaio case, coming to make inquiries here.

25. That is a case arising in another district. You said you thought you ought to have been employed to investigate the Papakaio murder case. Was that a case of emergency?—I think anything in connection with that case was a case of emergency, but I do not think it was any question of emergency that induced you to treat us in that matter as you did. I think, for some reason or another, you had no confidence in us. You were evidently not satisfied with some inquiries we had made about a revolver previously. You jumped to a wrong conclusion, which is a very dangerous thing to do. You jumped to the conclusion that because we did not find anything on that occasion, it had been slummed by us, and that we were not as capable of doing the work as the man you sent would be.

26. Did I not send down an officer who found what you failed to discover?—You are treading on dangerous ground, and you are showing that you did not rely on us as being capable. The inquiry was given to me by the most careful and trustworthy man you could find in the office in Wellington—Detective Hunt. He made inquiries, and answered exactly the question the Department wanted answered. They only gave us a limited amount of information. The telegram was something to this effect: "Accused is believed to have bought a gun or revolver in Dunedin from So-and-so." Detective Hunt went into every shop in Dunedin to see if he had done so, and then the Department discovered from somebody that a particular man in a particular shop had sold the accused a revolver ten years before, and this offended Mr. Dinnie. I leave it to you, sir, to say whether our failure to find something that happened ten years ago was any reflection on our capabilities.

27. You have not told me of any officer coming from Christchurch to investigate a matter arising in your district within my time?—I do not just now.

28. It is not a general system?—No; and that is why I feel aggrieved at your sending McIlveney here to investigate this other business.

29. Do you know that McIlveney is appointed to take up special matters connected with the various Departments, such as Post Office cases, Railway cases, and other special cases—really expert cases?—If you say so, I will take your word for it.

30. You do not know the system in England?—No.

31. *The Commissioner:* Is the matter of Detective McIlveney's appointment a grievance with the other detectives generally?—Well, he describes himself as Chief Detective, Headquarters Branch, and we could have no grievance except that in the distant future he might be a stumbling-block to somebody else's advancement. If by reason of his title he should become to be regarded as my senior, I feel I should have some grounds for complaint; but I do not think that is the intention.

32. In carrying out what you have outlined as a scheme based very much on the Victorian system, how would you provide for local control of the detectives? You must have some head, it seems to me?—I would make no change in the present system, except as regards placing them on the seniority list, and giving them another name.

33. Detectives would be detective constables?—Yes. Then you have detective sergeants, who would be equivalent to full detectives.

34. What term would you have answering to Chief Detective?—I would have constables who were detective constables as "Constable Brown, mounted, St. Kilda," "Constable Jones, foot, Brighton," "Constable Smith, C.I.B., Russell Street." Then, I would have "Sergeant Smith, C.I.B., Russell Street," and so on. This is how they would be described. Then, of course, at any place where there is a Superintendent there would be a vacancy for an Inspector. But I do not propose anything of that sort at all, as I do not think it would be entertained, particularly at a time when money is an object. Another reason is that the head officer here is the Inspector, and I do not think the idea would be entertained of making the present Chief Detective an Inspector equal with the Inspector in charge. Therefore I would ask that the next highest rank should be Sub-Inspector with seniority, with the right to remain as he is or go into the other branch in his proper turn.

Mr Dinnie: I quite agree with Mr. Herbert's ideas as regards the detective branch.

Witness: I submit your Worship might reasonably see your way, when framing your report, to review the past promotions to the extent of placing men who without sufficient grounds have

been promoted over their seniors in their proper positions, and then when the promotion of those men who have been passed over, if they are deserving of it, is to be carried out, they should be promoted over the heads of those who never should have been passed over them.

35. *The Commissioner.*] Have you noticed any deterioration as regards the intelligence and physique of the men joining the Force recently?—There are some splendid men in the police here—as good as you would find anywhere in the world I should say, but there are others who appear to me not as good physically.

36. Are you of the same opinion as Inspector O'Brien as to the degree of intelligence and physique generally of the men who have joined recently?—I am not in the same position of offering an opinion as the Inspector, and I do not care to venture an opinion upon that. But on the question of education, I do not think it is so much a matter of what standard should be set as the degree of ordinary common-sense a man possesses. I believe there are men who can barely read or write who would make better constables than many well-educated men.

37. Surely you must have some standard of education by which to gauge a man's fitness for the Force, otherwise you cannot tell what degree of intelligence he possesses until he is in the Force?—I should say the Fifth Standard as a general principle, and the Fourth Standard if in other respects more than ordinary qualifications are present.

38. That would be opening the door to differential treatment?—In some of the other colonies they have what are called "probationary constables," who are taken on at 1s. a day lower pay than the permanent men, and I would have men on probation in the Force for twelve months if I had my way. If a probationer fails to be taken on permanently, it looks better than being dismissed after he is taken on.

ROBERT CRAWFORD, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 30.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Clyde. I shall have had twenty-seven years' service on 2nd December next. Was promoted to the rank of sergeant after twenty years' service.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any statement to make?—Only that I consider the pay of the men on starting in the Force should be 8s. a day, and that when sergeants are on duty they should be allowed first-class passes on the railway. If it could be done also, I think when sergeants and constables are on leave they should be given some little railway concession. The constables in my district are sober intelligent men. I have no complaint to make with regard to promotion.

ALBERT TIVY EMERSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 31.)

Witness: I am a sergeant, stationed at South Dunedin. I entered the Force in 1892, and was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1906. I have been in Dunedin about three years. In Dunedin we have some really good intelligent men, but some who have come down here within the last three or four years have been practically useless. I do not consider they were the right class to make good constables. They did not take enough interest in their work, nor had they the education.

1. *The Commissioner.*] They would have passed the Fifth Standard, and that is pretty high, is it not?—I do not know whether they did or not, but I know some of them did not remain very long in the Force.

2. Would you suggest anything that would make the Force more attractive to young men?—I would increase the pay. Most of the men I come in contact with complain bitterly about the pay; they consider they could make much higher wages outside the police, and have a much better time. They would not then have to work on Sundays, and they would have no night duty to do. They could live where house-rent is cheaper, and they might be able to keep a garden and fowls or something of that sort. In town the least one can get a house for is 14s. a week, and we are only allowed 7s. for rent.

3. Are you aware of any general feeling of dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion?—I have heard it expressed as regards junior men being promoted before their seniors.

4. Did you satisfy yourself that those complaints were well founded?—I could tell whether they were junior or senior by their regimental numbers.

5. You think the senior men were equal as regards efficiency?—Yes.

6. How did it come about?—I was one of the juniors promoted over the heads of others, and I was simply told by my Inspector that I had been recommended for promotion. I did not make application.

7. Do you know of any political influence being used?—I have heard men talk about "wire-pulling" and using political influence, but I do not of my own knowledge know of any cases.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Were the junior men you speak of appointed to special posts, clerical or otherwise?—I suppose some of them would be clerks in the Inspector's office, but my case was not one of those.

9. There are men junior to you who have been promoted?—Oh, yes. What I mean is that some of the men senior to me complain at my having been promoted before them. They were promoted after me.

10. *Station Sergeant King.*] If you were offered the position of station sergeant, and had to remain as station sergeant, would you accept it?—I should prefer to remain in the country as a sergeant. Of course, if I was to have a chance of rising higher it would be different.

WILLIAM GILBERT, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 32.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at the Dunedin central station. I think in physique and intelligence the junior men in the Force to-day compare favourably with the older men.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is the standard kept up?—I think the standard is hardly kept.

2. Do you think there is any gradual deterioration in the quality of the men?—I think there is, perhaps.

3. To what do you attribute that?—I think there should be a little more pay. The Force is not attractive enough, and the men can get better wages outside the Force.

4. Do you think the standard of education is too high?—I would not say that. I think you would get plenty of good men if they were properly paid.

5. Do you know of any dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion and treatment generally?—There is dissatisfaction as to promotion.

6. One man in your district said he had not had a Sunday off in three years?—Very often you cannot spare a man. I have not had a Sunday off in ten years; I cannot get away.

FRIDAY, 16TH JULY, 1909.

ALFRED EDGAR SIDNEY WARD, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 33.)

Witness: I am stationed at Dunedin at present. I joined the Force on the 28th September, 1898, and on the following day had to report myself to Sergeant Emerson at Wanganui. I remained in that district, working between Palmerston North and New Plymouth, until February, 1902, and on the 2nd of that month I was transferred to Christchurch. On the 1st June, 1905, I was appointed detective, and in February, 1907, was transferred to Dunedin.

1. *The Commissioner.*] For what period were you acting-detective?—I only worked for one year in uniform.

2. Were you promoted for any special reason, or simply in the ordinary course?—I was especially promoted for the part I took in the arrest of a man named White in Christchurch. In the year 1900 I was detailed for special work in connection with serious fires that had taken place at Marton. Detective Bishop and I were there for about two months, and were successful in bringing a man to justice who was responsible for fires. At the conclusion of that case at the Supreme Court the Chief Justice made some highly complimentary remarks concerning the part I personally took in the matter. A few weeks later Commissioner Tunbridge asked me if I would care to join the detective department. This is leading up to a point I intend to make. Of course, I felt complimented at being asked by a man like him to join a certain department. I accepted, and I had no more uniform duty practically after that. When I am asked to take up duties in a certain department I fail to see why that avenue leading to the higher offices of the service should be closed to me simply because I chose to enter that department. We were very much disturbed some time ago by an announcement that was made in the House by the late Minister of Justice, who laid it down in no uncertain terms that the avenues to the higher offices were permanently closed to the detective force. I am well aware that Dr. Findlay has since altered his predecessor's opinion, but my point is that the political world might be turned upside down to-morrow, and we might get another Mr. McGowan; and we want you, sir, if you are satisfied by the evidence, to submit to the Government a recommendation which will have permanent effect, and which we can refer to in the event of our getting another man in office holding Mr. McGowan's ideas. We consider, of course, that we ought to be able to reach the higher offices of the department. Another small matter I wish to mention is this: To men in the detective force travelling on public service by boat steerage fare only is allowed. Personally I have never travelled steerage since I joined the department. Last October I was sent to Auckland to give evidence in a case in the Magistrate's Court. The Department, under their regulations, provided me with a steerage ticket between Lyttelton and Wellington return and between New Plymouth and Onehunga, and I had to pay the difference out of my own pocket. We consider we should not be called upon to do this.

3. That is on account of the class of people you have to associate with?—Just so. Generally speaking, the regulations do not affect me as much as they do the uniform men, but I have been asked to briefly refer to them. The regulations we are working under now have been in force since Goodness knows when—since 1886, I think—and that is a good argument why they should, in my opinion, be cremated and a fresh lot drawn up. This is Regulation 112: "Members of the Force who are on leave will be subject to every order, rule, and regulation of the Force, and will be liable to be called on to act, and to the consequences of any breach of discipline or good order, as if they were on duty." Now, the men have only twelve days' leave in the year—I do not know why not fourteen—and they consider, rightly or wrongly, that the Department should pay their train fare when travelling on leave or supply them with a pass. Regulation 122 reads: "No man will leave his barracks without acquainting the sergeant or constable on duty where he is to be found, or go from his station any greater distance than a quarter of a mile without permission." At the present day surely a man can be trusted to go away further than a quarter of a mile. I understand the regulation was framed in case of a strike or a sudden riot, or something of that kind, so that the men could be readily called upon for duty. If that regulation were wiped out not more than one man in twenty would be out in the country for a bicycle ride or at the other end of the city. I agree that the Inspector should have power to bring into force a regulation of that sort in case of sudden emergency, giving him local power. This is Regulation 128: "The hours for meals will be fixed by the officer in charge of the district, and posted in the dining-room. At half past 10 p.m. such men as have not leave or are not on duty will go to bed; and all lights and fires, except such as are authorised to be kept up during the night, will be extinguished by 11 o'clock." That, I suppose, was framed so that men would be well rested and ready for duty next morning; but I think if a man wants to read at night he should be entitled to do so as long as he likes, and if he is not fit for duty next day it would be for his

officer to deal with him. Then, Regulation 190 says, "In case of persons of known respectability being arrested for some trifling offence, they need not be searched, but should be requested to produce such property as they may have on their persons, and should, when possible, be placed in a cell by themselves, and provided with clean bed-clothes." The latter part of that is all right, but the first part I consider is absurd, because no matter how respectable a person may be he may have matches or poison on him, and if anything happens to him the watch-house officer is responsible. But I believe that is altered now.

4. What takes the place of that now?—I think the authorities have issued a regulation that all persons are to be carefully searched.

5. A very strict special regulation?—Yes. Then Regulation 214 says, "On any alarm of fire the police—including those who are off duty—will turn out in uniform, and render every aid in their power which circumstances may demand." I am not in a position to say whether that is strictly adhered to.

6. It cannot apply in all places, because fire-bells are not rung in Christchurch or Wellington, at any rate?—Well, where it does obtain I would suggest that certain men only of those who are off duty should be instructed to turn out. As regards enrolment, I consider that no man should be enrolled unless he has resided at least a year in the Dominion, and I should say that, as far as possible, the Force should be recruited from the farming community.

7. You were not of the farming community?—No. I should make the standard of education the Fourth Standard, and I would further suggest that every man, after serving his month or two months in the depot, should be placed on probation for six months, and that no probationary constable should be stationed other than in one of the four large centres for that period. In my short experience I have not noticed any marked deterioration in the Force. I am speaking of my own personal observations, and after perusing the annual reports of the several Inspectors in charge of the different districts. I think, without exception, it will be found that the Inspectors in their general remarks concerning the behaviour of the members of the Force use in effect these words: "With few exceptions, the conduct of the members of the Force has been so-and-so." Now, with regard to those exceptions, I would suggest that the Inspector, when forwarding his report to the Commissioner, should mention the names of those he deems to be the exceptions, and that their conduct should be made the subject of special attention by their sergeant and the other officers. Then when the next annual report is forwarded, if those men are still found to be exceptions, I think the sooner they are turned out of the Force the better. In 1906 or 1907, when that unfortunate affair took place in Dunedin, people, of course, said the Force was deteriorating, and going to the dogs generally. Well, that was simply because a few unworthy members had brought discredit upon the whole service. That same remark applies, I think, at present in respect to certain members of the Force who have so far forgotten all sense of decency as to bring disgrace at least on the North Island section. There is just one more thing I would suggest to the officer in charge of the Department, and that is, when he decides to appoint to the detective branch a constable who has served for five or six years in one of the big towns, that man should be appointed to the town in which he has gained his experience. When I came here I held the rank of detective, but the men on whom I most relied for local information in connection with the cases I had to investigate were the men who had been doing beat duty. Local knowledge is an invaluable aid to a man in the performance of his duties.

8. Why were you transferred from Christchurch?—Well, I had a brother in Christchurch who was favourably recommended, I understand, for detective duty, and the Commissioner did not deem it advisable to keep two brothers in the same town. I do not take any exception to that at all.

9. Your brother is only a constable now?—Yes.

10. I know he is a very good man. Which do you consider was most in the interests of the service: to leave you in Christchurch or leave your brother?—I think the step the Commissioner took. I only want to add this: There is no doubt that the Commissioner is now on his trial, and it is only my duty to say that since I have been in the Department I have received from the Department everything I consider I deserved, and without asking for it.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you are aware the Police Regulations are being revised at the present time?—Yes; but I think they should be promptly revised and given to the men.

12. You understand that it takes a little time to go through them and revise them?—Yes. Perhaps I am wrongly informed, but it is believed by many of the men that the revision of the regulations was in hand two years ago.

The Commissioner: When was the last change of regulations?

Mr. Dinnie: With the exception of amendments, there has been no change for many years.

The Commissioner: Are those amendments made piecemeal?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

The Commissioner: How long has it been recognised that a revision of the regulations is necessary?

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It has been recognised for some little time. Amendments have been made during the whole of the time I have been here. I should like to ask the witness this question. (To witness): although there is a regulation in respect to men who are off duty, are they not, as a rule, permitted to go where they like?—I am prepared to say the regulation is more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

14. *The Commissioner.*] It merely gives the Inspector the power to enforce it when necessary?—Yes; but where the regulation exists it is clearly the duty of the Inspector to enforce it.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know there is now an instruction that all persons arrested are to be thoroughly searched, no matter who they are?—That is so.

16. I quite agree with you that men drawn from the farming community generally turn out the best constables, but I am afraid we should have a difficulty in getting all our men from the

farming class. Do you not think we should accept men from other sources as well?—I would not make a hard-and-fast rule, only I would give them preference. The young fellow from the country will not develop into a rogue as quickly as the young fellow from the town, and the sergeant finds him easier to train.

17. *The Commissioner.*] You have suggested that men should be placed on six months' probation. You know that a man can be dismissed at any time after he joins the Force?—Yes; but there are men who go out on beat day after day for years—respectable sober men, but who are practically useless. They take no interest in their work, they will not see anything that is going on, and all they want is to avoid trouble. Well, you have a job to shift that fellow.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you admit such men will be found in all Government departments?—Yes.

19. You think a probationary period would get over that difficulty?—I think the right class of sergeant would drop to a fellow in six months.

20. I know of some sergeants who would not?—That means you must be careful as to who you appoint sergeants.

21. The difficulty is to get the class of men you require. The majority of them consider themselves fit for promotion, do they not?—Yes, the great majority, I should say.

22. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Do you consider Constable Macholm a useful man?—Yes.

23. He had considerable local knowledge in Dunedin: transferring him to another city he knew nothing about would handicap him considerably, would it not, for at least twelve months?—Yes, and longer. I had him in mind when I said if a man is appointed to our staff from a big centre he should, as far as possible, be left in the centre where he was appointed.

24. Speaking of uniform men in barracks, as distinct from detectives, do you not think a constable who comes off duty at 9 p.m., and who has to go on duty at 5 in the morning, should be in bed not later than half-past 10 if he is to be fit for duty?—Yes; but I would not make it a hard-and-fast rule, because next day he would be off duty at 5 and not on again till 9 the next morning.

25. In the matter of reading, lights, &c., I agree with you that every man should read as much as possible, but should there not be some restriction as to the time lights in barracks should be extinguished?—Yes.

26. Do you think 11 is a reasonable hour?—I would not make it a hard-and-fast rule. Men in the big cities often come off duty at 5 and go about doing duty although off duty, and return to barracks about 10, and I think they should be able to read till 11 or 12, as they are not on duty till 9 in the morning. I think 12 would be a reasonable hour.

27. On whom do you think the cost of leaving the lights from 11 to 12 should fall?—On the Department.

28. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Do you think twelve days' leave in the year is enough?—No, I think there should be at least fifteen days.

29. And that should be allowed to accumulate for three years?—Yes.

30. Do you think there are men in the detective branch who are entitled to promotion before Detective Quartermain?—His appointment does not affect me personally, but the men in the Force generally think his appointment is a mistake. As a general principle, I think so; he has had no practical detective experience.

31. Do you think he is entitled to rank as a finger-print expert in view of the fact that he has practically learned all he knows in a few weeks or months? Do you think the term gives him an exaggerated idea of his own position, and makes the position of other detectives appear comparatively insignificant?—Personally, I do not say he is not entitled to be called "expert," but I do say, considering his service, he is not entitled to rank as detective.

32. If it is a fact that he could become expert in so short a time, and considering also that a finger-print expert is a valuable man to have in the service, could not other acting-detectives also be converted into experts in the interests of the service by being given the same opportunities?—That is the general feeling—that the whole thing is kept in Wellington, and others know nothing about it.

33. It is unfair to other detectives, as well as injurious to the service?—Yes.

34. Every acting-detective could then be a finger-print expert, and be on the spot as such wherever he may be stationed?—I do not know that I would personally care to put in the time necessary to become one.

35. You may not want it now, but I am speaking generally of acting-detectives: would it not be an encouraging thing for them to find themselves in the same position as regards pay as Quartermain?—Undoubtedly.

36. Seeing that he learnt his business from Mr. Dinnie, jun., would the office be under any disadvantage if he were removed, and others sent to learn the business?—No objection could be taken to that.

37. Do you remember the Commissioner, in connection with the Papakaio case, saying in a memo. that in future he would watch over your and Bishop's interests, or something to that effect?—I know he appreciated the work we did—I cannot be sure about the memo.

Chief Detective Herbert: I am asking this question to ask the Commission to read the papers connected with that case and see all the things said by everybody about everybody, and compare it with the experience of others.

Witness: In regard to acting-detectives as compared with men attached to the district office doing clerical work, they contend rightly that they ought to have a greater allowance than the clerical staff. Constables in a district office get ordinary pay and 1s. a day, and so do acting-detectives. They consider their work is of a far more important nature, and their hours are three times as long, and therefore they should receive more pay. And they contend they should not have to wait so long before promotion.

38. *The Commissioner.*] What is the average time?—I do not know.

39. Was Quartermain appointed over your brother's head?—He and Quartermain joined the same month, and came out of the depot together.

40. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you aware that Quartermain served in the Prisons Department for some time?—Yes.

41. Do you not think that is of great advantage in the position he now holds?—No; if he were attached in a big centre the experience might have been valuable.

42. Would it not be of advantage in the identification of criminals?—If he had been attached to one of the district staffs.

43. He knows a great many prisoners?—Yes; if Smith has a lot of convictions against him, and you had a photograph of Jones, he could say it was not a photo of Smith, but he could more readily detect criminals by finger-prints than photos.

44. Do you know he has had many outside cases in his time?—I know he has arrested men that he knew. I do not want to say anything unkind about him.

45. What are his educational qualifications?—Above the average.

The Commissioner.: Is Mr. E. Dinnie's position recognised on the estimates as a separate and distinct office?

Mr. Dinnie.: Yes, as an expert.

THOMAS KING, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 34.)

Witness.: I am stationed in Dunedin. I joined the Force in 1878, having had previous police experience. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1898, and station sergeant in 1906. It was only after hearing your Worship's address to the men that I decided to give evidence, as you assured the men that no injustice would follow the giving of evidence. I have a complaint to lay before the Commission, labouring as I do under a sense of injustice. In October, 1905, I received a telegram from Inspector Gillies, offering me the position of station sergeant, with an increase of 1s. 6d. pay. I replied asking what the house-allowance was, and on receiving a reply I telegraphed back that I had no wish for the position, as I considered the remuneration insufficient—that I would only accept it if instructed to do so. In the following February I read of my appointment to the position in Christchurch in the newspapers. I returned to my station, and got a telegram with the appointment, with a memo. to the effect that the pay was 11s. 6d., rising to 13s. by an increase of 6d. every two years and a house-allowance of £40. I replied to the effect that I had been led to understand the pay was 13s. per day from the start, and the pay offered was a reduction of pay to me. I got no satisfaction, and I made representations that I was dissatisfied, and wished to remain where I was, and had no wish whatever to leave. I got a reply saying that the arrangements were made and could not be altered. I came to Dunedin, and was handed the charge of the office. I carried out the duties as best I could. Five or six weeks afterwards Mr. Dinnie came to Dunedin, and I interviewed him in the Inspector's office. I complained of being taken from a good station and put to a loss of 3s. 6d. a week in connection with house-rent. Mr. Dinnie said, "Well, you had better settle down to your work if you want to get on in the service; it is a stepping-stone to further promotion. I intend to make all Sub-Inspectors from the rank of station sergeant." I left him with the understanding that it was to be so.

Mr. Dinnie.: It may be so yet.

Witness.: Some eight months afterwards I discovered that the station sergeant in Wellington was getting £50 house-allowance and the one in Christchurch was getting £65. I wrote asking for an increased house-allowance, and after writing again got it raised by £5. I was satisfied in a way, but it seemed to me I should have been treated as others were. Soon after that I was leaving the station in the afternoon, and Mr. Dinnie, who was leaving at the same time, joined me, and we walked together. He spoke of house-rent, and asked if I was satisfied. I said I would like to be treated as others in the same position. He asked how I stood on the promotion list. He said, "You are about senior, are you not?" I replied I was second—that Phair was senior to me. He said, "You won't have to wait long now." That was the last conversation I had with him. That was about two years ago. About two months afterwards I saw in the newspapers the announcement of Station Sergeant Norwood's promotion to Sub-Inspector. When I was satisfied the report was correct I applied for a transfer to Christchurch, as he was third on the seniority list, and was four years my junior. The application was sent back for reasons for making it. I attached a report saying that Norwood was to be sent to Dunedin, where he would be in immediate charge of me, who had hitherto been his senior all through the service, and I thought it might save a position which might cause unpleasantness to us both, which I wished to avoid. I also mentioned that there were free quarters in Christchurch for the sergeant, who was my junior in rank, while I was paying 13s. 10d. for rent in excess of my allowance. The Commissioner replied, "I understand Sergeant Norwood has not performed police duty either under or with Station Sergeant King, and they are practically strangers. If any unpleasantness should result through the change I am satisfied it will not be Sergeant Norwood's fault. I regret I cannot alter my arrangements." This position put me for two years and a half under Norwood. I must say I have found him a gentleman, and am sorry he left; but if any unpleasantness had arisen between him and me—which I am glad to say was not the case—he would have been believed, and I would not. It was practically a threat hanging over my head all the time he was in charge. I have been thirty-one years in the service, and have no enemies in the Force. That remark of Mr. Dinnie's hurt me very much. At the end of 1906 I happened to be on leave and staying with a farmer in the neighbourhood of the Papakaio murder, and I called in and saw the sergeant and constable on the scene. I knew my position better than to interfere, but having only lately left the district, I called the sergeant on one side, and gave him the best advice I could,

and offered to assist him if he wanted me to. He evidently did not want my help, and I left him. A day or two afterwards Inspector Gillies, who had arrived on the scene, asked me if I could remain for two or three days, as I knew the district, and my local knowledge would be of assistance. I consented to do so if he would inform my Inspector, which he did. I stayed about three days, and gave all the assistance I could. In three or four days Mr. Dinnie arrived, and Inspector Gillies told me the Commissioner said I was to return to my station.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What are you deducing from this?—I was unfortunate enough to be in the district at the time. False reports were circulated about certain things found in the house. I was not accused directly of circulating them, but I was by implication in a communication from the Commissioner.

2. I cannot reconcile what you are saying now with the fact that the Commissioner made you, as you told me, a promise of promotion to Sub-Inspector, because that was long subsequent to the Oamaru business?—The Commissioner seemed friendly to me until this unfortunate occurrence. Soon afterwards the Commissioner came down to Dunedin, and the man was committed for trial. After his return from Dunedin the Commissioner wrote to the Inspector saying, "I have information that false reports are being circulated in Dunedin about so-and-so; Station Sergeant King, who was on the scene, perhaps may know their origin." It was not a direct accusation, but the inference was there, and no other conclusion could be drawn than that I was a party to the reports. I have always been jealous of my honour, and I felt the position keenly, and I confess I wrote very strongly in reply. I replied in effect that these reports had been circulated in Dunedin before my arrival from Oamaru, and I was not many minutes in the place before I was accosted by several persons in the city who knew I had been in Oamaru and asked whether these reports were correct. I contradicted them in every instance, and mentioned the names of two or three persons in repute in the place who could be interviewed and asked what I did say. I said, "I am not going to see these men; I will give you the opportunity of seeing them, and if I am guilty of what I am accused of, if you can find one single instance, I am prepared to forfeit my position in the service." I got no reply, and I do not know whether Mr. Dinnie made any inquiries or not, but the matter ended. Then, one of the detectives who was down here making inquiries stated in my presence and that of Mr. Black that there were men in the police-station trying to prejudice the evidence in the case. I took no notice, not thinking I was suspected of it till I heard the matter talked of further. Some time after, when the detective came down again, I said, "I did not take any notice of your remark the other day about men trying to prejudice the case." He said he never said men in the station, but had said people in Dunedin. I took him into Mr. Black's office, and the detective repeated his explanation, but Black said, "You can twist it as you like, but you accused men in the station of trying to prejudice the case." The matter then dropped. About seven months after the thing had occurred I was told by a man that Mr. Dinnie had said to him that I was very indiscreet in ridiculing the evidence in the way I had. Now, unless Mr. Dinnie is prejudiced by this, I cannot see why I have been overlooked in promotion. Mr. Dinnie, no doubt, will say the best men are promoted. I have nothing to say about the men; they are good men, but I was senior to them. I have been recommended by my Inspector. I have been under Mr. Gillies and Mr. Ellison, both of whom, with my own Inspector, will say I am quite competent for the position. Has Mr. Dinnie the same opportunity of knowing the qualifications of a man as the Inspector under whose immediate charge he has been? To show what Mr. Dinnie thought about me when I came here first, in conversation in the Inspector's office immediately after my arrival, I said, "I want my duties defined"—the station sergeant's duties are very peculiar; you do not know what they are. One of the duties he allotted to me was prosecutions in Court, which I did for eighteen months.

3. While the Sub-Inspector was here?—Yes; I felt for him, but those were my instructions. I have done that duty off and on since, and I think I have given satisfaction. During all the time I have been in the Force I hold an unblemished record, I think, equal to any other man's. It would be very interesting to me to know what Mr. Dinnie's reason was for overlooking me. I do not think there is any sergeant in the Force in charge of a country station such as I had who would accept the position of station sergeant if he had not the hope of getting higher in the service. Every sergeant will tell you it is most irritating and unpleasant work. If I had any special duties allotted to me I should know my position, but as it is I have not. If anything goes wrong, I am held responsible; if I carry out duties or give instructions, the Sub-Inspector may come along and cancel them.

4. What are your duties?—I do not know. I come on duty about a quarter to 9. Any complaints that come in from sergeants or any correspondence during the night comes to me. If there is anything urgent, I attend to it at once. I parade the men when they come in and when they go out. The sergeants and constables all put in their reports through me, and I have them dealt with as far as possible before returning them to the Inspector's office. I am held responsible for the cleanliness of the station and other things. If people come with complaints, I take their reports.

5. How did you get into the way of doing your duties if they were not defined?—It is an understanding between the Sub-Inspector and myself. I got on very well with Mr. Norwood; we talked matters over, and understood one another; if anything was in doubt, we consulted one another. But I cannot order men away to do certain things without asking permission. I reported the whole of my alleged injustice to the Minister of Justice, and it went to the Commissioner from the Minister. The Minister was down here, and I told the Inspector I would like to see him, and he introduced me to him, and he asked me what I wanted, and I told him I considered an injustice had been done me by being passed over for promotion. He told me to report the matter fully, and in my presence told the Inspector to forward the report direct to him. The report was forwarded by the Minister to the Commissioner, and this is the latter's minute: "In the interests of the Department, and with a view to the efficiency of the Force, I recom-

mended two officers for promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector whom I consider to be superior in qualifications and better fitted in every way to hold that important rank, and who are the class of officers suitable for further advancement should vacancies occur. Station Sergeant King no doubt carries out his duties appertaining to his position in a very satisfactory manner, but I agree with my predecessor, whose remarks in respect to Sergeant King are that he is a good sergeant, but scarcely up to officer standard. That cannot be said of the two men recently promoted. The sergeant's suggestion that I am influenced against him on account of what occurred in connection with the Papakaio murder case is totally unfounded, and I am surprised at his Inspector indorsing his suggestion in respect to rumours originating from the station sergeant himself. If Station Sergeant King is the best man on offer, considering service and qualifications combined, at the next vacancy I will recommend him." The Commissioner has said that he takes credit for recommending me for my present position. I was in Inspector Gillies's district at the time, and I understood it was Mr. Gillies who recommended me, although I did not ask him to. Asked to note the above memo., I could not help writing as follows: "I respectfully ask to be allowed to make a few remarks on the minute above quoted, with reference to my non-advancement in the service. The Commissioner states he recommended me for my present position, and also states that I am carrying out my duties in my present position in a satisfactory manner. May I ask what better proof is required as to my fitness for the position of Sub-Inspector, only one grade higher than my present position, than the Commissioner's assurance that I have been efficient as sergeant and also as station sergeant? I do not consider that Mr. Tunbridge's remark as quoted by the Commissioner is applicable in my case." I never heard anything more of the matter. I have been on one occasion for three months acting Sub-Inspector and station sergeant combined. I think my Inspector will say I gave satisfaction. Again for six weeks I was acting Sub-Inspector, and lately again for two weeks, and on other different occasions. I found I gave satisfaction to my Inspector, who, I think, ought to be the best judge. My career in the service has been a very honourable one, and I have always been very jealous of my position, and have always had the welfare of the Force at heart, and have probably got on better than some. I joined in Wellington, and I was there for a month. The day after I was sent out on duty I was appointed, out of some thirty or forty men, as night watch-house keeper, and was there for three months. Then they wanted a mounted man for Oamaru, and I was selected for that position. I was in Oamaru for three years, and was one year at Ngapara. Inspector Thomson, in Oamaru, said, "King, I don't like to lose you; I would rather you remained," and I did remain. I was there only six months when I was under orders for promotion to third-class sergeant in Dunedin. I was, however, left in Oamaru till sent to Tapanui, and when I had been there twelve months Inspector Weldon came to the station and said, "I want you in Dunedin as sergeant." I said, "I am doing very well here. I am about to get married, and don't want to leave." He advised me to leave, and, after consideration, I said I would go to Dunedin as he wished. Mr. Dinnie hinted I was not offered promotion, but I was on that occasion. I defy any one to say I ever asked for anything I have got in the service. I never put in an application for promotion or transfer except when transferred to Oamaru, and on that occasion my application and my appointment crossed in the post. In reference to general matters before the Commission: In the first place, I think constables are underpaid. I may say we have some very good men, but others could be improved upon with a little care and judgment. I cannot understand how some men get into the Force; they say they have passed the examination, but, if so, they must have forgotten all they learned since doing so. I think it is worth nothing. Some men who have not passed the Fourth Standard are told to go to a teacher and undergo examination, and it is sufficient if he gives a certificate that they are equal to the Fifth Standard. We all know the value of such a certificate. I know a schoolmaster who would swear I had passed the Civil Service Examination if I wanted him to. In regard to recommending candidates, it was suggested that a sergeant should make the inquiries. I quite agree with that. I was in country districts where candidates came to me and said they wanted to join. I had my doubts about their character, and told them how it could be done. They went through the form, and in one or two cases were refused, and I was accused of putting in a bad report, and stopping their chance of getting into the Force.

6. By whom?—By the candidates. I made enemies of them and of their friends. They had no direct proof, but had a suspicion that it was my report. In one case there was a man arrested for a criminal assault; it was not a very strong case, but I had my suspicion that the man was guilty. He was discharged. To my surprise, a short time after he was in the Police Force. I happened to ask a constable what sort of report he gave this man. "Well," he said, "I gave him a favourable one, because I thought he would make a good constable, but I stated the facts of the case in my report." The man got into trouble here, and was dismissed in Wellington. If a sergeant were asked to make the report, he would first go to a constable and get his history.

7. Do you say the constable reported the facts of the prosecution?—Yes. As to education, I do not think the standard is too high. I find a difficulty in this way: If a constable has not a certain amount of education he will shirk work that entails the making of a report. There is a school of instruction once a week. I give one here once a week, in the afternoon. It is supposed to be compulsory for the first twelve months after enrolment; but I find the men who know least are the men that first absent themselves, and after the twelve months do not attend. In regard to travelling-allowance, that is a matter I have suffered from myself. In important cases a detective and I have travelled together—the detective first-class and I second, although I was in charge. My expenses were quite equal to his, yet he was allowed 8s. and I only 6s. I do not want to bring the detectives' expenses down to ours, but I want to raise our allowance. I have reported the matter, but got no satisfaction. I was told if I had produced receipts for amounts I paid I would have got them allowed: but there are many cases, when in a hurry to catch trains, that you cannot get receipts. As regards the class of men getting into the service, we are getting some very

good men and some very indifferent ones. I could name a man here who is to such an extent below the standard in physique that I have seen women turn round and look at him, remarking, "What a little policeman." There are others here who should not be. I do not say it is the fault of the Department, but there is one case in which I think a man should have been rooted out before being allowed to remain so long in the Force.

8. For what?—For an occurrence he brought on himself through his own folly.

9. Was he dismissed?—He was allowed to resign, and he is living now in a very shady way. He was about twelve months in the Force.

10. After the knowledge arose?—No; he was suspended for a month. He was suffering from a loathsome disease, and the men in the station objected to his being there. He was off for a month, and was then taken back. In regard to promotion, that is another matter that is causing dissatisfaction. In the three last promotions in the *Gazette* the last man in the list is senior to the other two in the service. This man will now be junior to the others all through. If he was fit for promotion at the time he was promoted, he should have been fit two months previously. This causes a great deal of dissatisfaction. I think a man who is passed over should be passed over for all time, though I hope it will not happen in my case.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your expression of dissatisfaction in connection with promotion was submitted to both Ministers?—No, only to the present Minister.

12. He has not thought it necessary to make any change?—No.

The Commissioner. He mentioned the matter specially to me, and he may have avoided taking action as this was one of the matters to come before the Commission.

Witness. These promotions took place soon after Dr. Findlay became Minister, and he did not know the details. Our opinion is that he is a capable Minister, and that we will get justice from him.

13. *The Commissioner.*] He must be dependent on advice from the Department for some time?—Yes.

14. *Mr. Dinnie.* Do you know that Mrs. King wrote to Mr. Arnold?—Six weeks ago Mrs. King was away from home, and a letter came in reply to a letter from my wife. I am as innocent of the letter as you are, and I will take good care she does not write another. That was the first information I got of her writing to Mr. Arnold. I take this opportunity of saying, as Mr. Arnold is here, that I never spoke to him in my life, nor asked any person to write to him.

Mr. Arnold. I received a letter from Mrs. King, and forwarded it to the Minister.

Witness. Did she tell you I was aware of it?

Mr. Arnold. I understood from her that you were not aware of it.

Mr. Dinnie. This is the letter written to Mr. Arnold by Dr. Findlay: "I have the honour to acknowledge a letter addressed to you by Mrs. King, of Dunedin, dated 23rd February, complaining of the non-promotion of her husband, Station Sergeant King, and, in reply, to inform you that, in the interests of the Department, and with a view to the efficiency of the Police Force, it is found necessary to promote the best-qualified men to the higher ranks, and occasionally junior men have to be selected with this view. This is what occurred on the occasion complained of, and the station sergeant has been fully acquainted with the cause of his being passed over."

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards probationers and their examination by schoolmasters, do you know as soon as they are taken on probation they are examined?—I was not aware of it. I went by the schoolmaster's memo. attached to the application papers before they enter the depot at all.

16. You do not know that they are examined before being taken on, and before they leave the instruction class?—No.

17. If sergeants are to inquire into the character and ability of candidates, where are you going to get them from, knowing that applicants reside in all the remote parts of the country?—There is a sergeant in charge of any sub-district, I understand. I should not think it a great hardship; my district extended about fifty miles generally.

18. You think it is practicable?—Yes.

19. Do you know of any cases where you reported against a candidate and he was afterwards taken on?—No.

20. What was the charge against the candidate you referred to?—Indecent assault.

21. And its result?—It was dismissed.

The Commissioner. That does not say the man was innocent. I have dismissed scores of cases where I had a latent feeling the man was guilty. Where a man is charged openly with such a crime it should be a matter of extreme care before he is taken on.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards measurements, you say the man you refer to was under the standard height?—I think so.

23. Do you know the measurement round the chest?—No, but extremely small for the Force.

24. Even small men have intelligence sometimes?—Yes; he was intelligent.

25. Do you know the Minister has approved of the admission of at least one man under height?—A quarter of an inch or so perhaps.

TERENCE O'BRIEN, Inspector, further examined. (No. 35.)

1. *Station Sergeant King.*] Have I given satisfaction during the three years I have been station sergeant?—You have given every satisfaction.

2. Have you recommended me for promotion as Sub-Inspector?—I have.

3. You think I am quite competent to fill the position?—I do; otherwise I should not have made the recommendation.

4. I have been acting Sub-Inspector on different occasions?—Yes, when a change was taking place, or when the Sub-Inspector was away on leave or on the sick-list you have filled the position.

5. With satisfaction?—You have indeed.

6. After I came here, were you instructed that I was to conduct the Court prosecutions?—Yes.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Was there a Sub-Inspector here at the time?—Yes.

8. What did you assume to be the reason? Did the Sub-Inspector take exception to it?—Probably the reason was that the station sergeant could do the work as well, and it would leave the Sub-Inspector the opportunity of more outside supervision. The Sub-Inspector took no exception to it.

9. I am surprised to hear the duties of station sergeant have never been defined. Is that a fact?—In a way. When the rank of station sergeant was created the Commissioner himself promised to define the duties; for some reason he has not done so.

10. Is there any difficulty about it?—Not a bit. If I had my own way, I would have had them defined long ago.

11. The Inspectors, in conversation with the Commissioner, could settle it in five minutes?—Yes.

12. Their not being defined does not conduce to good discipline?—Well, they are defined in a way, but there is no guide laid down for the benefit of station sergeants.

13. Is it desirable there should be?—We have been expecting it from the Commissioner all the time.

14. In regard to this man who was living in barracks with venereal disease, did you make any recommendation?—I reported the matter to the Commissioner.

15. What was the nature of the recommendation?—I do not know that I made any special recommendation. The station sergeant reported that there was dissatisfaction amongst the men, and the papers were sent to the Commissioner.

16. But the man came back to the station?—Yes; but he is out of the service now.

17. How long was he here after he returned?—Not very long.

18. How did the month's absence come about?—He reported himself unfit for duty.

19. Was the Commissioner aware, to your knowledge, of the man's condition?—No; and I was not aware of it when he first went on sick leave.

20. But did he not require to give a medical certificate?—Yes; but I do not think it mentioned the disease.

21. Then, what is a medical certificate worth?—Very little.

22. Who gives the certificate?—The Police Surgeon.

23. You might never have been aware of the man's condition had it not been for the men?—That is so.

Station Sergeant King: He did not disclose his disease, but was sick for nine days; he came back on duty, and I discovered what was wrong. The men took exception to being with him. He tried to get into the Hospital, but they would not take him in, and he was treated as an out-patient for a month. The Commissioner knew what he was suffering from, as it was in the correspondence.

24. *The Commissioner.*] Would you think it desirable, in the interests of the service, that a man having suffered from this disease should be allowed to come back?—I think it very undesirable.

Station Sergeant King: The man, from the beginning, was a very undesirable class of man. There is a matter I should like to mention in connection with what Chief Detective Herbert said in reference to Mr. Mitchell's knowledge of the station sergeants. I think Mr. Mitchell's opinions should be respected.

The Commissioner: Mr. Herbert was quite right to draw my attention to what he considered a weak spot in Mr. Mitchell's evidence. His reference to Mr. Mitchell was in perfectly good taste.

Mr. Dinnie: As regards the man suffering in the manner indicated, in other Police Forces I have known men suspended times without number, and when they were well taken back again to the same position at the same place.

DIANA PINE, Married Woman, examined on oath. (No. 36.)

Mrs. Diana Pine appeared, and asked to be allowed to tender evidence in reference to alleged slanderous statements made by Detective Mitchell concerning herself.

The Commissioner said that was a matter for a separate action in the Courts of law, and he could not hear evidence in regard to it.

WILLIAM DARK, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 37.)

Witness: I am stationed at South Dunedin. Was enrolled on the 1st January, 1906. I think, if there is one aim a man has in the Force, it is to get off the street duty, and it is considered promotion to get to a station in charge of one man. I do not know who is responsible for promotion, but I will quote a couple of instances where junior men have been placed over the heads of seniors. "A" joined the Force in November, 1905. In August, 1907, when he had seen one year and nine months' service, he was transferred to a station over the heads of at least four other constables in the locality—one of three and a half years' service, one of two and a half years' service, one of two years and two months' service, and one of two years and one month's service. I do not cast any reflection on the men promoted, but the senior men were men with clean sheets, intelligent, and fit for the position at the time. The man with three and a half years' service was thirteen months afterwards put in charge of another sub-station, showing that he was competent to hold the position. "B" was an application of my own. I got a communication saying that my service was not considered sufficient. I was satisfied with that; but the next applicant who was put into the position was a man with three months' less service than I had. As the Inspector has mentioned, it is common talk among the men that if you are in the Dunedin district you have very little chance of getting any benefits, and the sooner you get out of it the better are your chances of a country station. Then, I consider that any man who is sent to investigate sly-grog selling cases, whether successful or not, should be afterwards transferred to another district.

I know of a man who had been sent on this work, and who was not successful, and I know from personal experience that he has suffered in consequence. With regard to pay, I think constables should start at 8s. a day, and that the increment of 6d. a day should come every two or three years instead of every four years. The rent allowance at present I consider is not sufficient for the married men. In 1897 Sergeant Emerson was in a house at Invercargill the rent of which was 8s. 6d. a week. The same house is now let for 15s. a week, showing the increased cost of house-rent, although the same allowance is made now as was made then—7s. a week. With regard to Sunday leave, I have only received four Sundays off in the last three years, not including holidays.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you applied for it?—No; but, of course, I recognise it is hard in a suburb to get Sunday leave.

2. What proportion of Sundays do you think a man should have off in the year?—It depends on the number of men at the station. It would not, of course, be possible to give as much as one a month, but I think the men should get as much as can be reasonably allowed. To show that there must be some dissatisfaction in the Force, the strength of the Force when I joined in January, 1906, was about 657; on the 1st July this year it was 766, being an increase of 109 in three and a half years; 316 men joined during that time, showing that 207 men have left in three and a half years. That is to say, at the rate of fifty-nine men a year are leaving the Force for some cause or another. Those figures are as nearly as possible correct.

3. How many have left voluntarily?—I could not say. With regard to transfers, I believe that in the last eight or ten years there has been only one man transferred to a station of his own from Dunedin South, and some of the men there have had long service.

4. To what do you attribute that?—To a certain extent to the fact that the sergeant in charge did not recommend the men; but I think the recommendation should come from the Inspector, as he surely knows the qualifications of his men.

5. I understand your application was for promotion to the watch-house, and that the man appointed had less service than you?—No; the man I spoke of was not appointed to that vacancy, but to the next vacancy that occurred. Somebody got it when I applied.

CHARLES HENRY LENNON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 38.)

Witness: I am one of the clerks in the district office in Dunedin. I wish to cross-examine Inspector O'Brien on certain statements made by him regarding the district office and my appointment.

The Commissioner ruled that, as the Inspector's evidence had had no personal application to the witness, he could not allow him to cross-examine his superior officer.

JOHN MACINTYRE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 38.)

Witness: I am Acting-Inspector of Weights and Measures at Dunedin. I joined the Force on the 1st September, 1883.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You remember that on one occasion you saw me in Wellington, and the question of promotion was mentioned?—Yes.

2. Did you then say you were unable to perform street duty owing to your illness?—Yes.

3. *Inspector O'Brien.*] How long ago was that?—Last January.

4. Suppose the rank of sergeant had been offered you four or five years ago, would you then have accepted it?—I should not like to say I would have accepted it on the street, but I would have accepted it freely if allowed to remain where I was, or if I had charge of a country station. I was asked to go to two stations something like three years ago, but I declined to go to them on account of my health. I got hurt in the service a good many years ago.

5. Up to the time you interviewed the Commissioner in Wellington, had you ever been offered a position as sergeant in charge of a station?—Yes.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Because you could not take charge of a station on account of sickness, would it not be inferred from that that you could not do street duty?—Yes; I refused a station on that account. I am strong enough for the duties I am carrying out now.

JAMES FREDERICK ARNOLD, Member of Parliament, further examined. (No. 40.)

Mr. Dinnie: I desire to express my appreciation of Mr. Arnold's action in appearing before the Commission on this occasion. It shows, at least, that he now has a desire to ascertain what truth there is, if any, in the serious allegations he has made.

Mr. Arnold: What do you mean by "now has a desire"?

Mr. Dinnie: I will explain what I complain of. I say "now has a desire to ascertain if there is any truth or any foundation for the allegations he has made." It seems to me most extraordinary and surprising that those allegations should have been made by a member of Parliament, or by any other person, without some little inquiry as to whether there was any foundation for such statements. That Mr. Arnold knew where to obtain that information is obvious.

The Commissioner: You know Mr. Arnold has a perfect right, as a member of Parliament, to say what he likes on the floor of the House.

Mr. Arnold: And I shall take full advantage of it at all times.

Mr. Dinnie: Undoubtedly, I do not complain of that; but he knew my mouth was shut. It was practically a stab in the back, both as regards myself and the Department. He dared not make those statements in public outside, otherwise he might have been appearing before another Court.

The Commissioner: You must, of course, take the responsibility for what you say.

Mr. Dinnie: If I thought it was in the interests of the service I should be satisfied, but I am afraid there is some ulterior object in the matter.

The Commissioner: Do you think it is wise to raise a question of that kind, looking to the fact that the Minister of Justice, in the exercise of his discretion, and with the full approval and concurrence of the Government, has thought proper, as the result of statements made by Mr. Arnold and others, to set up a Royal Commission? Do you think it is wise to refer to the motives which actuated Mr. Arnold?

Mr. Dinnie: I applied for the Commission.

Mr. Arnold: When you knew it was coming in any event.

Mr. Dinnie: Then, sir, you prevent me from making reference at all—

The Commissioner: When you are on oath I shall give you the fullest opportunity of defending your position as Commissioner of Police, but you are certainly trenching on my good nature in making a set speech now, quite different from Mr. Arnold when he commenced to give his sworn evidence. When the time comes I shall give you a full opportunity of traversing the whole position.

Mr. Arnold: I presume the position is this: When I tendered evidence I introduced it with a few words, and I am here now to be cross-examined. When Mr. Dinnie is sworn to give his evidence, then will be the time for him to make the statements he is now making, and it will then be my privilege and my pleasure to cross-examine Mr. Dinnie.

The Commissioner: I understand it is at Mr. Dinnie's own request that he shall be sworn to give evidence with regard to specific matters relative to the Dunedin district.

Mr. Dinnie: At present you will understand, sir, that I only intend to answer definite charges. Hearsay evidence and general charges, as you are well aware, are difficult to answer, and hearsay evidence is not admitted in a Court of justice, but here there is a great deal of it.

The Commissioner: But we are not a Court of justice.

Mr. Dinnie: I will confine myself to the specific charges which Mr. Arnold has made.

1. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I suppose I am right in saying that you have no practical experience in respect to the control or supervision or system of maintaining discipline in the Police Force?—You are quite correct to that extent, but I do know how a body of men should be treated.

2. Do you know there exist rules and regulations framed for the maintenance of discipline and efficiency of the Force?—Yes.

3. Do you know that the Police Regulations relative to the divulging of departmental information are precisely similar to those which obtain in the other branches of the Civil Service?—I am fully aware of it.

4. Do you consider such regulations are essential for the maintenance of discipline in the interests of the Department and of justice?—I do not.

5. You will perhaps recollect the steps which were taken in respect to those men attached to the Post Office who divulged departmental information at Christchurch?—Yes.

6. I think they were dismissed?—I understand they were.

7. Do you suggest that the information you obtained and the circulars you quoted in connection with the Police service in the House reached you otherwise than directly or indirectly through members of the service?—Certainly I do, and I may say this—and this is part of the matter quoted by me: that during your predecessor's term of office sixty-five men were dismissed from the Force and nine resigned, making a total of seventy-four; during your own term of office 146 have been dismissed and twenty-two have resigned, making a total of 168: and surely you must be aware that those men who have either resigned or been dismissed are as familiar with the working of the Force as are those who are in the Force to-day. In addition to which, I have, of course, had full access to the *Police Gazette*.

Mr. Dinnie: There may have been reasons for those changes. If you had looked further back you might possibly have found a similar difference in the numbers who left the Force.

The Commissioner: I understand Mr. Arnold is only giving the probable source of his information.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the charges you made, you did not seek to verify your information very much, apparently?—Why do you say "apparently"?

9. I will show that later on?—Well, let me say this: Those who know me know that I am not a man who enters readily into emotional or hysterical public matters. I do not look to have the limelight cast upon me, and I took the greatest possible care in the matters I entered into; indeed, some of them were given to me upon oath; and when the Commissioner gives opposite evidence upon oath, then it will be for me to judge as to whose words I shall accept—my friend's or the Commissioner's.

10. You will have the files. Will you believe them?—I will see about that later on.

11. It is doubtful now—they might be "faked," might they not?—I am not sure whether the Commissioner wishes those words taken down. The suggestion is that such a thing is possible.

12. It is possible, yes?—Thank you.

13. You knew perfectly well you could get verification of your statements in a most simple manner—by applying to the Minister of Justice?—Yes, but the Commissioner surely knows what my object was. We had evidence this morning from a man who believed he was suffering under a grievous wrong—he was discontented, if you like—and a connection of his communicated with me. That communication was forwarded to the Minister. From the Minister it went to the head of the Department, was minuted, and returned to the Minister. A reply was sent to me, and there the thing is. Mr. Dinnie should know that that sort of thing has been going on for the last four or five years, and while it has been going on, the Force over which he has control has been going from bad to worse, and the discontent which I alluded to the other day, and which has since been proven to exist by his own chief officers, has become more intense; and the reason I

did not go to Mr. Dinnie or the Minister was that I felt the time had come when some extraordinary action must be taken, in the interests of the public and in the interests of the Force. I knew what was before me when I took that step, and, as a result, this Commission, although Mr. Dinnie may say he asked for it.

14. What step did you take?—I delivered a speech in the House, instead of going to you.

15. Do you not think the Minister of Justice would have looked into any matters in connection with the Police Force?—I do; and although I asked for the Commission—and I am now delighted that it has been appointed, although I at first thought it would be a whitewashing Commission—if the term is allowable—when I made that speech and asked for a Commission, I believed the Minister himself was strong enough to go fully into the departmental matters, and bring about a washing-up, which would have the same result as this Commission will have, and some of us know what that will be already.

16. You saved the Minister the trouble?—That is a matter for the Minister. He preferred this course.

17. Do you consider that definite statements of that sort, if there is no foundation for them, are conducive to the welfare of the Department?—Do you say there is no foundation for them?

18. I say there is no foundation for the definite statements?—Which do you speak of?

19. One statement you made was in respect to the Finger-print Expert getting six months' leave on full pay. Is that a definite statement?—The statement made in Parliament was that the Finger-print Expert, who happens to be your own son—since you have brought the matter forward—had received six months' leave of absence on full pay to go Home for the purpose of getting married; and, in spite of what the file may say, I shall ask you, when you are giving evidence, if you will say on oath that originally six months' leave of absence on full pay was not granted.

20. My dear sir, you will have the file, which will prove that without my swearing it. I have asked you whether, if those statements are false it is wise to make them?—It is never wise to make false statements. I am surprised at your asking a question like that.

21. Do you not consider that information of any description in connection with the Department should be referred to the head of the Department, who ought to know best whether it is true or not, or to the Minister?—In this case I did not think so.

22. In the case of hearsay evidence, or information of any one coming to pitch a tale, do you mean to say you should repeat that without knowing whether it is true or not?—Everything depends upon where the tale comes from, and upon whether one believes it is true or not. I have not yet heard evidence as to whether it is true or not.

23. There is a saying that "If you believe all you hear, you might as well eat all you see"?—That is very true so far as this inquiry is concerned, from the evidence I am told we will have in connection with this matter.

24. On the 25th April, 1906, did not you and Mr. Barclay write to the Minister of Justice this letter: "DEAR SIR,—In making some inquiries in reference to the police changes here"—Of course, I do not know what right you have to make inquiries—

Mr. Arnold: We have every right to make inquiries.

Mr. Dinnie: "—we have been struck with the case of Constable McIntyre"—

Mr. Arnold: Is this connected with the Finger-print Expert?

Mr. Dinnie: This is to show that you knew to whom to apply for information.

Mr. Arnold: I did so in the case of Mrs. King, and you know the result.

Mr. Dinnie: That Mr. King has not got his promotion yet.

Mr. Arnold: That the matter was forwarded to you, minuted by you, and there the matter ended.

Mr. Dinnie: No; it went before the Minister. However, that is coming. But to continue this letter of yours: "This constable has a very long record of service, and a very clean conduct sheet. We have observed that a number of new sergeants are being appointed, and some of them are comparatively young men, and some who are clerks in the police office, and who, we believe, are not called upon for street duty. We venture to represent to you that Constable McIntyre has considerable claims to be promoted to the rank of sergeant. Possibly the reason why he has not been promoted is that he occupies the position of Inspector of Weights and Measures, and the mere fact that he has been selected presumably on account of his suitability and capacity for the position ought not to bar him from rising in the Force, and from being promoted to a sergeant's rank. We would respectfully ask that you would be good enough to inquire whether Constable McIntyre is not a proper man to be raised at the present juncture to the rank of sergeant, and, in conclusion, we add that we are making this representation to you quite independently of Constable McIntyre himself, and because it strikes us that the matter may not have received so far your attention.—We are, &c., A. R. BARCLAY, J. F. ARNOLD." Then did you receive this reply from the Minister: "I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of 3rd ultimo, *re* Constable McIntyre, who is employed as Inspector of Weights and Measures at Dunedin, and, in reply, to inform you that apparently your inquiries in reference to police changes at Dunedin, especially as regards this constable, were incomplete, otherwise you would, I think, have arrived at a different conclusion, and refrained from suggesting that Constable McIntyre had been overlooked. Constable McIntyre joined the Force on the 1st September, 1883, was advanced to second-class constable, 27/7/85, and appointed to charge of Alexandra Station on 9/10/90. Being then a single man, he was transferred to Dunedin, a married man replacing him. In January, 1898, he was appointed to charge of Arrowtown, but at his own request, on account of his bad health, he was transferred to Dunedin, and given light duties as watch-house keeper, and subsequently appointed as Inspector of Weights and Measures, as he was unfit to perform ordinary street duty. He has recently been offered charge of a station, but declined, being medically unfit for such a position." Now, this proves the reason for his non-promotion.

Mr. Arnold: It also proves the statement that we did not consult Constable McIntyre nor he us.

Mr. Dinnie: I am not suggesting that, but it does not prove it, otherwise we should not have had the other information. To continue: "The duties he is now performing are light, simple, and, in fact, the only police work he is capable of performing, being medically unfit for promotion or to hold any other position in the Department, and it is simply to prevent his being invalidated from the service that this appointment was conferred on him. It will be observed, therefore, that this constable has received every consideration, and that he is totally unfit for the promotion suggested, the qualifications required being ability, energy, and general fitness to superintend and maintain discipline.—I have, &c., JAS. MCGOWAN, Minister of Justice." That proves, anyhow, that Constable McIntyre is not fit for street duty as sergeant.

Mr. Arnold: You are now talking about the Finger-print Expert.

Mr. Dinnie: No, that is coming.

Mr. Arnold: Because we have the appointment of that expert to consider sooner or later.

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, we have, and I think it will be to your detriment.

25. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You have had other communication with the Minister?—Yes, in all probability.

26. Coming to this Finger-print Expert business, perhaps you will believe this is the original application, owing to the stamp, date, and everything else?—I do not know that I even admit that, if, according to your statement, these things can be "faked."

Mr. Dinnie: Other people may believe it, if you do not. This is dated 2nd December, 1908: "Application of E. W. Dinnie, Finger-print Expert, for leave of absence to visit England.—I respectfully beg to apply for six months' leave of absence from the 12th February next to the 11th August, 1909, for the purpose of proceeding to England on private business. I have now completed five and a half years' service, during which time I have not had any leave of absence. It is my intention when in London to visit the Finger-print Department of the Metropolitan Police, new Scotland Yard, with a view of obtaining all information in respect to all recent improvements in the system of identifying criminals, and also to purchase some up-to-date paraphernalia required in the finger-print branch.—E. W. DINNIE, Finger-print Expert." That is addressed to the Commissioner of Police. My minute upon that is as follows: "The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—Recommended: one month with pay, remainder without pay. Arrangements can be made in respect to duties of applicant during his absence.—W. DINNIE, Commr., 2/12/08." This is marked "Approved" by Mr. McGowan on the same date, 2nd December, 1908. I should like you to look at this document to see if it is genuine.

Mr. Arnold: It is immaterial in any case to me.

Mr. Dinnie: And yet you go and make a statement in the House—knowing that it is immaterial—to my detriment and that of the Force—a deliberate falsehood. There is the proof of it.

The Commissioner: A deliberate falsehood implies that the speaker knew it was false when he made the statement.

Mr. Dinnie: He had made no inquiry to ascertain whether it was true or not.

Mr. Arnold: Do you say I told a falsehood?

Mr. Dinnie: I say it was an untrue statement.

Mr. Arnold: Do you read *Hansard*?

Mr. Dinnie: I do.

Mr. Arnold: Have you a very bad memory?

Mr. Dinnie: I have this memory: that when you were told it was not on full pay you suggested that the original statement had been altered.

Mr. Arnold: You have suggested the possibility of such a thing, and I am surprised at that coming from you as head of the Department. Do you say now that I stated as a fact that your son had received six months' leave of absence on full pay, and that I told a falsehood?

Mr. Dinnie: What you said was that my son had got six months' leave of absence on full pay.

Mr. Arnold: And will you say that you read the report in *Hansard* and in the papers, and that you have a memory of some kind?

Mr. Dinnie: My memory may not be so retentive as yours.

The Commissioner: What do you suggest, Mr. Arnold, was the statement you made in the House? Have you a copy of *Hansard*?

Mr. Arnold: I am quoting from page 228 of *Hansard*: "But, strange to say, within a very short time, another member of the Force requiring to go to Great Britain received six months' leave of absence on full pay." You say he did not?

27. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I am submitting the files for the consideration of the Commission. Perhaps you will say that *Hansard* has made a mistake?—No, *Hansard* makes no mistakes.

28. When you were informed by the Prime Minister that he was not granted six months' on full pay, did you not then suggest that he had been granted six months' on full pay, and that it must have been altered since?—I still suggest it.

29. I am surprised?—Why?

30. Because there is the file. I should like you to look at the file and see what you think of it?—I am quite prepared to leave the matter in the hands of the Commission.

31. You are not satisfied yet that this is the original file?—I have told you already that I hope to ask you upon oath whether your son was not originally given six months' leave on full pay.

32. Will you be satisfied if I swear on my oath that these are the original papers?—I shall then have to decide whose word I shall accept on oath, yours or that of the people whom I will not at present name.

33. If I call the late Minister of Justice, Mr. McGowan, who granted the leave, will you accept his word?—If you bring him down where I am, and I am given an opportunity of cross-examining him, I will take his word on oath.

34. I do not know about his doing that, but Mr. McGowan has offered to come forward at any moment?—I think it will be necessary, because either Mr. McGowan or you will have to defend yourselves very seriously.

35. I want to say, as regards the Finger-print Expert, that all he has been granted on full pay is one month, and he is entitled under the regulations to thirty-six days?—I made no complaint at all with regard to the leave of your son at six months on full pay. What I did complain of was that he should receive that leave on full pay whilst a constable was refused some days over what he was entitled to. It was discriminating between your own friends and others in the Force.

36. Seeing that Constable Potter has been given all the leave he was entitled to on full pay, and that I have not recommended in the case of the Finger-print Expert the full leave he was entitled to, do you not think the complaint should be on the other side?—That means that you are discriminating against your own friends—a thing which neither the public nor the Force give you credit for.

37. Do you not think I had an object in that?—I presume you had an object.

38. Do you know what it was?—I do not.

39. Well, it was for such as yourself. It was a little bit of bait for such as yourself to bite at?—Oh, nonsense; you can talk like that to the boys in the Magistrate's Court.

40. But I knew what I was doing at the time, and I knew it would be made public?—Intelligent men will not accept things like that. In your own words, you laid a trap for public men to fall into. That is really what it means.

Mr. Dinnie: We laid a trap for men who are interfering with the Department.

The Commissioner: We had better pass from that and continue the cross-examination.

41. *Mr. Dinnie (to witness):* I presume you accept the statement I made that Potter applied for thirty-six days' leave and received twenty-nine, and that that was all he was entitled to; also, that that was in accordance with the regulations?—That is not denied.

42. Then we come to Constable Mills, whose case was referred to by you both in the House and in your evidence?—I said that he came out of the barracks at 9 p.m., that he was on street duty until 10 p.m. on Saturday, that a constable was not likely to be in a publichouse during the time he was out, and that at 10 p.m. he was ordered back in a state of intoxication. I said I should be very glad if you could assure the Commission that he was not the worse for liquor when he came out of the barracks at 9 p.m.

43. Of course, you know I will have to call the men who saw him at that time; I am not able to prove that myself?—You are responsible for what takes place in your own barracks, surely.

44. I do not shirk responsibility at all, but the suggestion is made that inquiry is not made into these men's characters before they join the service?—I said nothing in regard to that man.

The Commissioner: I think, as it will be necessary for Mr. Dinnie to produce documents in reference to the appointment of these men and other matters, it will be as well that he should be sworn now. He has suggested it himself.

Mr. Dinnie (who was accordingly sworn): I produce the original files in respect to the appointment of Constable Frederick Mills. He left school at the age of fifteen years, and was in the employ of a tailor in Tuam Street, Christchurch, from February, 1899, to February, 1908. The files show that inquiries were made as to his character, not only where he was working, but where he was lodging, and that there was nothing to prevent his being taken into the Force.

Witness: It is admitted that this man was in the Force, and that he was sent off at 10 p.m. Do you still say, as you are reported to have said in a newspaper in Wellington, that it is impossible to find out such information until these men have been in the service for a considerable time?

Mr. Dinnie: I said they had to be tried before you could tell what they were.

Mr. Arnold: Did you say this: "He could speak with certainty, from his own knowledge of the London police, that the newspapers did not take notice of such incidents there"?

Mr. Dinnie: That is so.

Mr. Arnold: And do you suggest such things should be permitted in New Zealand—permitted to pass without the public Press taking any notice of them?

Mr. Dinnie: I do not see what that has to do with the matter at all. I do not suggest that men should be allowed to get drunk if we can prevent it. If after careful inquiry is made in respect to the men it is found their characters are highly satisfactory, they are appointed. It is impossible for me or anybody else to foresee what may happen afterwards.

Mr. Arnold: Does that not suggest that the inquiries in regard to a man's habits are not sufficient?

Mr. Dinnie: I suggest that that man may not have tasted drink until he came into the Force.

The Commissioner: If a man is sworn in on the 28th October, 1908, and two months later he is charged with misconduct, as another man was, it is impossible to conceive a man in his sober senses doing that sort of thing. And then in June, 1909, he is dismissed by you for drunkenness. Could that man have suddenly developed those bad qualities after he had joined?

Mr. Arnold: The point I want to make is that in a case like this the man's dismissal does not take place until public attention has been drawn to the position.

Mr. Dinnie: Then, there were the three men who were concerned in that brawl in Wellington. They have all been dismissed.

The Commissioner: I think, without going into details, you might just let me have the file of papers.

Mr. Dinnie: I should like to show to the public that proper inquiry was made in each case, and that these men had specially good characters before they were admitted.

The Commissioner: I cannot understand where the information came from.

Mr. Dinnie: It came from the people with whom they were employed.

Mr. Arnold: There was a sergeant here who says on oath that an educational certificate could be obtained with the greatest ease, and that he could get one man to certify that he had passed the Civil Service Examination. I do not believe he could get one from any schoolmaster in Otago.

Mr. Dinnie: We do not rely upon certificates of character. We say, let us know where you are employed?

Mr. Arnold: The trouble is that when people make statements they will not go back upon them.

Mr. Dinnie: Then, it does not matter whether you send a sergeant or a constable, if they will not go back on what they say.

The Commissioner: I quite recognise the difficulty; but I am not prepared to express an opinion as to whether we could not secure some better system of making inquiries.

Mr. Dinnie: This man Clay was a very good constable indeed before this particular occurrence.

The Commissioner: It seems extraordinary that a man can suddenly develop the worst characteristics.

Mr. Dinnie: He joined the service in 1907, and there is not a mark against him until this particular occurrence.

The Commissioner: How do you account for the sudden development of bad qualities?

Mr. Dinnie: There is only one way in which I can account for it—that he went out with two others, got into temptation, and started drinking.

The Commissioner: Do you mean to say that there is more temptation for them after they join the Police Force?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes; I have seen so much of it. I know they are induced to drink.

Mr. Arnold: Yes; the Force has my sympathy. One has to be very careful in the Force. Before you pass from Constable Clay, will you kindly tell me why, when the other two constables were dismissed, Constable Clay, who was equally guilty, was retained in the Force for some time, and what influence was brought to bear to secure his dismissal afterwards?

Mr. Dinnie: That is not the case, I think you will find.

The Commissioner: The date of the dismissal of each man is given. Clay's dismissal was on the 2nd June, 1909, and the date of the others is the same.

Mr. Arnold: Were they all suspended?

Mr. Dinnie: Two of them were suspended, and the other was not.

Mr. Arnold: Why not?

Mr. Dinnie: Because the evidence against him was quite different. The evidence incriminating him did not transpire until it was given at the Court. Then we come to the case of Constable Halbrook: I understand your statement also applies to that case—that insufficient inquiry was made.

Mr. Arnold: It is contended that these men were practically taken on without inquiry. It is the only conclusion we can come to. I should like to know if it is admitted that a certain man left England with his wife's sister; that he came to New Zealand with her; that inquiries were made by his wife in New Zealand, and he was discovered living at the Hutt, in the Force, with his wife's sister, having had two children by her. Is that admitted?

Mr. Dinnie: Not exactly as you put it. It might be as well to go into the details of that case. It is a fact that he was living with his wife's sister, but he came to us from the Manawatu Railway Company, where he had been employed for some time. He was employed on the Government railways as a porter from 1904 to 1908, and all this time, it appears, he had been living with the same party, and had had two children by her.

The Commissioner: How did all this come out in the end?

Mr. Dinnie: Through his wife writing out inquiring about him; and I submit it was rather difficult for us to know whether it was his wife or not.

The Commissioner: Mr. Arnold only wants you to say whether you admit that this fact exists. It can be left to me to say whether there is excuse.

Mr. Arnold: My object is to prove that, in consequence of the admission of such men, the more respectable members of the Force feel discontented and dissatisfied, and that other good men will not join, and that is partly the reason for the inferior men you are getting.

Mr. Dinnie: Can you offer any suggestion as to how it could have been ascertained that he was so living?

Mr. Arnold: I think, in your predecessor's time, such a state of things would not have existed.

Mr. Dinnie: I may tell you that under the system of my predecessor the inquiry was not so complete as it is now. Five years back was considered sufficient to inquire. Five years back is considered in most Police Forces to be sufficient to inquire into the character of any applicant for enrolment.

The Commissioner: Does that apply in the Old Country?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

Mr. Arnold: Do you think it would be well to adopt that in New Zealand?

Mr. Dinnie: No; I think the stricter the inquiry the better. Then, there is the case of this man Ratt. The suggestion in respect to him is that when he left he ran away with another man's wife. I do not know what the Police Department has got to do with that.

Mr. Arnold: The suggestion is that this man came from England, and was stationed in the first place in Auckland; that he was transferred for fighting; and at that time the general public knew that the relationship between him and the married woman was not what it should be—although the Commissioner did not—and that afterwards he cleared out with this married woman.

Mr. Dinnie: I produce the papers giving certificates of this man's employment at Home, educational qualifications, and so on.

The Commissioner: How long was he in the Force before he ran away with this woman?

Mr. Dinnie: Perhaps twelve months.

Mr. Arnold: Living with her all the time?

Mr. Dinnie: That did not come under my notice. Eventually he resigned of his own accord. In regard to there having been insufficient inquiry into the case of Willets, his record is: Public Works Department, Otira Gorge, platelaying, 1897–99; Royal New Zealand Artillery, 1899–1907; joined tram service in Wellington, 1907; Humphrey Bros., as labourer, 1907–8; then joined the service.

The Commissioner: How was he disposed of?

Mr. Arnold: I understand he is still in the service.

[File handed in.]

Mr. Dinnie: In regard to Wallace, McBride, and O'Connor?

Mr. Arnold: Wallace was dismissed from the Glasgow police for assault on his sergeant: how is it that was not shown before he was accepted? Did the police know nothing about it?

Mr. Dinnie: No, not until writing to Scotland for information. He was taken on for a short time till a reply was received. As soon as the reply arrived he was dismissed. Not only that, but two other constables who had had service in the same Police Force, and who gave evidence that he was sober and honest, were also called upon to resign: the three had to resign.

The Commissioner: The whole trouble would have been avoided if inquiry had been made before he was taken on.

SATURDAY, 17TH JULY, 1909.

JOSEPH CHARLES WILLIS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 41.)

Witness: I am stationed at Dunedin Central. I joined the Force in 1893. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1907, having previously passed the police examination. I had then had thirteen and a half years' service. I have been stationed at Dunedin as sergeant a little over two years. There is one matter I desire to bring under notice: the married men object to the very harassing restriction which compels them to go to and from their homes in uniform; they look upon it as degrading that they cannot be trusted to do so for fear of their doing something wrong. The order was the result, I understand, of the police scandal here some years ago.

1. *The Commissioner:* Do you know of no reason why it should be still enforced?—No. The men can very well be trusted to go to and from their homes without bringing discredit on the Force. If they are not fit to be trusted in this way they are not fit to be in the Force. Another thing the men complain of is that they do not get as much Sunday leave as they might. At present they get about every sixth Sunday, but if the district clerks were detailed for street duty on Sundays, to relieve the men who are out day and night all the year, they would be able to get off on Sunday more often. In regard to the clerical staff generally, personally I think I am voicing the feeling of the Force in saying they are pampered too much. The police are paid for working seven days a week, and these men only work five and a half days and only seven hours a day, while they are paid 1s. extra, and are allowed to wear plain clothes. And it opens a back door to promotion. They have Sunday and half Saturday off, and most of the public holidays, which comes to about eighty-five days a year—that is, they work three months a year less than the average constable. The clerical branch of the service is very much sought after. When a man has been in the Force a few days now he thinks he should be in the district office.

2. There are many men outside the office who are as well qualified to do the office work as those inside?—Yes.

3. It does not take any time to get acquainted with the duties?—I do not know where the extra qualification comes in. I know of plenty on the block who are qualified.

4. Do you think it would be desirable, in the interests of the men, that they should have a turn in the district office to qualify themselves for charge of a station?—It might tend to disorganize things if that were done. I do not come here with a grievance exactly, but in regard to promotion of these men, I do not know where their merit comes in. They occupy a snug position for ten years. At present the three district clerks doing duty in Auckland, Wellington, and Dunedin are just as capable as myself: I do not think they are any worse or better than I am, but they have become my seniors. The position is this: Supposing one of these men were to say, "I have had enough of the office; it does not agree with my health; I want to come out on the street," he would come out as my senior. If they had any particular merit, or had done anything meritorious, there would be no objection. Sergeant Dart has been promoted very early, but he is recognised as a very superior man. Another thing: I think it should be understood that a man has to put in a certain time on the street before being eligible for a staff appointment of any kind; it is not right that a man should join one day and in a few months find himself in a position in the district office, or watch-house keeper. In connection with the district clerks doing no Sunday duty, I would point out that the watch-house keeper and the constable who does plain-clothes inquiries in connection with old-age pensions both take their turn at Sunday duty, and there is no reason why the clerks should not do so. I would emphasize a point mentioned by Constable Fox—the fact that when a man enters the district office on the clerical staff he is no longer a comrade of the other policemen, but looks on himself as being a cut above them, and does not associate with them.

5. That follows as a fact?—In my experience. He is altogether a separate sort of person from a common policeman, and tells people he is secretary down at the station; he drops the title of constable, and calls himself "Mister." I think they should be taught that they are still constables, and be made to do that duty. Another thing: A constable or sergeant on night duty comes off at 5, and it is pretty well 6 before he gets to bed, and if he has a case he has to parade at the station and be at the Court at 10. This interferes with a man's health.

6. What do you suggest as a remedy for this?—It has been advocated that the Court should sit in the afternoon, but that, of course, is absurd. But the same might be done as in Australia, and the men might be allowed time off for it.

Chief Detective Herbert: That is a common thing in Victoria.

Witness: There is no reason why there should not be a scale fixed, and every time a man has to get up for some ordinary "drunk" he might be allowed an hour off. There are often cases which are not called on till late in the day, and the man loses the greater part of his day waiting in the Court, and then has to be on parade at 9. This is a hardship that in these days of eight hours should be made up for by time off.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Are not the officers considerate in the matter of giving time off?—A man never gets time off for this except in this way: If a man is kept at Court the whole day he might be let off an hour or two earlier in the morning, but, as a rule, he is not allowed anything for it. The same thing obtains with the man on the first relief—5 to 9. He has to go home and get breakfast, and be back to take the prisoners to Court at a quarter to 10. In regard to railway fares, it is generally considered that we should get some concession, as we cannot take our holidays at Christmas or Easter time, when the cheap fares are on, but always have to take them at times when normal fares are charged. Then, there is an anomaly in regard to the travelling-allowances of sergeants and detectives, the latter getting 8s. and the sergeant 6s. We maintain we are entitled to the same as the detective. Take the case of a station with a sergeant in charge and a detective attached: the man in charge gets 12s. a day as full pay and the detective 15s., and the man in charge has to travel second class while the other travels first. I think the pay of the Force should be raised; the present rate is not sufficient to attract a good class of men.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards going to and from the station in plain clothes: do you know that regulation is in consequence of the men going into the single men's quarters and hanging up their clothes there?—I have heard so.

9. The clerical staff, you say, is much sought after?—It is in Dunedin.

10. Do you know I have only seven or eight applications from the whole Force for those positions?—I am surprised to hear it. I know men, as soon as they join, aspire to the district office.

11. *The Commissioner.*] Is it generally known that men should apply before they obtain recognition?—I think so. I know there are four or five applications from Dunedin.

Mr. Dinnie: They would be quite recent.

Inspector O'Brien: Some are and some are not.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any case where a clerk has been sent out and promoted over the head of any uniform man?—No, but promoted and kept in the office.

13. But that has not interfered with the promotion as sergeant of any uniform man?—I know of no case in my own knowledge. As long as they remain in the office we do not object.

14. It does not interfere with outside promotions?—Hogan was entitled to it when he got it, but that is not the case all round.

15. Time is given off when a man is employed in the Court in the morning?—Very rarely, if a man is in Court all day.

16. In larger Forces the men can be relieved much more easily?—I presume so.

17. We have not sufficient staff to replace them?—I think it could be done.

18. *The Commissioner.*] How would you arrange it?—I have not thought it out, but a man would not be out more than three or four times a month, and I do not see why he should not get off for three or four hours at a time when the station sergeant could spare him.

19. Have you noticed anything in regard to the physique and intellectual ability of recent recruits?—We have had some very poor men during the two years I have been here—poor in every way.

20. Is there a difficulty in getting men of a better type?—It seems so. I am rather at a loss to understand it. I cannot suggest any reason for it. There is one matter I should like to mention: I consider it is a mistake to take men from another Police Force into our Force; they should be some time in the colony, so that some idea of their character may be gained.

21. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the Force as regards any burning questions?—I cannot say I do. From time to time there are little heartburnings.

22. Do you know anything of political influence?—I cannot point to anything of that nature that has come under my notice.

23. In regard to the sobriety of the men?—They are a very sober lot of men at present.

24. What is the maximum age at which a man should be promoted to the rank of sergeant to do street duty?—Not more than forty-five.

25. It is pretty trying work?—Yes; I was thirty-eight when I was promoted. If I had my time over again I would not leave a country station to come into town; I lose £50 a year by it.

26. Have you any views as regards the promotion from the plain-clothes branch to higher offices?—Well, it narrows the avenue of promotion to ourselves, but we cannot deny the justice of it. It is a pity a rank could not be created in their own branch. If a sergeant and a Chief Detective have equal ability, the sergeant does not get a "look in" with the detective. He is before the public every day; he prosecutes in Court; he comes into contact with the best people; he must acquire knowledge of the law, and a certain amount of polish. The sergeant may be as able, but he has no opportunity of showing what he can do. The station sergeant has no show

against the Chief Detective. He is connected with the administrative work in barracks; he may be as good as the Chief Detective, but he has no show.

27. It does not follow that every Chief Detective is fit for promotion to higher rank. You admit the justice of their promotion if the qualifications are suitable?—Yes.

28. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Have you ever known of an instance where a constable has applied for three or four hours' leave on the grounds that he had one or two days during the week to attend Court, necessitating early rising in the morning, and the application has been refused?—No.

29. Leave has been granted where the constable could be spared?—Yes.

30. As regards leaving the station and coming to it in uniform, do you not think the average constable is more likely to be circumspect in uniform than in mufti?—There is no question about that.

31. In order to carry out your views in this respect two things would be necessary—a dressing-room at the police-station with wardrobes?—It was never done before, when men came and left in plain clothes.

Inspector O'Brien: That was just the difficulty.

J. F. ARNOLD, Member of Parliament, further examined. (No. 42.)

Mr. Dinnie: As there may be some misconception as regards my meaning in respect to the statement made in the House by Mr. Arnold, I wish it to be understood that what I meant was that the statements made are not accurate, and that there is proof to the contrary. I wish it to be understood I am here simply to answer those definite charges, and that Mr. Arnold had other means of obtaining better verification of the statements than the one he adopted. That is as far as I go. I do not suggest that he made statements absolutely knowing they were not correct.

Mr. Arnold: I am pleased to accept the Commissioner's apology, but I think now he has mentioned it I might clear the matter up. What he did say—and the paper is correct, I think—was, "Do you consider statements of this description made in the House, if without foundation, are conducive to the welfare of the Department?" and I said, "Do you say there was no foundation for them?" You replied, "I do, as regards the definite statements"—that is, that there was no foundation for my definite statements. In his communication to the Minister, the Commissioner said that these charges were reckless. I presume the Commissioner will admit that the charges I made in regard to fighting in the streets of Wellington were definite. The one in regard to the man ordered off the street was definite; also in regard to the man who came to the colony with his wife's sister; and in regard to the person who went away with another man's wife; the one in regard to the constable who assaulted his sergeant in Glasgow; and also the notorious criminal who came from Australia, and whose photograph was in the possession of the Department. These were definite statements. Only two others have to be touched upon. The whole of these are proved up to the present. I would like Mr. Dinnie to say now whether he considers they were reckless.

Mr. Dinnie: What I do say is this: There are only two charges to answer, so far as I am concerned. The first is regarding the Finger-print Expert's leave of absence; the second, as regards no inquiry having been made concerning the men who got into trouble.

The Commissioner: Not sufficient inquiry. You would not say "no inquiry," Mr. Arnold?

Mr. Arnold: Certainly not.

The Commissioner: It is a question of the sufficiency of the inquiry. Mr. Dinnie referred to "deliberate falsehoods." Well, of course, we must assume a member of Parliament, speaking in the House with the sense of responsibility as speaking the voice of the people, would not tell what he knew to be deliberate falsehoods. The use of the word "deliberate" implies that the person knew it to be false when he said it. The paper this morning reports it, but does not draw attention to my statement in regard to it. I took exception to it at the time, and if it had not been brushed aside in the course of argument I should have spoken very strongly about it. There was perhaps a little heat on both sides.

Mr. Dinnie: I was quite calm.

The Commissioner: I know you were. However, I am glad to hear Mr. Dinnie's explanation of the matter—that he withdraws the suggestion that there was anything in the shape of deliberate falsehood. His complaint now is that inquiry was not made of a departmental officer, or through a Minister, of the various matters about which you made complaint in the House—that you should have gone to the Department and made inquiries. I am glad to have the reference to "deliberate falsehood" cleared up, because from a gentleman in Mr. Dinnie's position it looks bad, it reads bad, and sounds bad.

Mr. Arnold: I am delighted to hear Mr. Dinnie's explanation. If we are to confine ourselves to the two questions—what inquiries should have been made, and in regard to your son's leave of absence—I am quite willing. I presume you will admit the correctness of my other statements?

Mr. Dinnie: I shall be glad if you will read the papers, and see what inquiries were made.

Mr. Arnold: In regard to Willets, who I say was dismissed from the Wellington tramways, how was it the police could not discover that, if satisfactory inquiry was made as to the reason of his dismissal and the character of the man? He was not a man who had just come from Home.

Mr. Dinnie: I was not aware he was dismissed from the tramways.

Mr. Arnold: Is he in the service still?

Mr. Dinnie: I believe so.

The Commissioner: Have you submitted to me any evidence in regard to his being dismissed?

Mr. Arnold: Yes, in my evidence the other day.

The Commissioner: Have you submitted any corroborative evidence?

Mr. Arnold: No, but it can be obtained in Wellington. (To Mr. Dinnie): You admit that you had Macdermott's photo in the Wellington office?

Mr. Dinnie: I will read the particulars in regard to this case: "This man applied for appointment on the 19th March, 1908. At that time we were particularly short of candidates. Out of seventeen candidates called up on the 18th February, 1908, only seven accepted, and they were warned to report on the 9th March, 1908. On that date three of them did not turn up, so that there were only four to start the batch with. Seven more were then called up—9th March, 1908—which exhausted the list of available candidates. Out of the seven called we got six, which made the batch up to ten. On the 13th March, 1908, one of the ten resigned, which only left nine. It therefore became necessary to select a few candidates who had not been placed on the list, owing to the inquiry into their antecedents not having been completed, but who could be got at once, as the work of the batch was being delayed. Macdermott came with the best of recommendations, showing that he had been employed as wardman in the Gundagai Hospital from January, 1899, to March, 1900; as overseer for the Lunny Sisters, at Darlinghurst, from March, 1900, to February, 1905; as dredge-hand at Port Stephens from March, 1905, to December, 1906; and again by the Lunny Sisters from January to December, 1907. He had relatives at Petone, and Mr. Wilford, M.P., who personally recommended applicant, assured me that the family, whom he had known for twenty-five years, was a most respectable one. As it was necessary to make up the batch in the depot to at least a dozen, Macdermott and two others, who were in Wellington at the time, were medically examined, passed, and sent to the depot at once on probation, being told that inquiries would be made as to their antecedents, and, should they turn out unsatisfactory, they would be discharged. A letter was accordingly written to the New South Wales Police on the 3rd April, 1908, giving details of Macdermott's employment, and asking for a report as to his character. No reply having been received before the batch were sworn in, on the 14th May, 1908, he was appointed, still subject, of course, to the inquiries being satisfactory. Shortly after his being sworn in a testimonial in his favour was received by Mr. Wilford from Mr. John Thomson, M.P., Melbourne, and submitted. I may mention that while in the depot his finger-prints were taken, but no similar prints could be found in the finger-print bureau, owing to the fact that they had not been received from New South Wales. The following month his photo was accidentally noticed in a volume of New South Wales criminals; inquiries were made, and it was put beyond doubt that he had been convicted of forgery in Australia, and he was at once discharged. The result of inquiries in New South Wales did not come to hand until after his photo had been recognised here, and he had been dismissed."

The Commissioner: The reports from New South Wales verified that?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

The Commissioner: That is a letter addressed to you by your Sub-Inspector?

Mr. Dinnie: It is got out by myself. I asked him to prepare it, and I minuted it.

The Commissioner: This is actually an admission of the facts alleged by you, Mr. Arnold. The Commissioner takes up the attitude that under pressure, owing to a shortage of men, he did not complete inquiries before the man was appointed.

Mr. Arnold: This opens this difficulty in my mind: that in March, 1909, it was almost impossible to get suitable men to enter the Force, and yet during the last twelve months there have been no less than 387 candidates. Can the Commissioner explain this?

Mr. Dinnie: It is easily explained. The number rejected is much greater than of those accepted. Although we may send for the candidates, frequently they get employment whilst they are waiting, and we cannot get them.

The Commissioner: When do you commence inquiries?

Mr. Dinnie: Immediately the application is made.

Mr. Arnold: 387 men applied and 250 were rejected: only 137 were suitable?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes. That tends to verify what I say: that every inquiry is made.

Mr. Arnold: It also proves the class of men trying to get into the Force. Why can you not get suitable men? There are plenty in the Dominion.

Mr. Dinnie: My impression is that, although it was considered advisable a year or two ago to raise the standard of education with the view of getting better men, it has been found by experience we have barred a great many men who might have possibly proved to be better constables, but who have passed only the Fourth Standard.

The Commissioner: What would you suggest for consideration by me as to the means to be adopted to increase the area of choice?

Mr. Arnold: If the pay were made such as it should be—attractive for suitable men, and the conditions improved, and the larrikin element kept out of the police that has been introduced during the last three years—it would be possible to get plenty of suitable men in New Zealand; and there is not the slightest reason why the Department should not make the fullest inquiries to satisfy themselves in regard to every man in New Zealand. But the seven instances I gave are quite enough for me to quote in Parliament. When the Commissioner selects men the majority of whom are imported then proper inquiries cannot be made.

The Commissioner: Do you think the standard of education is too high?

Mr. Arnold: Yes; in my evidence I said I thought the Fourth Standard was quite sufficient, always providing the sergeant in the training school is permitted to say as to whether he considers a man's all round education is sufficient to enable him to do his ordinary work.

Mr. Dinnie: Do you suggest that more strict inquiries are made in any other Police Force than here?

Mr. Arnold: I am not aware.

The Commissioner: Is there a list of discharged prisoners in the office in Wellington?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

Chief Detective Herbert: The man's name must be in the New South Wales Police Gazette.

The Commissioner: To whom do you delegate this work?

Mr. Dinnie: I have one clerk in my own office and one in the finger-print department.

The Commissioner: If a man comes from New South Wales, it would be very simple to examine the New South Wales *Police Gazette*.

Mr. Dinnie: He would not know how far back to search. He did not carry out his duty as he should have done, and he has been dealt with for it. He is a very careful man as a rule.

The Commissioner: One mistake in a matter of that sort discredits a man.

Mr. Arnold: If it is admitted that this officer did not make careful inquiry, and has been reprimanded for it, that is another proof of the correctness of my statements.

Mr. Dinnie: As it happened, I was not in Wellington at the time. What do you suggest in regard to Hood?

Mr. Arnold: I say he was in the Police Force, that he should not have been; and that when an assault was committed on a constable on duty in Wellington, he was amongst the crowd urging the civilians on as against his own comrades.

Mr. Dinnie: The report does not prove that in any way.

The Commissioner: How was he dealt with?

Mr. Dinnie: This is my minute: "It seems evident he did not render the assistance he should have done, and is reported as useless as a constable. I call upon him to tender his resignation at once."

Mr. Arnold: One of two things seems certain. Either inquiry was not made or the inquiry made was useless.

Mr. Dinnie: I will not admit that.

The Commissioner: It is a question for me to decide whether inquiry was made or whether it was useless.

Mr. Dinnie: I want to show that in some cases, no matter what inquiry was made, this man would have been admitted into the Force. With regard to the promotion, as the files are at Headquarters, I think it would perhaps be better to leave it to the Commissioner to look into them there.

Mr. Arnold: I have given you the dates and the names, and I am quite satisfied.

Mr. Dinnie: I was pleased to observe in *Hansard* that Mr. Arnold said that from the standpoint of ability and character the Police Force of New Zealand to-day is equal to any Force in the Australasian Colonies.

Mr. Arnold: I said also that it was gradually degenerating, and that I wished to prevent that.

Mr. Dinnie: Well, I should like to draw attention to the figures in my annual report, as showing the percentage of arrests for all offences reported as compared with what they were before I came here. It will show Mr. Arnold, I think, the degree of efficiency of the Force at the present time. In 1901-2 it was 93.86; in 1902-3, 94.43; in 1903-4, 95.53; in 1905-6, 94.7; in 1906-7, 95.65; in 1907-8, 95.86; in 1908-9, 95.63. That, I think, shows the Force are doing their work.

Mr. Arnold: It shows that you have some capable officers, such as those who are now sitting around this chamber, and in all probability the great majority of arrests are made by those men.

Mr. Dinnie: It shows there are a good many of them, because the arrests are made all over the Dominion.

Mr. Arnold: I believe you have a splendid Force, if you treat it properly.

Mr. Dinnie: I think they have received better treatment than for many years past. Perhaps they are too well treated. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. Arnold: Mr. Dinnie has practically admitted everything I require at present, at any rate. You admit the correctness of the circulars I quoted from?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, I do.

Mr. Arnold: In my evidence, when I spoke of the dissatisfaction, and the undercurrent of unrest that exists, you said, "We will see how many others will say so." I suppose after the evidence you have heard this week you are fairly well satisfied there is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction.

Mr. Dinnie: I am far from satisfied.

Mr. Arnold: I may say that some of the evidence given in Dunedin has come as a surprise to me, though I knew where evidence was likely to come from that would prove all I wanted. I consider, even if Mr. Dinnie had not admitted all my charges, the evidence that has been given this week from the Force has proved my general statement on that head.

Mr. Dinnie: I have not admitted all your charges.

Mr. Arnold: All with the exception of that relating to the Finger-print Expert.

Mr. Dinnie: But that is the most serious charge.

Mr. Arnold: I have proved all with the exception of that. Now, I have a communication which I am about to hand to the Commission, and I shall quote two or three lines of it, so that Mr. Dinnie may have an opportunity of denying it if he can. I am anxious to have all the evidence I possibly can, and I think every constable and every sergeant in New Zealand should have absolute confidence in the Minister of Justice and in the Commission, and should come forward boldly and give any evidence he has to give. The safety, of course, is in numbers, and the more that will speak boldly the safer the position is. This communication is bearing upon the evidence of another witness who stated it was believed that you had a spy in every centre who communicated with you as to what was transpiring. Now, the writer of this letter is a most reliable man, and he says, "As now conversation *re* Commission is very guarded, as it is commonly reported that Mr. Dinnie has placed a number of spies out to gather all information as to who is going to give evidence against him." Of course, it is hearsay as far as this man is concerned, but he knows what he is talking about. I would like you to give this a direct denial if you can, so that the constables and others in Wellington and elsewhere may have more confidence than they otherwise would have.

Mr. Dinnie: I can only say there is not an atom of foundation for such an allegation. It is one of the most outrageous allegations I have ever heard, and it can only have been made by some one with some object detrimental to myself.

Mr. Arnold: The writer believes this to be absolutely confidential. He did not know I was going to quote it.

Mr. Dinnie: If that person would kindly give you a little more information as to who are the parties I shall be pleased.

The Commissioner: It is only fair to give you an opportunity of giving this an emphatic denial upon oath, because the allegation is strongly made. You say it is absolutely incorrect?

Mr. Dinnie: Absolutely without the slightest foundation.

Mr. Arnold: So far as these men are concerned, they need not fear to come forward boldly and give evidence?

Mr. Dinnie: I certainly say that. I went so far as to send to Dunedin to encourage them to come forward.

Mr. Arnold: With regard to your son, he applied for leave of absence and the application was sent by you with a minute thereon to the Minister.

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

Mr. Arnold: And you swear on your oath that that application and the minute was not for six months' leave of absence on full pay?

Mr. Dinnie: That application submitted is the genuine one, and there was no application submitted suggesting that he should have full pay for six months. I will prove that by Mr. Matthews, Mr. McGowan's secretary, and by Mr. McGowan himself.

Mr. Arnold: Do you know there is a newspaper published somewhere in New Zealand called *Truth*?

Mr. Dinnie: I do, and I have prosecuted it on many occasions.

Mr. Arnold: I do not say they did not deserve it. Do you know that immediately that leave was granted, nearly all the Force in Wellington believed that your son had six months' leave of absence on full pay, and that *Truth* had a very cutting article upon it?

Mr. Dinnie: I do know that.

Mr. Arnold: And you say that in consequence of that article the original application was not withdrawn, and another one made for six months' leave of absence with one month's pay only?

Mr. Dinnie: Most certainly not. When that appeared I went so far as to take advice as to whether I should take action against *Truth* or not, and you will see the papers in reference to that very thing. I have them still, and I have Mr. Myers's opinion on the matter. I spoke to my Minister about it, and, as he did not seem to encourage a prosecution, I let the matter drop.

Mr. Arnold: Do you think that was wise?

Mr. Dinnie: Well, considering the position I hold, perhaps it was.

Mr. Arnold: Were you aware that right through the Force in Wellington there was a feeling that you were doing this for your son while refusing another man an extra seven days' leave on full pay?

Mr. Dinnie: Certainly not. There are in Wellington one or two dissatisfied men, and my belief is that it was through those men that the suggestion was made to *Truth* to hurt me. It could not have been done by any one else. It was known at the station that it was not on full pay.

Mr. Arnold: I said in my evidence that I would be very pleased to discover that Mr. Dinnie could clear this matter up; but, as I said yesterday, it was of no consequence so far as my general charges were concerned. The whole of the Force in Wellington did and do believe that originally six months' leave was granted on full pay. I was not myself aware of that article in *Truth* when I spoke in the House.

The Commissioner: If Mr. Dinnie states on oath that this is the only and original application that was made in connection with that leave, we must accept that. Is this the only and original application, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: That is so. I hope Mr. Arnold will be gentleman enough to withdraw the assertion if he is satisfied.

The Commissioner: This, of course, bears the Minister's initials.

Mr. Dinnie: I think Mr. Arnold ought to withdraw his statement.

Mr. Arnold: I do not wish to prosecute the Commissioner, so far as favouritism in connection with his son—

Mr. Dinnie: I think you ought to withdraw the allegation. It is a serious matter to me

Mr. Arnold: What allegation?

Mr. Dinnie: That I did recommend him, and that he went on leave on full pay. It is only just to me that you should withdraw, seeing what you have seen and the evidence you have got.

Mr. Arnold: If this had taken place yesterday I might have done so, but I must say conscientiously that I am not too sure about those files.

The Commissioner: I have looked carefully through the files, and, from a very long experience in connection with such documents, I can say that if the allegations made in connection with the matter were true the Minister must have been a party to the withdrawal of the original application and the substitution of this. You will recognise the Minister's initials on this paper, Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Arnold: Well, that is the belief in the Force at the present moment, and I am pleased that Mr. Dinnie has made the matter clear for his own sake.

Mr. Dinnie: I should like to hear from you that you are satisfied, Mr. Arnold, because I can bring further proof if not.

Mr. Arnold: No, I am not satisfied.

The Commissioner: It remains now in my hands. Have you any further questions to ask, Mr. Dinnie, as this is the last opportunity you will have in Dunedin?

Mr. Dinnie: With regard to the promotion of Detective McGrath: I sent for the information about it, and it appears that I recommended him and others for promotion on the 8th October last year, that the application was submitted to Cabinet by Mr. McGowan, and that the delay that occurred was in Cabinet. He was not promoted until after the present Minister of Justice came into office.

W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, further examined. (No. 43.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] What are your views with regard to the question of promotion from the plain-clothes branch to the higher offices of the Force?—I agree with Mr. Herbert in that respect. I think if a man in the detective force is fully qualified for promotion, and is equal in seniority to the men in the uniform branch, he should have an equal claim to promotion.

2. What was it that disqualified Station Sergeant King as regards promotion? I wish to remind you that he has sworn that on one occasion you specifically told him in so many words that he would be promoted?—Well, I must deny that. I do not think there is a man in the service who can say I made a promise of that sort. I always tell them their application will be considered. I go no further than that, because I know the danger I am running.

3. Are these promotions always made by Cabinet?—No. The Minister in some cases sends the matter to Cabinet.

4. I want to know how far your powers go in regard to promotions?—I recommend in every case, and it is for the Minister to approve or otherwise.

5. Can you give me any instance in which promotion has been granted without your recommendation?—I do not remember a case.

6. Then, I take it that you have never been ignored as regards promotions?—Certainly not.

7. Coming back to Station Sergeant King, *prima facie*, on the evidence, he would appear to be entitled to promotion. Now, your minute on the papers indicates that he is not entitled to promotion. I am bound to ask you why?—There are sergeants who are fit for the position of sergeant and nothing more, just as there are constables who are only fit to be constables; and there are station sergeants who are not qualified for the higher ranks. When Sergeant King's case came up there were two other men who were specially qualified, and their Inspectors, who know them best, will say so, I think.

8. Who were they?—Norwood and Henry.

9. I want to know what particularly disqualified Sergeant King?—I did not think he was capable of holding the rank, and there were others ahead of him.

10. Suppose there was a vacancy now, would you still view it in the same light?—If I had a better man.

11. How are the promotions of sergeants made? Are they made by you?—I always submit promotions to the Minister for his approval.

12. What does the Minister know about it?—It is more a matter of form than anything else. I recommend them from a list of those whom the Inspectors recommend.

13. When a promotion is to be made, do you recommend them in a certain order of preference, or do you recommend a particular man? That is to say, if there is one vacancy you recommend one man, and if there are three vacancies you recommend three men?—Yes, from my list. The approval by the Minister is more a matter of form than anything else.

14. How do you promote the men from street duty to the charge of a station?—I do that without reference to the Minister. All the actual promotions go to the Minister for approval.

15. Has that always obtained in the office?—Yes, I think so.

Inspector O'Brien: I have no questions to ask Mr. Dinnie, in view of his silence. I had anticipated he would have had something to say by way of evidence-in-chief.

The Commissioner: No evidence will be given by Mr. Dinnie in Wellington, where I intend to wind up, in respect to any particular locality or the officers in that locality. His evidence will be of a general character.

Inspector O'Brien: I quite understand, and I appreciate it very much.

16. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] I understood Mr. Dinnie to say that there had been no case where a man who he had refused to promote had been promoted over his head?—I did not exactly say that.

17. Have there been no cases of promotion from constable to sergeant where you did not recommend them?—There was a case when I came here first of all, but that man was accepted as a sergeant before I came, and I had simply to put the file before the Minister.

18. You are referring to the case of a man now in Christchurch. I am thinking of a man named Burrows, who was stationed in this district, who was promoted in spite of the fact that he was not recommended by the Inspector. Was he recommended by the Inspector?—I could not say until I see the files. I may mention that my predecessor left a list for me, giving me his opinion of the men. It may have been that Mr. Tunbridges's opinion in respect to that man was different from that of Inspector O'Brien.

19. Would you be influenced by his opinion rather than Inspector O'Brien's?—To a great extent, because I found his opinions were very sound.

20. Do you say that Burrows was not promoted against a recommendation by you to the contrary?—I am certain he was not.

The Commissioner: I will call for the papers.

21. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] You remember the late Minister of Justice saying in the House that Chief Detectives would not be promoted to the higher ranks without first reverting to the lower grade in uniform and working their way up as a sergeant has to do?—I would not say it was exactly that.

22. Do you remember that the effect of what he said was that the Chief Detectives must first go out of their own rank into uniform to qualify for the position of Sub-Inspector?—It was something to that effect.

Chief Detective Herbert: The Commission will remember that the late Minister of Justice refused to permit men from the plain-clothes branch to go right on to the higher positions in the Force.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not think he entirely refused.

Chief Detective Herbert: I want to put the saddle on the right horse if I can. We believe the Commissioner himself was opposed to the promotion of McGrath to the rank of Sub-Inspector out of the detective branch, and that when Mr. McGowan made that statement in the House he did it with the concurrence and by arrangement with the Commissioner—that the Minister's views were the Commissioner's views.

The Commissioner: You are trenching upon ground that is dangerous. It would be better not to refer to or criticize in any way Ministerial acts.

Mr. Dinnie: I remember the effect of the Minister's statement in the House, but I am not sure whether Mr. Herbert has given the precise words.

23. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Did you recommend Chief Detective McGrath for promotion to the position of Sub-Inspector prior to that?—I do not think I did.

24. Had you any intention prior to that of recommending any Chief Detective for the position of Sub-Inspector?—Oh, yes.

25. Had you recommended any?—No.

26. Were you, prior to that statement by Mr. McGowan in the House, favourable to promotion from Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector?—Certainly.

27. Was the Minister aware that that was your view?—I do not know that he had occasion to be aware of it, because I had not recommended it to him.

The Commissioner: You would not wish me to take evidence as to verbal conversations between the Commissioner and the Minister?

Chief Detective Herbert: No, sir. The only thing is that we thought the Minister would not have made that statement in the House without Mr. Dinnie being aware that he was going to make it.

The Commissioner: Now that you have Mr. Dinnie's absolute denial upon oath, I think you should be satisfied.

Chief Detective Herbert: I am, sir.

28. *Station Sergeant King.*] I should like to ask Mr. Dinnie a question. You have denied that you at one time told me that I should not have to wait long for promotion?—Yes.

29. Do you remember my interviewing you in the Inspector's office in Dunedin some months after I was appointed? Do you remember I then asked you what my duties would be as station sergeant? You said you could not very well define them then, but one of the duties you told the Inspector I was to do was to prosecute in police cases in Court?—Yes, I think that was so.

30. Did you use these words to me on that occasion: "You settle down to your work; it is a stepping-stone to promotion, and you are near the senior on the list"?—I do not think I used those words. I may have said it was a stepping-stone to promotion, but I could not swear as to whether those were the words or not.

31. What was your reason for passing over Phair and promoting Norwood, who was his junior?—Because of the qualifications of the junior man. Phair was not such a good man as Norwood, in my opinion.

32. Since I left the Court yesterday, I understand you have been showing a paper to some of my juniors in the service, and that on that paper were some hints or suggestions which Mr. Tunbridge had given you, and on that paper was my name?—I have no such paper. Let us hear more about it.

The Commissioner: Do you refer to the file of papers that came up in evidence?

33. *Station Sergeant King.*] It was stated in the paper that I was a good sergeant, but hardly up to the position of Sub-Inspector. Mr. Tunbridge has been away now for over five years. Do you not think my experience would be greater now than it was then?—Yes.

34. But still you think I am not fit for the higher rank?

The Commissioner: He did not say so. His statement was general—to the effect that some of the junior men were superior to the senior.

35. *Station Sergeant King.*] How much of my work comes under your notice?—Your reports and other matters. I knew of your connection with the Papakaio murder case, for instance.

Station Sergeant King: Unfortunately for me, I think.

The Commissioner: I must ask you to confine yourself to asking questions.

Station Sergeant King: I would like to ask Inspector O'Brien whether he can remember the conversation which passed between Mr. Dinnie and myself on the occasion I referred to just now.

Inspector O'Brien: I cannot repeat verbatim what passed between Mr. Dinnie and yourself on that occasion. I know you made some representations as to losses incurred by you in coming from Oamaru to Dunedin to take up the position of station sergeant. I clearly recollect that in reply to that the Commissioner told you to settle down to your work, and that he used some words from which it might clearly be inferred that future Sub-Inspectors were to be made from the office of station sergeants. The Commissioner made no discouraging remarks. It was rather the contrary. No actual promise was made, so far as I can recollect.

The Commissioner: Simply an encouragement to settle down and do his work, and his chances would be considered.

Mr. Dinnie: I admit that.

Station Sergeant King: I made a statement yesterday which, if I was correctly reported in the Press, did not convey the meaning I intended. I am reported to have said I had no doubt I could get a Civil Service certificate if I wished. Well, I did not want to cast any reflection upon the teaching profession. What I meant was that I thought candidates could get certificates a little too freely.

MONDAY, 19TH JULY, 1909.

JOHN FOX, Constable, further examined. (No. 44.)

Witness: I am here to represent the views of fifteen out of seventeen of the single constables living at the central station, Dunedin, in reference to the matter of late leave at night. This has not been originated by me, but I am here to support their views as far as I can. When I was giving evidence the other day I said that by applying for late leave in writing it was granted. I omitted to say that we were not allowed leave later than 1 a.m. Now, some constables, like other people, like to go to a dance or a social occasionally, and sometimes to a wedding, and they think it a hardship if on such occasions they must be in by 1 a.m. This is more especially the case perhaps when a man has to see a lady friend home afterwards and return some considerable distance to the station before 1 a.m. Very often the amusement is just as its height about the time one has to leave, and we see no reason why leave should not be granted until 2 or 3 a.m.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any occasions on which leave to a later hour has been refused?—Yes. For instance, on two occasions I myself applied for leave, once until after midnight and the other until 2 a.m. On the second occasion it was granted to 1 a.m. I wanted to attend a social. Of course, that may not have been considered leave for some special purpose, but I understand there is a rule that leave cannot be granted later than 1 a.m.

2. At what hour have you to be on duty the next morning?—At 9 a.m.; but we have only four hours' duty, and there is nothing to hinder us from going to bed for two or three hours in the afternoon. But I have not mentioned this so much because of myself, but it is considered a grievance by the men.

3. Do you want the Inspector to be given wider discretion in the matter, because you could scarcely have that sort of thing fixed by regulation. The only thing you could do is to give the widest possible discretion to the Inspector, and if, in his discretion, the Inspector refuses an application, who can gainsay him?—We think that under special circumstances a constable might be granted leave for an hour or two later than he is now. I would like to refer briefly to a portion of the evidence I gave before the Commission the other day. In answer to a question by yourself I stated that I knew of no instances where political or other influences had been used in connection with promotions, but that I knew of a certain feeling existing among the members of the Force to the effect that influences other than political were supposed to have been used. From what I have heard since, some of the men have misunderstood me, and they think I had an ulterior motive in giving such an answer. As a matter of fact, I answered what was the truth to the best of my knowledge, and I am still of the same opinion. I think your Worship did not understand from my remarks that I had any such motive.

4. I think you gave your evidence fairly and straightly, and with advantage to the view you were supposed to be placing before me?—There is a certain member of the Force superior to me in the service who has done me the honour to call me a scoundrel behind my back for making mention of this affair. I do not see the reason for it, because nothing was further from my mind than to offend any one personally. I merely made a general statement, and I say that the feeling I spoke of is not at all confined to the members of any particular religious denomination.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know of no case yourself in which such influence has obtained?—Not one.

6. Neither Masonic, religious, or anything else?—No, I have not heard of one. I simply say the impression exists.

7. You know when I address the constables, as a rule, I tell them not to seek influence in any way, and that it does not obtain?—Yes, I have heard you say so.

FRANCIES GEORGE CUMMING, Agent, Patients' and Prisoners' Aid Society, Dunedin, examined on oath. (No. 45.)

Witness: At the outset, I may say I am here with no grievance, and if I had anything to say with regard to the Police Force it would be complimentary rather than the other way. I have had a good deal of experience during the last twenty-five or twenty-six years in connection with police matters, not only in New Zealand, but in Australia and in other parts of the world, where I have come in contact with the Force. During the last few years my contact has been perhaps more close than previously, and I would like to say that to my personal knowledge the reason why some of the men required for the Force, such as farmers' sons, and so forth, are unwilling to apply is the smallness of the allowances made in the way of salary. We say that in the Police Force we want men of ability, both from the standpoint of education and physique and character. The men who possess these qualifications have no hesitation in stating that 7s. 6d. a day is too little, and I honestly believe that men of that description cannot be procured at so low a rate of pay. I think 7s. 6d. a day is not sufficient for a constable to live on, at all events in the centres of New Zealand. It is a lower wage than is paid to the ordinary working-man, and the work of a constable is certainly no less laborious than that of the man who works with a pick and shovel. A policeman has to take a good many risks, and altogether I think a constable should be paid not less than 8s. a day. I would further suggest that after two years' service there should be an increase in his pay. If what I suggest is done I am satisfied that a better class of men can be procured. Another grievance that the young married men in particular bring forward is that they are placed at a great disadvantage inasmuch as they only get 7s. 6d. a day and 1s. a day for house-allowance. It is not possible for any one to secure a home for himself and his wife and family at 7s. per week, and I do not see why a constable should be asked to provide the remainder of the rent for a house, which may cost him from 15s. to 17s. per week. It may cost a little less in Christchurch or Dunedin than in Wellington, and I think that fact should be taken into consideration when the allowance is made.

1. *The Commissioner.*] I do not say I disagree with you, but when you make a comparison between the pay of a constable and that of an ordinary working-man, you must take into consideration the fact that the working-man has to pay his own rent?—I admit that is so.

2. It seems to me that if you are going to argue for an increased remuneration, and at the same time for an increased house-allowance, then you are trenching on the impossible?—I merely wanted to point out the difference between the position of the married men and the single men. I have had no communication upon the matter with any constable, and my statement is made purely voluntarily. The next question I would mention is in reference to the leave of constables. At present they receive only twelve days in the year. I think any constable working for twelve months should be given at least from sixteen to twenty days' leave in the year. With regard to the standard of education, I think it would be a great mistake to bring it below the Fifth Standard. In this country most boys pass the Fifth Standard.

3. Are you sure of that?—There is, of course, a difference between the country and the town. I admit that a man who has passed, say, the Fourth Standard might make a splendid constable, and if he is sufficiently qualified in other respects I think he might be admitted, but I do not think the Fifth Standard is placing the education test too high.

4. Do you think the requirements of the Fifth Standard constitute a factor against the enrolment of good men?—I should say no.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you aware that we have to reject a very large number of applicants owing to the fact that they have not passed the Fifth Standard?—That is so.

6. And many of them men who might turn out excellent constables?—Yes; but, as I say, I would not block a man because he has only passed the Fourth Standard; but, taking the education test as a whole, the Fifth Standard is not too high for New Zealand, I think.

7. *The Commissioner.*] But if we have the test, surely we ought to adhere to it?—That is so.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know that married men who have been in the service for a short time have an advantage over the single men in that they are appointed to stations?—Yes, I admit that.

9. And that is a very good position?—Yes; I was speaking of the married men principally, in the centres.

10. You mean, for the first few years of their service?—Yes. I know, for instance, that a married man in Timaru or Oamaru has an advantage over a married man in Christchurch or Wellington or Dunedin as regards rent-allowance. I think the smallness of the allowance granted in the cities may have the effect of causing men to live in localities where they should not have to live.

WILLIAM JOHN PHAIR, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 46.)

Witness: I am now stationed in Dunedin. I was in Wellington from the time of my promotion up to the time of my coming to Dunedin.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Why were you transferred?—I cannot say.

2. Was it at your own request?—No.

3. When did you join the Force?—On the 27th April, 1877. I entered the depot at Mount Cook, and was sworn in on the 18th May of the same year. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant on the 1st January, 1898, and was promoted to be station sergeant on the 1st March, 1906. I was promoted to Sub-Inspector on the 1st July, 1908.

4. Have you any general remarks you wish to make?—I may state I have no grievance either against the Commissioner or against any of the Inspectors. With regard to the ruling rate of pay in the Force, you will no doubt remember that some years ago the Police Force was recruited principally from the farmers' sons, or from those who were working upon the land. Owing, however, to the prosperity of the country during the past twelve or thirteen years that channel has been somewhat closed. The farmers have been receiving such good prices for their produce that they have been able to pay a good rate of wages, and they select the best men they can get to do their work. The Police Force only pay 7s. 6d. a day, which cannot induce good men to come forward. Consequently the Force has had to draw its recruits from other sources, and the men of late years have not been up to the physique that they formerly were. I feel satisfied, from my own knowledge of what takes place in Wellington in regard to the selection of men for the Force—and I was there three years and four months—that the Commissioner selects the best men he can possibly get. The inquiries in many instances have passed through my hands, and I am fully aware that the strictest inquiries have been made as to their character. In fact, I have often wondered why the inquiries were so strict, because even if a man had been only, say, two months in a place it was necessary that inquiries should be made as to how he conducted himself during that time. The inquiries in Wellington were, under my instructions, carried out by a sergeant and not by a constable. With regard to the rate of pay, I think if it was increased probably a better class of candidates would be obtainable—men with good physique, who could stand the strain and hardship of a policeman's life. The men working upon the farms have a certain amount of freedom, and they have a bed to sleep in every night; while the men in the Force have to be on duty day and night, and their life is a hard one. I think, therefore, they are entitled to a little more consideration. I also think their privileges might be increased; for instance, they might be allowed a little more leave. There is another matter in connection with the Department I should like to refer to, and that is the quantity of outside correspondence that comes into the hands of the police. I do not know that it can be called police work. For instance, the Education Department gives us a lot of work. We are a regular inquiry office for those who are in arrear for maintenance of children, &c.; they have to be sought for all over the colony; inquiries have to be made, money collected, and distress warrants and warrants of commitment served if necessary. All this entails a large amount of work on the police, and consequently many constables have to be taken off their ordinary duties. I think Departments such as the Education Department should have their own officers for this, and leave the police to do only what

is purely police work. Then there are many other things, such as inquiry after lost property (not stolen), and other matters which I think might reasonably not be placed on the shoulders of the police. Then in connection with railways and steamers—lost luggage, principally owing to the carelessness of the owners; they leave their luggage to any person, and expect the police to find it.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] After making inquiry themselves unsuccessfully?—Yes. These are matters that require attention. If these matters were taken off the police, and they only had police work to do, it would be very much better. Both the clerical staff and outside constables are called upon to do a large amount of work they should not have to do.

6. As regards inquiries made about applicants, you know they are much more stringent now than when I arrived?—That is so; the strictest and most careful inquiries are made.

7. Do you know of any case in which there has been an adverse report and the candidate has been appointed?—No.

8. You know that the files are frequently sent back for additional inquiry?—Yes.

9. This morning I gave you a number of files to examine: have not strict inquiries been made in these cases?—Yes. most careful.

10. Is there anything in these papers to show why the men should not be admitted into the Force?—Nothing; on the contrary, they had the best of characters.

11. Some of the men had been in Government service before?—Yes, and in other police services.

12. The suggestion was that sufficient inquiry was not made into these cases, or no inquiry?—The fullest inquiries were made.

13. Special attention has been given to the case of Willets, and it has been stated that he was discharged from the tramway service: will you look at this report from the sergeant on the matter from the head of the tramways? Does that say he was discharged?—No.

14. The report states that the sergeant interviewed Mr. Richardson, engineer in charge of the tramways, and states that the attached testimonial was signed by him, which speaks very highly of Willets. He also reports that he interviewed Mr. Humphreys, contractor, who states that the attached testimonial was given by him, speaking very highly of Willets. There is nothing to indicate the man was discharged. I suggest this is a full answer to the suggestion made. In the case of Macdermott, this letter shows—

The Commissioner: Why ask the Sub-Inspector these questions?

Mr. Dinnie: I want to prove here that the men's characters were highly respectable, and no Force would refuse them.

The Commissioner: You enrolled the man before you got a reply.

Mr. Dinnie: He was temporarily employed.

The Commissioner: But it does not do away with the fact that he was employed while he was a criminal, and you did not wait till you got a reply.

Mr. Dinnie: He was simply on probation till the reply came. The reply did not come when it ought to have come; that I could not prevent. I made the same statement as regards Wallace; the letter here shows that inquiries were being made, and as soon as the reply came the man was dismissed. These were the only cases where two men were taken on probation till the reply came.

15. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] As regards the employment of a special man with a view of obtaining information, have you heard anything of that sort?—Never.

16. Do you not think you would have heard if such a rumour had gone about?—I should think so.

17. Would you believe it if you did hear of it?—No.

18. Would you repeat it if you heard it?—No; it would not show good discipline.

19. What is your opinion now of the condition of the Force here?—From what I have seen, it is a very good Force; there are an intelligent lot of young men here.

20. You know from your experience that most respectable men join the Force, and sometimes a man here and there gets into trouble and gets dismissed?—There are black sheep in every flock.

21. Other Government Departments in New Zealand have the same thing from time to time, and the cases are quashed?—I think the Force compares very favourably with a good many of the Departments.

22. Or any other Police Force?—Yes.

23. Men are promptly dealt with when they do misbehave?—Such has been my experience; the late dismissals in Wellington seem to show that.

The Commissioner: They could not do otherwise, when men are convicted of crime.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Prior to that you know their characters were excellent? Did they perform their duties?—I regarded them as three of the steadiest men in the station—excellent men; but they got into trouble when off duty.

25. Through taking a little extra drink?—Yes; and probably if they had not been interfered with there would have been no trouble at all.

The Commissioner: Would taking a little extra drink induce a man to abominably assault a woman in the public street? What is the use of talking like that?

26. *Mr. Arnold.*] I understand you say that ample inquiries were made as to the characters of these eight men referred to before they were brought into the Force?—Yes.

27. You admit, with the Commissioner, the charges made against them were correct?—Yes; and the men were dismissed promptly.

28. Have you had any experience outside the Police Force in commercial or manufacturing affairs?—Not in this country; I have at Home.

29. Do you think it likely men such as they could have found employment in responsible positions in private firms?—I do.

30. If sufficient inquiry was made as to the character of these men, and they still got into the Force, what is the good of your inquiry?—I suppose all men are frail, and liable to make a mistake.

31. Do you consider the inquiry made in connection with the admission of candidates is sufficient?—Yes.

32. And yet in this case it proved to be absolutely useless?—Afterwards it did. But the inquiries were full and complete, and the men were shown to be of good character at the time of their admission.

The Commissioner: The Sub-Inspector's opinion will have no bearing upon my judgment. I have the papers, and rely on them. He tells me the closest possible inquiries were made, and these men were of excellent character when admitted to the Force.

Mr. Dinnie: So they were.

The Commissioner: Some of them were of bad character when admitted to the Force, and I still repeat my opinion that the Sub-Inspector's evidence on a matter of this sort, where men of bad character entered the Force, will have no bearing on my inquiry.

Mr. Dinnie: He speaks of some of the men.

The Commissioner: Please do not interrupt me, Mr. Dinnie. I am speaking of some of these men. I have to report to the Governor, and if my report is based on insufficient evidence I am responsible to the Governor.

33. *Mr. Arnold.*] Your opinion is that the character of members of the Force is excellent: does that apply to Dunedin?—I consider they are efficient men.

34. You were in charge of the station at Wellington as Sub-Inspector for, how long?—Twelve months; part of the time—two months—I was unwell.

35. Are the young men of the Force in Wellington equal to those in Dunedin?—I cannot say that, because the men here have had more experience. It is the practice in Wellington to send the older constables from the depot and to retain the men of very little experience. There is a greater proportion of raw constables in Wellington than in other head stations, and the older men are continually drafted away to fill vacancies, Wellington being consequently left with the younger men. It has been a wonder to me it has escaped so well, with the material it had.

36. Will you give your idea as to why there has not been better material to work with?—I have already expressed the opinion that owing to the prosperity of the country young men can get better wages outside the police.

37. Can you explain, then, why a very much larger number have left the Force during recent times, when there has not been the prosperity we have had recently, than during the time of prosperity?—A good many have left to settle on the land.

38. Do you know that a very large proportion of those who applied to enter the Force during the last twelve months have been rejected as unsuitable?—I can understand a good many being rejected, because a good many passed through my hands for measurement, and they were under standard.

39. Then, they were rejected because they were not physically fit?—I presume so.

40. The Commissioner says it was in consequence of the inquiries being unsatisfactory as to their character?—I am speaking of my observation.

41. As a matter of fact, is it not because the salary is insufficient, and the conditions of the Force not attractive, and because the larrikin element is such that many respectable fellows will not enter the Force?—I do not know about the larrikin element; I know the pay is not considered sufficient; I have heard it frequently discussed.

42. Do you think the general conditions of the Force are such as to attract men to enter?—I do not know as to the conditions; I consider, owing to the high wages ruling elsewhere, men are not so willing to join.

43. You do not know anything about the conditions, such as the treatment the men receive, outside of the regulations?—I am not aware of any bad treatment they receive. The Inspectors in the majority of the districts treat their men very well.

44. You are not acquainted with any complaints?—Not against the Inspectors.

45. But as to the general conditions of the Force?—No.

46. Is there any undercurrent of discontent amongst the members?—I am aware there are two or three in Wellington who are discontented.

47. Statements have been made with regard to the conduct of the men in the Wellington barracks: who is responsible for their management?—It depends upon who is on duty.

48. You were not responsible more than others?—I was in charge during the time I was there, in the absence of the Inspector.

49. Are you aware that considerable rowdiness and larrikinism goes on in barracks at night there?—I am not; I was not there at night; it may be so. I have not heard of it, except, I believe, when I was away on sick leave.

50. Would you not be likely to hear of it if it was the case?—I might or might not; if it came to the ears of the sergeant it would be reported to me.

51. If it is the case, and you are not aware of it, there may be considerable discontent in the Force without you being aware of it?—I do not think so.

52. You should know what is going on in barracks at night?—How could I be expected to know? I went home at 9 as a rule, and unless some one told me I should not be likely to know.

53. *The Commissioner.*] Is there always a sergeant on the premises?—The sergeant on night duty is in and out.

54. Who is really responsible?—The sergeant on night duty.

55. *Mr. Arnold.*] You do not know that the men who come in after night duty complain that it is impossible for them to get any rest in consequence of the behaviour in the barracks, which

is very bad indeed?—I have heard them complaining about men making a noise going up when they come off duty at 5 in the morning.

56. Have you ever heard of two sergeants having to go in and quell a disturbance?—I heard of it; I was sick at the time it happened.

57. Is there a library in the barracks?—A small one; it is not now used.

58. Do you know why?—No.

59. Who receives the subscriptions?—I cannot tell you.

60. Is there a billiard-table?—Yes; it is used.

61. Who keeps the bank?—I think, Sergeant Gavney.

62. Do constables play there during the luncheon-hour?—At any time during the day; not, as a rule, in uniform. I have seen them in uniform before going out on duty, not while on duty.

63. Did you ever play with them yourself?—I am not a billiard-player. I may have had one or two games.

64. Do you know any Sub-Inspector that does?—No.

65. Do you think it would be a right thing for a Sub-Inspector to play with them while in uniform?—I have never known such a thing to happen, but I do not see why a Sub-Inspector should be debarred from enjoying himself during lunch-hour.

66. Do you think it would tend to discipline?—I do not say that he did play with the men, or that any of them play with the men. I think, as a rule, the Sub-Inspectors keep themselves to themselves as much as possible. I know I have always endeavoured to do so.

67. Can you tell me who is recognised in Wellington as the Commissioner?—Mr. Dinnie, of course.

68. Is it not generally admitted that Sub-Inspector Wright, and not Mr. Dinnie, is the man who is ruling the Police Department?—I have never heard of it. Mr. Wright is the Chief Clerk, of course, and I have never heard of his being regarded as the Commissioner.

69. Is it not a fact that the members of the Force in Wellington consider that the failure during Mr. Dinnie's time, if that be proven, is in consequence of his permitting Sub-Inspector Wright to occupy a position which Mr. Tunbridge would never have permitted him to hold?—I have never heard such an expression from any member of the Force.

70. If a constable were about the barracks the worse for liquor before going out on duty, do you think such a thing would be reported?—I am satisfied it would be reported if it were known.

71. You remember that on a certain Saturday night a certain constable was sent home in a state of intoxication at 10 o'clock: would you be surprised to hear that that man was the worse for liquor when he went out at 9 o'clock?—I scarcely think he would be, because the relief is paraded every night either by the station sergeant or by myself at those times. But I was not on duty that night. I have never seen any drinking in the barracks in Wellington.

72. Would you be surprised to hear that this man going out at 9 o'clock at night is not the only occasion on which the same thing has happened?—I should be surprised. I spoke to the constable who was reported next morning about the matter, and he said that he had felt unwell—that his bowels were bad—and that he went into a hotel and had two nips of brandy; that he was quite sober at parade, but directly he went into the cold air it had a sudden effect upon him.

73. Was any departmental inquiry held?—Yes; Inspector Ellison held an inquiry.

74. Was evidence taken as to whether he was the worse for liquor when he went out?—I could not say.

75. Has the evidence given in Dunedin as to the discontent existing in the Force come as a surprise to you?—I have not heard the evidence except for a few minutes to-day.

76. Do you mean to say you have not read the evidence given by Inspector O'Brien and Chief Detective Herbert?—Yes, I have in the papers.

77. Did not their evidence as to discontent in Dunedin come as a surprise to you?—I have been only a short time in Dunedin, but it did surprise me, because, with the few exceptions I have referred to, in Wellington I have heard of no grumbling. Having been in close touch with the men in Wellington, if there was grumbling I think I should have heard of it.

78. You do not admit it to be correct?—I have no reason to consider it correct in any way.

79. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was Mr. Wright the Chief Clerk when I came here?—No, not for some time afterwards, I understand.

80. I suppose the suggestion is that he took over the office of Commissioner when I appointed him. Do you believe there is any truth in the statement, from what you have seen and from the manner in which I have dealt with the men?—No, you are looked upon as Commissioner, and no one else.

81. You know there are two or three of the men in Wellington who have been dissatisfied for years past, and who have fully expressed their dissatisfaction?—Yes.

82. You have seen what appeared in the newspaper called *Truth*, I suppose, in respect to the Police Force: did you draw the conclusion from that that some of the dissatisfied men had been communicating with the Press?—I do not wish to go so far as that. It has been hinted at, I know.

83. You look for a motive in these things?—Yes; but I do not say they did so.

84. *Inspector O'Brien.*] You do not profess to be conversant with all the little chat that goes on amongst the members of the Force in Wellington?—Not all of it—only what comes under my notice.

85. So that there might be some feeling that there might be such a person as "the useful man" in existence for all you know?—I had not heard it stated.

86. A good many other things have occurred in Wellington that you do not appear to have heard of, and this might be one of them?—All I know is that I have never heard of it. I cannot go beyond that.

87. Respecting the candidates who have been brought to Wellington for enrolment, say, from Southland, Otago, and Canterbury, who do they interview before being actually enrolled?—They generally go to the Commissioner's office in the first place, and get their papers.

88. And if the Commissioner is not there?—I suppose they get their papers from the Chief Clerk, Mr. Wright.

89. And then they are sent to the depot at Mount Cook?—Yes, after a few inquiries, measurements, and so forth.

90. You say many of the men are rejected as not being up to the standard as regards height, chest measurement, and so forth?—Yes.

91. That includes applicants from Southland, Otago, and Canterbury?—I could not say, but I should not think they would be called to Wellington unless they were fit medically and of proper height, and that the inquiries showed they were of good character.

92. Have you come into contact with those applicants very much before they are established at Mount Cook depot?—Not with those from other districts. The men from the Wellington District, as a rule, pass either through my hands or the station sergeant's for measurement, and very often for inquiries.

93. If they are not up to the standard, do you recommend that they be rejected?—No, I simply enter the measurements on the form. That is sent to the Commissioner, I understand; then returned to the Inspector, who deals with the matter afterwards.

94. Is it not a fact that many have been admitted into the depot who were not up to the standard as regards height and chest measurement?—I have not known of any.

95. With regard to those men who have been drafted from Wellington to Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin, are they not usually men who have been defaulters?—There are a few, of course; but it is generally the men of good character who are sent away. Inspector Ellison often prefers to deal with his own defaulters in his own district; he has said so himself.

96. Can you assign any reason for men from the depot—inexperienced—being allotted to Wellington more than any other district?—The requirements of Wellington are greater, and the vacancies are more numerous, I suppose, than in other centres.

97. What makes vacancies numerous?—Men leave or are drafted away elsewhere. There have been times when we have been working shorthanded in Wellington. I have known of our having only four men for relief duty when we required six or seven.

98. Why are they drafted from the Lambton Quay Station rather than from the depot?—I do not know why.

99. You have heard of a good many defaulters from the Lambton Quay Station lately?—Yes.

100. If they are not actually discharged from the service, what is done with them, as a rule?—A good many of them are kept there. Some of them are sent to other districts, if their length of service and conduct warrant it.

101. Are there many of the candidates who are not intelligent?—I have noticed a good few lately who are not very intelligent.

102. *The Commissioner.*] What do you gauge their intelligence by?—Principally by the reports they submit.

103. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Have you had men considerably under the standard height on duty in Wellington?—I am not aware of any.

104. *The Commissioner.*] As to those eight cases which the Commissioner has mentioned, how many have you first-hand knowledge of?—I do not know that I had first-hand knowledge of any. I was only speaking from what I had seen of the papers, and from some inquiries that were made in Wellington.

104A. Unless you have first-hand knowledge, I do not think an expression of opinion by you will be of much value as evidence, because I shall have the papers.

Mr. Dinnie: I suggest, sir, that he has the same opportunity as you yourself will have to express an opinion.

The Commissioner: Mine is the opinion of authority. That is the difference. I do not require the opinion of any witness as to what those papers convey.

105. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You know that Wellington supplies Napier, Wanganui, and the West Coast with men when vacancies occur, and that in consequence you have sometimes to send away men with some service?—Yes.

106. You know it is advisable to keep the young men at the station in order to teach them their duties?—No doubt it is advisable.

107. Under the system every probationer is posted in a city?—Yes.

107A. And he remains there for two or three years before he gets a transfer?—They generally remain twelve or eighteen months anyhow.

108. You know that defaulters are frequently transferred from one district to another—from Wellington to Christchurch, from Auckland to Wellington, and so on?—Yes.

109. And we get a good many in Wellington who were defaulters in other districts?—Yes.

110. *Inspector O'Brien.*] I should like you to ask the witness, sir, whether he has had any defaulters in Wellington from Dunedin during the time he was stationed there?—I do not remember any from Dunedin coming to Wellington.

111. *The Commissioner.*] With regard to the general policy of transferring defaulters from one district to another, that would depend upon the nature of the default, of course: you cannot lay down any hard-and-fast rule?—No.

The Commissioner (to Mr. Dinnie): Was the Sub-Inspector transferred from Wellington here on your recommendation, or in any other way?

Mr. Dinnie: On my recommendation.

The Commissioner: As a matter of discipline?

Mr. Dinnie: In the interests of the service.

The Commissioner: Is the Wellington District considered a more important one than this?

Mr. Dinnie: It is.

The Commissioner: Presumably you want a good man there?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

The Commissioner: You consider the Sub-Inspector you transferred from here answered those requirements?

Mr. Dinnie: I do, certainly.

PATRICK DENNIS O'CONNOR, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 47.)

Witness: I am stationed at Dunedin. I was enrolled in September, 1890, and was promoted sergeant in February, 1909. My experience of late years has been in small county districts.

1. *The Commissioner:*] Have you any opinions in regard to the physique of the Force as compared with its condition when you first joined?—There are some very good men in the Force.

2. Does the physique of the Force, as a whole, compare favourably with its condition when you joined?—I think so; there might be a little falling-off.

3. Did you pass the examination before becoming a sergeant?—No.

4. How old were you when you were promoted?—About fifty.

The Commissioner: What do you take as evidence of age, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: We have a certificate of birth from applicants, but in many cases they could not be got, and we have had to rely on a sworn affidavit.

5. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Was your promotion a surprise, or had you applied for it?—I applied about twelve months ago. I was strongly recommended by the Inspector.

6. Do you know of the existence of a sort of rule—*lex non scripta*—that no man over fifty shall be appointed sergeant?—I have heard a rumour of it. I was not surprised, because I was strongly recommended.

7. Have you felt physically fit for the work? Have you suffered at all?—Not the slightest.

8. You are still fit for a good many years?—I think so. Some men are old at forty-five, and some old men are young at sixty.

9. What is the general conduct of the younger members of the Force here?—Very good.

10. They compare favourably with any that have gone before?—Yes.

11. Have you ever heard any statements in regard to political or other influence being used on behalf of particular men?—I have heard such statements, but have never known it to my own knowledge.

12. *Mr. Dinnie:*] Have you heard anything about a special man being placed by me at each district to obtain information?—Never.

13. Would you have heard if it had been seriously talked about?—Perhaps; I am not very long here.

14. *Inspector O'Brien:*] You were stationed in the country, not in Christchurch?—Yes.

15. There might be a great many things in Christchurch you never heard?—Yes.

16. The district in which you were promoted was Canterbury?—Yes.

THOMAS O'GRADY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 48.)

Witness: I am stationed at Dunedin Central. I joined the Force in June, 1893, and was promoted to sergeant in December, 1907. I have been here ever since, having been transferred from Auckland. I consider the travelling-allowance to the police is not sufficient; it should be raised all round from 6s. to 8s. I consider that amount is necessary.

1. *The Commissioner:*] What is the general charge in hotels in Otago?—Some run to 10s. a day.

2. Then, you are out of pocket?—Yes. Then, I think uniforms should be free: the making-up at present costs about £2 10s. Boots also should be allowed—two pairs a year. Then, in regard to transfers, we consider we should be allowed saloon passages by steamer. I found it necessary to pay the difference—I have a family of two. I consider an increase of pay should be given all round—say, 6d. This would induce a better class of men to come forward. Men get better wages outside; a working-man gets 8s. 6d. or 9s. Another matter is that constables should be allowed time off after having to attend Court. If a man locks up a prisoner between 5 and 9 in the morning, he has no time to get his breakfast before having to attend Court.

3. It affects the efficiency of the work?—Yes; many a man escapes being locked up because the constable would have to get up in the morning if he were arrested. Then, the order compelling men to go home in uniform is unsatisfactory, and I do not think it is fair. He may have shopping to do, and if he goes into shops in uniform people gape at him, and wonder what he is doing. The men might be trusted to go home in plain clothes. I consider the Sunday leave is not sufficient. I think the men should get two Sundays a month. To assist that, the clerks in the district office should be compelled to do Sunday duty. They get Sunday, half Saturday, and every holiday, and get 1s. extra pay, while the others work all the year round. Then, I think when the men are on leave they should get some railway concessions.

4. The difficulty is that the Railway Department will not have it, and it would become a charge on the police. How old were you when you became a sergeant?—Thirty-nine.

5. What is your opinion in regard to the maximum age at which a man should be promoted, having regard to the class of work he has to do?—He should not be much over forty or forty-five; it is very trying work, and a man over fifty does not last long at it.

6. If you were in charge of a station at that age you would rather remain there?—Yes.

7. What class of men are the young constables now?—The majority of them are very good.

8. The exceptions mean that you have to exercise greater supervision?—Yes.

9. That is what a sergeant is for?—Yes.
10. Is it only the result of youth and inexperience or intrinsic badness?—They do not seem to have the same qualifications in regard to intelligence. They are some of them very green, and may improve. The stamp of men is not up to the standard it used to be some years ago, with a few exceptions.
11. Their conduct is fairly good?—Yes.
12. Is the discipline pretty good in this district?—Very good.
13. Do you think promotion is fairly dealt out, or do you hear complaints?—Well, some have been put over me who were of less service, but I make no complaint.
14. You assume there is some adequate reason for their promotion?—Yes.
15. Do you hear anything about political influence or interference?—I have heard of it, but I do not know of any case.
16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to promotion to sergeant, you know that they are first of all placed in a city?—Yes.
17. How long were you in the city before being placed in charge of a station?—Three or four years.

EDWIN MURRAY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 49.)

Witness: I am stationed in Dunedin, as district clerk. I have been sergeant since 1907. I joined the Force in February, 1897, and have been district clerk since 1902. Previous to that I was assistant clerk since 1899 in Christchurch. I was district clerk five years before promotion.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was the reason for your promotion?—At the last Commission it was one of the recommendations that the district clerk in charge of an office should take the rank for special reasons, on condition that he was recommended by his Inspector.

2. How many clerks are there in your office?—Two.

3. Is there any reason why the clerks in your office should not go out on beat occasionally, to relieve men from duty?—The question never came up till this Commission. The work of the district office depends greatly on the arrival and despatch of mails. The first mail from the north is in the boxes about 5, and another comes in about 11. On Saturday when the second mail comes in I have to keep a clerk to attend to it. I do the first mail myself, which takes from one to three hours. Another clerk takes up the mail at 11, and passes it to the Inspector's office, the correspondence being dealt with by the Inspector on Saturday night or Sunday morning, and the record clerk has to dispose of that on Sunday morning. If the men had to do duty on Sunday the work of recording would devolve on myself.

4. Why not send them out alternately?—Well, there would not be so much inducement for a constable to work for the position.

5. But there are surely other attractions—the men get not more than six days' work, 1s. extra, and can wear plain clothes?—It is only of late years constables have been offering for this work. I think they should not be required to go on the street. The work they do is altogether different from street duty. They receive, after probation, 1s. a day, and are termed "assistant clerks."

6. They have no rank as such; they are constables. They regard themselves as clerks, and that is the trouble?—If they make a report, they have to sign as clerks.

7. Can you show me that it would be detrimental to the service that these clerks should be sent out on street duty occasionally?—I think they should not go out.

8. Would it be in any way detrimental to the service or to their usefulness as clerks?—It is different work; they would not take the same interest in their office-work.

9. You are cutting the men off from the Police Force, and taking up the ground that they should be assistant clerks, and nothing else?—Yes.

10. What proportion of the men remain in the position of assistant clerks till they work up to be district clerks, and what becomes of the rest?—I do not know. Men who are found unsuitable have to go back to street duty.

11. What does the average suitable assistant clerk work up to?—He has the rank of sergeant to look forward to, and that is the end of his promotion.

12. But there is nothing to prevent your asking for further promotion?—Yes, there is; it was understood that I was to be district clerk only.

The Commissioner: Is there anything to prevent him applying if he thinks proper, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Nothing at all. I rather encourage them to go out as sergeants, because they make good men. After years in the office they make better men; but they will not go out.

13. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] You have not a full appreciation of your position?—Yes; I have a full appreciation of the responsibility.

14. The fact remains, it is not quite right to say as a set off to other things that you have to remain a district clerk—that is, at your own option?—That was the understanding when I was promoted.

15. Do you think you are unfit to be a sergeant in uniform?—No.

16. If you wished to be a Sub-Inspector, and go out again into the uniform branch, you have a perfect right to do so?—I should then be entering into competition with the sergeants in the street. The reason of the appointment was the pay.

17. You would rather keep your clerks in your office?—Yes, because I think they would lose interest in their work.

18. Because they are called upon to do a little duty with other members of the Force?—Yes; in the same way as constables doing street duty could not come into the office.

19. How long would it take you to get a constable into shape, assuming he had suitable qualifications?—Eighteen months, or perhaps more.

20. How long do you think it takes me to get a cadet fresh from school into the work of my Court? I cannot understand that it would take eighteen months to get a constable into shape?—If you got a man with exceptional qualifications, it might take less; but it requires more than a Fifth Standard education to do the work in the police office. I passed the Sixth Standard, and went on to a high school, and I cannot say I know too much.

21. But you know enough?—I have had considerable experience.

22. Does not experience often go as far as education?—A man profits by experience.

23. What standard have your two men passed?—I do not know. The qualification is not always the result of education.

24. *Dr. Dinnie.*] You think the longer you have a man in the office the better he is able to perform his duty?—Yes.

25. *The Commissioner.*] And you would not keep them so long if they were sent into the street?—No.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Men would hesitate to apply for the clerical positions if they were sent out in the streets on Sunday?—Yes.

27. At present applications are few?—Yes; there are more in Dunedin than in Christchurch.

28. You do not suggest they should be sent out?—No.

29. Should you say from the work you see that your two clerks have passed more than the Fifth Standard?—I should say so. There are subjects on which they might not have.

30. As regards the “useful” man at each station, have you heard anything of that?—No; only since the Commission started.

31. You are in touch with the men a good deal?—I do not care to gossip in the station.

32. Would not the constables with you tell you?—I should think so.

33. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Your two assistants get Saturday afternoons off pretty regularly?—Yes, but they work in the evening.

MICHAEL McKEEFY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 50.)

Witness: I joined the Force, after service in the Armed Constabulary, in September, 1887. I was promoted, at the age of forty-eight, to the rank of sergeant in 1908.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Had you applied for promotion for some considerable time?—Yes. I applied in 1904, owing to a paragraph that appeared in the Commissioner’s annual report stating that sergeants in the Force were getting old, and that discipline would be better if younger men were promoted, and that plenty of men were eligible of from thirteen to twenty years’ service from forty-five to fifty years of age. I received a favourable reply, saying that my application would be considered, but others had a greater claim. I was satisfied till, in December, 1904, a man junior to myself was promoted, and I began to feel annoyed, and applied again. I got a memo. saying that the application would be considered when the next selections were being made. After eighteen months there were other men junior to myself promoted. I saw the Commissioner when he visited the station, and told him. He replied that I should have to pass an examination. Several of these men who were junior to me never passed an examination. I finally sat, and passed it.

2. You were never asked to pass before?—No.

3. Are you aware of any reason why these men were promoted over your head?—No; I do not think they had better claims. Some of them I had taught all they knew.

4. Do you know of any reason why you were not promoted?—No; there are twenty-six who are senior to me now who are junior in the service. In regard to general matters, there seems to be dissatisfaction in this station owing to married men having to go to and fro in uniform; this is not enforced on other stations, and I do not think it should be. They have to do business on their way to and fro, and being in uniform they are sometimes called on to perform police duty, and they have to explain why they are late. I think the men should have more time off on Sunday.

5. Could that be managed in any way?—Men doing light work about the station should be available, such as the clerks. Many a time their services could be used without any disadvantage to the office or the service. There was an instance not long ago where, a man being sent on escort duty to Seacliff, only two men were on the street, while one of the clerks was reading in the library and the other airing himself in the street. It would have been no hardship for them to go on the street at a time like that.

6. It would hurt their dignity?—That is the only thing.

7. Do you think there is much feeling of this sort between the clerks and the men?—I think so; they do not recognise the men as comrades. The men think there is very little show now that the clerks are getting promoted. The office is looked upon as the recruiting-ground for sergeants. As regards men joining the Force, I consider if the men who are not well known were put on probation for a certain time their ability could be known, and it would be of more advantage to the Force. I was placed on probation when I joined, and I was previously in the Armed Constabulary. I consider a watch-house keeper more entitled to extra pay than clerks. He is put in a position where his sheet may be more readily marked. He has to take charge from constables, and if a man is not properly searched, and if he has a match left on him and sets fire to his bedding, he is liable to be fined. A clerk is not subject to anything of this sort. There are plenty of men available for clerks; I have never known one to be put out for not being efficient yet. It has been said that no sergeants have been sent into the street from the office. That is not so in Hogan’s case. He is a long way junior to me, but is senior sergeant.

8. How does the men’s physique compare nowadays?—It is not so good as it was.

9. To what do you attribute that?—When I joined there were a good lot to select from, and the best were taken. The Armed Constabulary was a good recruiting-ground. Nowadays a man can get as good pay outside the Force, where he is not subject to the same restrictions.

10. This question was a burning one with you at one time?—Yes.

11. You think other men are in the same position?—Yes.
12. You felt you were badly treated?—I did. If I had got what others have I should be now on maximum pay.
13. Are you more efficient to-day than when you were passed over?—I cannot see it. There is a case of a man who is now a month senior to one with ten years more service.
14. What is the general conduct of the men here?—Good.
15. Have you any knowledge of political or other “pull”?—I have heard it spoken of.
16. Do you believe it exists?—I do.
17. Does that account for things you cannot otherwise account for?—It looks like it. I do not see how it can be put down to anything else. The way men are picked out in batches—how could they all qualify if there were not some curious business?
18. What kind of business?—Either themselves or their families “pulling the wires.”
19. Does this create much discontent in the Force?—Men think if they cannot do this their prospects are very poor, and they have no chance of rising; it affects the efficiency of the service.
20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Speaking of “wire-pulling” can you tell me an instance?—That is a very hard question.
21. Do you know of one instance?—I could not tell you of one.
22. It is just hearsay?—Yes; I have heard of it ever since I joined. I remember Captain Coleman saying to me when in the A.C. Force, “Well, you have not got into the police yet? I see So-and-so has, but he has two members and you have only one.”
23. How do you make out that the clerical department is a recruiting-ground for sergeants?—I said it was going to be.
24. How many cases do you know of a clerk being sent out into the street on promotion?—The case of Hogan, during the Exhibition time.
25. It is not the rule?—I cannot see what is to be done with them in a short time if they are not sent out; they will be all sergeants in the district office. A man who has been ten years in the office gets promoted whether he asks for it or not. You might get one or two to go out into the street, but others will not go out and qualify for higher position.
26. *The Commissioner.*] You have not been long away from Christchurch?—Sixteen months.
27. Is there any feeling of dissatisfaction there in regard to promotion?—Just the same as here, so far as I know.
28. In the detective branch as well?—Yes; I do not consider they are any better treated than others.
29. Has there been any injustice in Christchurch?—Acting-Detectives Gibson and Ward are still acting-detectives; they are as good as any in New Zealand.

WILLIAM ECCLES, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 51.)

Witness: I am stationed at Dunedin. I was enrolled on the 15th June, 1886, and promoted to be sergeant on the 16th March, 1909. I was recommended by the Inspector of the Auckland District, where I was stationed, in charge of Devonport. As far as I am aware I was senior man amongst those recommended. I am the youngest sergeant on the street, being thirty-seven years of age.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Where were you doing duty as sergeant prior to that?—I came here straight after my promotion.

2. What sort of men are you coming in contact with at the Dunedin Station?—With a few exceptions, the men have been very good.

3. What are the few exceptions composed of?—As regards education, defaulters, and so forth.

4. What kind of breaches are most frequent?—Leaving their beat, and things of that sort.

5. Have you had occasion to report one?—None whatever here. With regard to the rate of pay, I also think it is too small. I should start constables at 8s. a day, and allow them 1s. 6d. a day for house-rent, so as to induce single constables to marry. I think the pay of sergeants should be increased to 11s. a day, with 2s. for house-rent. I also think we should have free uniform and one pair of boots a year. I notice that the 1898 Police Commission recommended two pairs of boots a year, and that recommendation was never carried out. As regards promotion, I think the detective branch of the service are quite as entitled to promotion as I am, and *vice versa*. If a sergeant of police shows exceptional ability in the detection of crime, and applies for a transfer, he should be entitled to a transfer to the detective branch, and rise to the higher ranks in the service. With regard to the district clerks and police storekeepers, I do not think they should be promoted to the rank of sergeant, as that causes a great deal of dissatisfaction. Muggeridge was promoted after six and a half years' service. I believe he is a real good man, though I do not know him personally. He may be entitled to the pay, but I contend he is not entitled to the rank. I think district clerks are quite entitled to the pay they receive, but they should not get the rank of sergeant until they qualify for it. A district clerk may afterwards go out in the street, and although he was junior man in the service he might be promoted station sergeant before his seniors. I would also advocate that constables, sergeants, and detectives travelling on transfer should receive a saloon passage in lieu of steerage as at present, and I think that constables applying for positions in the Force should have at least three years' street duty to start with. Then, I think if married constables are not to be intrusted to go home in plain clothes after finishing their duty they are not entitled to be in the service at all. In connection with all breaches of the regulations brought under the notice of the Inspector, I consider the evidence should be taken on oath. It would be fairer to the sergeant as well as to the men.

This concluded the Dunedin evidence.

OAMARU, WEDNESDAY, 21ST JULY, 1909.

WILLIAM DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, further examined. (No. 52.)

The Commissioner: The Hon. Mr. Jones, at whose invitation the Commission came to Oamaru, is unable to be present. I do not know if there is anything to bring before the Commission. The only matter I am concerned with is the question of whether the district shall continue to be part of the Canterbury Police District or be merged into Otago.

Mr. Dinnie: I know of no one coming forward to give evidence unless you wish to take the sergeant's statement as regards the change of district. The only factor in that is as regards correspondence; it is a loss of time to send to Dunedin and back to Oamaru. Another reason is the fact that there is a detective at Timaru, and it is very convenient to get him here at short notice; it would take longer to come from Dunedin, but these matters are trivial.

1. *The Commissioner* (to Mr. Dinnie).] What is your opinion, as Commissioner of Police?—I see no objection to the change; it would work better attached to Dunedin.

2. Geographically it should be part of Dunedin District?—It was originally, and it was only when Southland was worked from Dunedin that the alteration was made.

3. This district could be easily added to Mr. O'Brien's district without placing too much strain on him?—Yes. I think it could be very well worked from Dunedin.

4. *The Commissioner* (to Inspector Gillies).] Mr. Gillies, have you any remark to make on the matter?—I have no objection. The only point is in connection with the correspondence, which would have to go from Wellington to Dunedin and back to Oamaru.

5. But the train service is much better than it used to be, and it would cause little delay?—I have no feeling at all in the matter; I merely mentioned the fact.

6. What would it relieve you of?—Four stations—Hampden, Kurow, Ngapara, and Oamaru.

7. Then, if you and the Commissioner both agree it will be better for me to make a recommendation in my report that the change should be made without going further into the matter?—I may mention that the first express arrives from Christchurch at 12.40, whereas the first from Dunedin arrives at 11.30; consequently, in a matter of urgency the Inspector could be here earlier from Dunedin.

The Commissioner: The local feeling being in favour of the change, in a case of this sort, where there is no official objection, I do not see why the change should not be made.

THOMAS GRIFFITHS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 53.)

Witness: I joined the Force in March, 1876. I was promoted in February, 1900. I have served as sergeant nearly nine years, in Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Oamaru. I took charge here three years and three months ago. I have five constables and a gaoler on the station. It is a police gaol.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Does that require a gaoler?—There has always been one. I am pleased to say the gaol is not used very frequently.

2. Is the gaoler a police officer?—Yes; he is available for police duties; he is rated as a constable, but is paid by the Prisons Department direct. His name is George Macarthy; he joined the Force in 1899; he is very frequently called on to do police duty, and is always at my disposal. I have three out-stations—Ngapara, Kurow, and Hampden; there is a constable at each place.

3. Has the result of no-license in the district been that you get extra work?—It does not lessen the work, except from the point of view of there not being so many arrests, but otherwise the constables are fully employed.

4. In the detection of sly-grog selling?—It means a great deal of extra work.

5. Has crime diminished in the district?—Considerably.

6. During your experience, have you noticed, in any respect, the physique of the Force is not so good as it used to be? Is there any deterioration in the quality of the men?—No; they are not so large as they used to be—not so robust.

7. But they come up to the standard?—Yes; and their intelligence is very good.

8. Some sergeants I have examined imply that the intelligence of the average young constable is not equal to that of some years ago?—I cannot say that, but I think the constables of some years ago took a greater interest in their work.

9. To what do you attribute this lack of interest in their work?—It is not made attractive from the pay point of view; they think they are underpaid.

10. You have free quarters here?—Yes.

11. Have you anything to say about the sobriety of the men?—I have had men who were not giving satisfaction, but on being reported to the Inspector he had them removed.

12. Was that for being drunk?—In two instances it was.

13. What happened to them?—They were transferred and taken to Headquarters, so as to be under the immediate supervision of the sergeant there. The first one was owing to drink; the other was not giving satisfaction. I had my suspicions, although it was not directly reported, that he was tippling. The first man was reported for being under the influence of liquor. I reported him, and he was allowed to resign.

14. How long were you aware of the habits of these men before they were dealt with?—About three weeks; then I reported the matter immediately. An inquiry was held by the Inspector immediately here, and the result was as I have said.

15. Do you know of any political or other interference with any member of the Force?—I heard of a case where political influence was tried to be used, but it was not effective; it was only hearsay; the man himself did not tell me, but his friends did. This was about six months ago—not on this station, but not far from here.

16. In what direction was influence sought to be used?—The man had been transferred, and his friends used influence with members to have him retained, but unsuccessfully.

17. For what reason was he being transferred?—I think he had been giving dissatisfaction—not under me; I had nothing to do with him. I can give you his name.

18. Have you any views in regard to the method of promotion? Have you noticed anything that calls for remark?—I have not; I think promotion is given according to ability and fitness.

19. You mean the cases you know of appear to you to be proper?—Yes.

20. Under what circumstances were you promoted?—I gave a great deal of satisfaction in the suppression of sly-grog in Balclutha, and my Inspector recommended me for promotion.

21. Were you promoted over the heads of others?—There were seniors to me on that occasion—I should say, about two hundred.

22. You were promoted for special merit?—I should say that is what it was for.

23. Do you think this district could be as well worked from Dunedin as from Christchurch?—There is the matter of an hour and ten minutes in the arrival of the Inspector.

24. Not much difference, whichever way it goes?—No; I have no wish to part from Mr. Gillies.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The man you referred to was transferred notwithstanding the influence sought to be brought to bear?—Yes.

26. There is a feeling that sufficient inquiry is not made in respect to sly-grog selling here: I should like you to say whether special steps are taken?—When I have thought I was unable to cope with sly-grog selling I have reported the matter to Inspector Gillies, and on all occasions he has sent assistance.

27. Strange men have been brought into the district?—Yes; generally young constables.

28. Do they take up the work readily?—Yes.

29. There have been some here when you had no knowledge of it?—Yes; one was here for five weeks without my knowing anything about it.

30. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know anything of a constable having been found drunk in a sly-grog shop?—This is the first I ever heard of it.

31. The constable whose name you mentioned has since left the service?—I could not have said it was a sly-grog shop; he had some beer for his own use, and invited his friends to help him.

32. The general allegation is made that the management of the Force is unsatisfactory, and that no help appears to be given to suppress illegal drinking?—The outside public do not know what is done; if they did they would not talk.

33. Then the allegation goes on to say that a constable was found drunk in a sly-grog shop, and has been retained in the service?—It was not a sly-grog shop; it was a private house. The constable is still in the service in Christchurch. I would not say he was reported for being drunk, but he was under the influence.

34. There is not much difference. You will agree that a constable, once seen under the influence, is unfit to be one?—That was the ground I took.

35. The principal point is the selection of the men sent here to assist you?—The Inspector does that.

36. How long had these men been here?—One for six and the other nine months.

37. Were they specially selected?—I could not say.

38. In order to assist you and to resist the special temptations offered by sly-grog shops, they should be specially selected?—It would be well if they were—specially sober men.

39. What sort of men have you now?—Very good.

40. You have no complaints?—No.

41. Immediately you see grounds for complaint you get rid of a man?—Yes.

42. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I should like this matter cleared up. What was the man you refer to reported for?—Being under the influence of liquor when on duty. The report was submitted to the Inspector, an inquiry was held, and he was transferred.

43. Was the charge of drunkenness proved?—No, he produced a doctor's certificate to prove that he was sober.

44. The case was not proved at all?—No; but he was transferred.

45. But not for drunkenness?—Evidence was given against mine that he was sober.

46. *The Commissioner.*] Are you absolutely certain he was under the influence of liquor?—Yes, but the weight of evidence was against me.

47. Did the doctor say he examined him about the time?—Yes, immediately before I charged him. There was other evidence too, but the Commissioner thought proper to shift him.

48. His conduct had not been satisfactory?—That is so.

Inspector Gillies: Some fault seems to have been found with the administration of this district from Christchurch. I feel that very keenly.

The Commissioner: The person who supplied me with particulars is not here.

Inspector Gillies: I think, in justice to me, I should know who makes the complaint; it affects my administration.

The Commissioner: I have no objection to your knowing the contents of the telegram addressed to the Minister of Justice. It is as follows: "Management Oamaru police from Christchurch most unsatisfactory. No help suppress illegal drinking. Alleged policeman found drunk sly-grog shop Oamaru been retained service." Neither Mr. Dinnie nor I take it as a reflection on your administration; it is only unsatisfactory geographically. I think you are taking a wrong view of the matter.

Mr. Dinnie: I quite agree. There is no reflection on the Inspector.

Inspector Gillies: In that case I take your assurance that I am not affected.

Witness: I have been requested by the men to make certain representations. They would like to see the pay increased by at least 1s. a day, and also the house-allowance to married men. Owing to the dearth of houses they think it should be increased by at least 3s.; that is, to 10s. At present there are very few houses to be had in Oamaru. The average rent is about 12s. 6d. They would ask your Worship to recommend an increase to 10s.

The Commissioner: I shall probably make some recommendation; I cannot say it will be to 10s.

Witness: There is another matter: they desire to have uniforms supplied free. At present they have to pay the cost of making up, which is about £2 5s.; and they wish to be allowed a pair of boots a year. They say the Railway and Telegraph Departments get their uniforms free. I should like to state, in regard to the administration of this district from Christchurch, that the Inspector has been here twice within a little over three months.

Mr. Dinnie: As regards boots, the question of supplying them has been tried in different Forces, but the men prefer buying their own. Regulation boots are not a success.

49. *Inspector Gillies* (to witness).] How long have you been in charge?—Three years and three months. I came just before prohibition was carried.

50. Have I not from time to time charged you and your men to use special efforts to detect sly-grog selling in the Oamaru district?—You have.

51. Have I not sent men specially to you—men who were here for six or seven weeks—for no other purpose than the detection of sly-grog selling?—You have.

52. Has anything been left undone, so far as I as Inspector of the district was concerned, for that purpose?—Nothing that you or the police could do has been left undone to suppress sly-grog selling.

Inspector Gillies: I look upon that telegram which has been sent to you, sir, as a stab in the dark. You know my administration for many years past.

The Commissioner: I do not think it was intended as a stab in the dark, nor do I feel that the person who sent the telegram intended it as a personal reflection upon yourself in the slightest degree.

Inspector Gillies: Well, I feel sensitive on the matter.

The Commissioner: You are quite at liberty to see the telegram. Perhaps it would be as well that you should be sworn now and examined.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 54.)

Witness: I am Inspector of Police in charge of the Canterbury and North Otago District, and have been so for the last seven years and a half.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general evidence you wish to give?—I do not think I need refer to anything at present except the question of sly-grog selling. When prohibition was carried I took special steps to instruct the sergeant and the constables in the district how to detect sly-grog selling, and I have sent men from time to time, even unasked, to the district for that special purpose. On one occasion a special man was here for over six weeks without the knowledge of the sergeant or any of his men, and it was only when I sent the second man that I had to disclose the position to the sergeant. Everything that a police officer could do, to my mind, I have done. The police is not an advertising department, because we do not want the public to know what we are doing all the time. When a complaint is made I think it ought to go to the Inspector of the district instead of to the Minister, so that he may have an opportunity of replying; otherwise the Inspector is placed in a very false position.

2. So far as you are personally concerned, you say you have done all that you possibly could for the suppression of sly-grog selling in your district?—Yes.

3. What have you to say with regard to the administration of the local sergeant?—I am satisfied he has done his best, so far as his judgment goes; in fact, I think he has done all a sergeant could have done. From my observation, I should say sly-grog selling in this district was very limited, and I have no hesitation in saying that a certain section of the community advertise it a great deal more than is necessary.

4. Do you make a practice of sending men periodically to the district for the purpose of detecting this offence, or do you only send them when representations are made to you?—I send them when I believe, from my own observation, it is necessary.

5. Where do you get the men for that work?—Generally, from the depot in Wellington. I make arrangements with the Commissioner to have them sent. I do not think, as a rule, he would send men from Christchurch unless they were young men just appointed in Christchurch. We generally get young men, but the great point is to select the right man for the work.

6. Do you find there is any objection on the part of young constables to enter upon this class of work, or do they take it up willingly as a part of their police duties?—I should not send a man who had the slightest scruple, or who did not like the work. It would be utterly useless to do so. I know they have done their very best, because I have been in communication with them under an assumed name.

7. With regard to the men to serve under the sergeant in this district, do you select men as having special qualifications?—I generally recommend to the Commissioner the men whom I think would be most useful here, because I consider the work we have been speaking about is the principal work here.

8. There are two men whose names have been handed in: do you know anything of their records before they came here?—One of them had a clean default sheet. As to the other, I do not recollect. One of the men was reported for being under the influence of liquor on the morning of a fire. An investigation was held immediately, and the matter submitted for the Commis-

sioner's consideration. He ruled that the charge was not proven. I thought, however, even where there was a suspicion the man should be transferred, and he was transferred at once.

9. Generally speaking, you are exceedingly careful in the selection of the men for a district like this?—Yes. I prefer to have the men against whom there is any suspicion under proper supervision, and they are not sent to out-stations.

10. With regard to administration, do you know of any direction in which it could be improved? Do you think there are any weak spots?—Well, the matter is under our consideration at present.

11. At any rate, you can say that within a short time you hope to effect certain improvements?—Yes.

WILLIAM MILLER MCKENZIE, Carrier, examined on oath. (No. 55.)

The witness tendered evidence with regard to certain complaints which the Commissioner ruled were outside the scope of the inquiry.

This concluded the Oamaru evidence.

TIMARU, THURSDAY, 22ND JULY, 1909.

HENRY TEEVAN, Medical Practitioner, examined on oath. (No. 56.)

Witness: I am a duly registered medical practitioner, but on account of ill health am not now practising. I wish to make a statement as to the treatment I have received at the hands of Sergeant Mullany, who at the time of which I am about to speak was Constable Mullany. This matter goes back five years ago, and arises out of a collision I had with a man while driving one very dark night about twelve miles from Temuka, where I lived. The name of the place is Peel Forest. I was driving, with my lights burning brightly, on the near side of the road, when suddenly, and without warning, I was rushed into by a cart in which there were two men. The hub of my wheel was struck, and the near light extinguished. I was almost thrown out, and my horse bolted. I felt that I was being rushed to sudden death. When I did manage to pull up, I found that the swingletree was smashed in half, one half retaining its hold on the trap and the other half being suspended to the trace, so that the sharp end was dangling against the horse's side. My rug and other things had been thrown out. I went back along the road to see if any damage had been done to the cart, and to see if I could render any medical aid, but could find neither cart nor driver. I had to get my horse and trap home as best I could. I found out afterwards from the coachbuilder that the axle of my trap was twisted. There is no doubt I had a very narrow escape of losing my life, and the chances were in favour of my lying out all night, dead or alive. On my reaching Geraldine I reported the matter to Constable Mullany, who, however, said it would be almost impossible to find out anything about it. The accident occurred on a Monday, and I went to the constable on the following Tuesday evening, and on the next day again I showed him my swingletree. Seeing that the constable was not going to do anything about it, I determined to find out myself who it was that had run into me, and I offered my own man 10s. if he would find out the owner of the cart for me. Very soon after gaining a certain amount of information by means of telephoning to one of the stores in the district—which cost me 1s. 6d.—and through the Post Office, I found out who the owner was, through the blacksmith's shop where this man's cart had also to undergo repairs. I immediately gave Constable Mullany the name of the man, and he promised on that day (Wednesday) to go and see about it that day. He said he would go to the hotel at which the man had been drinking before the accident and also to Peel Forest. The owner of the cart which ran into me is now dead, so that I do not wish to say anything more about a dead man. On the following Sunday I went to the constable to see what he had done in the matter. He told me I was a most unreasonable man to expect him to go out to the places he had promised to visit. I had a few more words with him, from which I knew that he was not going to inquire further. He did not even carry out his promise to come and see my gig, although I live only about three minutes' walk from the police station. He said it was not his business to do so. He said further, "You are not satisfied, I know. You have got your remedy." I knew what was behind that, of course. However, the day before the case *Police v. Bull* came before the Court, the constable told me that I should be wanted to give evidence. Now, at the time there was no law in force under which a man could be charged with driving without lights, and this man was consequently charged with negligent driving.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was the result?—The case was dismissed, and I was comforted by the Justice of the Peace telling me that if I took a civil action I might probably get damages. At the hearing of the case the constable said to the Justice of the Peace, "Do you not think I did my duty, sir?" And the answer was, "You have done your duty." I then communicated with the Police Commissioner on the 16th August.

[Correspondence between witness and the Police Commissioner read.]

Mr. Dinnie: All that correspondence will be found upon the file.

The Commissioner: Then I can call for the papers in connection with this case.

Witness: Although the constable claims that he did his duty, I want to say that if he had visited the hotel he promised to visit he would have found that the man who ran into me was so beastly drunk that he could scarcely get into his trap. About three months after this the man was promoted.

2. The crux of your complaint is in the fact that the local constable did not act promptly on your information in the matter of inquiry?—Yes, he made next to no inquiry.

3. What is your object in bringing this matter up now?—To show how the Police Force is run.
4. Have you any wider knowledge of the police in other cases?—I have always been on the best of terms with them.
5. How long have you been in practice in Geraldine?—Twelve years.
6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What time of night did the accident occur?—A quarter past 8. The night was inky dark.
7. What time was it when you informed the constable?—About 5 the following day. Having been thrown out of my work by the accident I was unusually busy next morning.
8. Would it not have been better in a matter of this sort to go to the constable in the morning?—There were people waiting for me who ought to have been seen over night.
9. The constable gave you notice to attend the Court?—Yes.
10. And the man was brought forward and summoned and prosecuted: what was the result?—The case was dismissed.
11. *The Commissioner.*] Did you give evidence?—Yes; and was told by two Magistrates that if I had brought a civil action I might get damages.
12. Who else gave evidence?—The sergeant and the man Bull.
13. And the Court considered the case not proven?—Yes.
14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Subsequent to that you allege the local member (Mr. Flatman) and I conspired to get this man promoted?—Yes.
15. *The Commissioner.*] You allege that as a fact, in your opinion?—Yes. I said if it was not due to political influence it did the Commissioner no credit.
16. Did not Mr. Flatman deny this?—Yes.
17. Then, you think influence was used on that occasion?—Yes.

ELLIS MILLS, Wharf Labourer, examined on oath. (No. 57.)

Witness: I desire to make certain complaints. The first case is in connection with a stack of oats I had, which was destroyed by some boys who pulled the stack to pieces looking for rats. The oats were lying about for a fortnight or three weeks before I knew anything about it, and in the meantime heavy rain had destroyed them. I went to Sub-Inspector Green, and complained to him, and gave him two or three names of boys I knew, and said there were other boys I did not know. I believe it was Detective Connell who made inquiries into the matter, and seven boys were implicated. I wanted only to get some compensation for the destruction of the oats; I did not want to incriminate the boys. The police said they could do nothing except prosecute. I believe Detective Connell would have prosecuted the boys if Mr. Green had allowed him. I said he would have to prosecute them, because I wanted prosecution. In the meantime Mr. Green told me it was not a case for the police to take up, and he advised me to see a lawyer about it. I said it seemed peculiar that the police would take no action.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Why?—On account of two certain boys.
2. What was the connection?—They were sons of the gentleman at the head of the Telegraph Office.
3. What had that to do with the Sub-Inspector? How did the inference arise in your mind?—By a word or two that dropped.
4. You infer that because they were sons of a certain person the police refused to prosecute?—Yes. Then there is another matter. I am a large exhibitor at the flower-shows, and every year have been a loser through my tomatoes being nearly all taken. Last year I had 40 lb. or 50 lb. of tomatoes at the show, and they were nearly all taken. I had two express loads of vegetables taken, with the exception of a cabbage or two and some turnips. I spoke to Sub-Inspector Green about it, and he said he would see the committee. I told him the name of one of the boys who had been taking the tomatoes, and I had two witnesses. I had kept two of my boys to look after the exhibits, and they found some boys taking the tomatoes.
5. Did you want the police to prosecute?—Yes, and they refused.
6. Did they give any reason?—No.
7. Then you complained to the Commissioner?—Yes, and you have the reply.
8. Yes. He says, "With reference to your letter of the 24th ultimo, relative to alleged theft of your flowers and stack destroyed, I have the honour to inform you that, as a result of inquiry, it appears to me that as regards the destruction of your stack the local police rightly refused to investigate the matter, as you expressed your intention to proceed civilly against the culprits, hence it was not a matter for police interference; and as regards your missing flowers, it seems evident that at least a number of your exhibits were left behind unclaimed after the show closed, and were no doubt distributed amongst children and others, as is usual on such occasions. The Sub-Inspector to whom you mentioned the matter appears to have informed you of this, and referred you to the show officials. Under the circumstances, I do not consider the police are to blame in the matter, and am satisfied that any genuine criminal matter complained of will receive prompt attention." Do you dispute the correctness of that?—I do.
9. You withdrew your statement that you did not wish to prosecute, and asked the police to do it?—Yes.
10. You withdrew your statement that you did not wish to proceed criminally, and asked the police to do so?—Yes.
11. Did you ever go to the show officials?—Yes; they said it would be the best thing for some one to take action.
12. It was open to you to prosecute yourself. If you are aggrieved at the inaction of the police you could emphasize it better by taking action yourself, which might result in a conviction: that did not enter your mind?—No; I asked Mr. Dinnie what was the best thing to do,

and look at the reply I got. Now, to show a comparison. A boy of mine, seven years old, was playing in the street, and broke a neighbour's window with a stone. They laid an information with the police, and a case was made of it. My wife offered to pay any damages, and the neighbour's wife consented to withdraw the case, but the constable said the charge could not be withdrawn, but must go through. Now, in this case I am a loser to the extent of £4 or £5 in connection with the stack, and about £4 in connection with the other matter.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the stack, you said at first you did not wish to prosecute criminally?—No, I wanted to get compensation.

14. That was your sole object?—Yes.

15. Failing to get compensation, did you not ask the police to prosecute criminally?—Yes.

16. Your whole object being compensation?—Yes.

17. Well, the police do not take action in such matters?—Well, it is a poor lookout if you cannot get compensation or a case looked into.

The Commissioner: One of the first principles in connection with the administration of justice and the police is that they must not assist in any matters from a criminal standpoint to extract civil compensation for injury.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the second case, would you not have accepted compensation in that case?—No.

19. You had evidence against two boys of stealing: what evidence?—By my own two boys.

20. Nothing further?—No.

21. *Sub-Inspector Green.*] How long is it since the stone-throwing happened?—About eight years.

22. I had nothing to do with that?—I believe you were here.

23. When did the loss of the stack happen?—About three years ago.

24. In regard to the vegetables, what was seen taken?—Tomatoes. They were helping themselves freely.

25. Did you see it?—No, but my boys saw them taking them and planting them—4 lb. or 5 lb. perhaps.

26. When you spoke to me about it, did you not say your boys saw a boy take one tomato?—Yes, and more too.

27. Is that not what you told me?—I said "tomatoes."

28. And you said you did not want to bother about that?—No; I left you to do what you thought fit.

29. My recollection is that you said you did not want to bother about the tomatoes?—The tomatoes were the main trouble. My boy saw one boy with others, but he did not know the names of the others.

30. Do you know it is a practice with people to give their exhibits away after a show?—I have nothing to do with other people.

31. But at other shows have you not found it so?—It was not my practice. I have been a loser at other shows.

32. There was no one to look after your exhibits after the show closed?—They were in charge of the officials there, and they ought to have had somebody there.

33. There was, and, as is the usual practice, they were allowed to be taken away?—The committee never got my authority to allow it, because I spoke to them about it.

34. I advised you, did I not, to consult the committee?—I consulted the vice-president, and he told me the best thing I could do was to go to the police and lay a complaint.

HENRY GREEN, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 58.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your recollection of what passed between you and Mr. Mills?—From what I remember, Mr. Mills made a complaint about a small stack of his being damaged by boys who were hunting for rats in the stack, and, as far as I recollect, his own boys were among the culprits. The names of others were obtained and handed to Mr. Mills, but from what Mr. Mills then said, I understood he did not want the prosecution to be proceeded with. He, however, wanted damages out of the parents of the boys, and I advised him to take a civil action in the matter himself. I do not know that O'Connell had anything to do with it, and, if I remember aright, Constable Lewen was here then. With regard to the theft of vegetables, I remember Mr. Mills speaking to me some time after the flower-show, stating that he had lost a quantity of his exhibits after the show. He mentioned that a son of his had seen one boy take a tomato during the show, but that he did not want anything done with regard to that; but he said the exhibits stolen after the show meant a considerable loss to him. I made inquiries, and ascertained that Mr. Mills's exhibits, with others, had been distributed, or allowed to be taken away practically by any one. Some were given to the Old Men's Home and some to the Hospital. That is what I understand usually happens after a show. No one being there at the moment, the things were taken away by any one who was about the place. I thereupon advised Mr. Mills to see the committee about the matter, as I gathered he wanted compensation for the loss of his vegetables. Mr. Mills, I understand, did see the committee, and there was some talk about it, but no further action was taken, either by Mr. Mills or anybody else.

2. You did not consider there were any grounds for a police prosecution?—There was no hope of a conviction.

3. Did you explain this to Mr. Mills?—Yes.

4. How do you account for his attitude towards you to-day?—Well, he has had some little trouble with the police, and I suppose he has some motive for it.

5. *Mr. Mills.*] When I spoke to you about the tomato being taken, did I not give you the name of the boy?—You did.

6. Did not that put another complexion upon it? Was the reason why you did not prosecute because it was a certain boy?—No, you said you did not want the boy to be prosecuted.

7. I emphatically deny that?—Well, we differ about it.

The Commissioner: Are not all these exhibits at the close of the show held at the risk of the exhibitor? I think you are aware of that, are you not? So far as my experience goes, the only way in which an exhibitor can protect his exhibits is to take them away as soon as possible after the show is over. People, for some reason, do not appear to regard exhibits at a flower-show as ordinary property, and they help themselves freely.

Mr. Mills: How could I take away a couple of express-loads of stuff immediately after the show?

The Commissioner: It seems to me your only compensation is not to exhibit again. With regard to the stack of oats, did you instruct the detective not to prosecute?

Mr. Mills: No. The detective said he could not prosecute until he had seen Inspector Green about it. Then, when I saw Inspector Green, he said it would rest with the detective as to whether he prosecuted or not.

The Commissioner: If the detective had reported to the Sub-Inspector that, in his opinion, after making a few inquiries, there were *prima facie* grounds for a prosecution, the Sub-Inspector would not have dared to refrain from it.

Mr. Mills: Why did he not do it? I told them what the boys had done. Sub-Inspector Green says my boys were in it. I can prove they were not there, because they were at school.

The Commissioner: You will have to leave it at that. It will be for me to say where the blame lies, if there is any blame.

JOHN GILLESPIE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 59.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Temuka. I wish to give evidence with regard to the present system of promotion.

The Commissioner: In the telegram you sent me you simply say, 'I desire to place on record the unfairness of the present system of promotion.' Then, to the Sub-Inspector, in your letter, you say, "I beg to report that when the Police Commission sits at Timaru I desire to place certain evidence before the same on matters in connection with the past and present administration of the Police Department. I intend referring to a matter concerning Constable Hammond, who was formerly stationed at Pleasant Point. I would therefore like him to be notified of the fact, so that he may be present if he so desires. I also desire the production of my defaulter's sheet, the entries on which will be referred to by me when before the Commission." If you had given those details to me as Commissioner I should have been able to take your evidence with regard to Constable Hammond to-day, as I should have been able to give the constable the necessary twenty-four hours' notice in writing. But you have written to Sub-Inspector Green, who has nothing to do with the Commission. Where is Constable Hammond now?

Sub-Inspector Green: He is in Christchurch.

The Commissioner: The evidence on this matter will have to be taken in Christchurch.

1. *The Commissioner:* When did you enter the Police Force?—On the 17th July, 1876.

2. Have you any statement to make apart from references to Constable Hammond?—In October, 1899, as you are aware, there was a Commission held to inquire into the administration of the Force, and, owing to the unsatisfactory state of the service, Commissioner Tunbridge was brought from Home to reorganize the Department. Under this reorganization the status of the whole Force was altered, and country constables were left in the lower branches of the service. There were twelve branches when Mr. Tunbridge came, and he reduced them to six. I was at the bottom, and I thought I had been long enough there, more especially as I had been passed over by the Commissioner. I applied to the Commissioner for promotion, as I thought it was my only chance of reaching a higher grade and retiring with a higher pension than I would if I remained a constable.

3. How old are you now?—I am fifty-eight years of age. I made my application in 1899. I will read it in full, because I would ask you to place the applications of those who were promoted over me alongside of mine, and see which were the most deserving. I have no complaint whatever to make with regard to those who were promoted before I made my application. I would refer you, sir, to the regulations with regard to promotions. This is the application I made:—

"Having served in the New Zealand Police Force (not A.C. Force) as a constable during the past twenty-three years, and having always during that time endeavoured to do my duty according to the oath of office I took when appointed, I have formed the opinion that I am now entitled to some advancement in the service. Since I received my appointment I have never, directly or indirectly, asked for advancement, favour, or reward from any person either in or out of the Police Force. I have at times had to claim what is every man's right—namely, justice—and I think that has misled the Commissioner in judging my character and capabilities when he was selecting men for promotion. In submitting this application I am placed at a disadvantage, owing to my present Inspector having little knowledge of my ability, energy, or general fitness for promotion, as I have only been twelve months under his supervision. Some of the Inspectors who knew me best are not now in the Police Force—two are dead, and others retired. The only two left whom I have served under are Inspector Pender and Pardy, and I am not aware that either of those two Inspectors ever had any cause to complain of me in any way whatsoever during the time I served under them. I think they will bear me out in saying that I was always equal to any duty I was ever asked to perform. To give the Commissioner a slight idea of some of the police duties I have performed over twenty years ago when I was in charge of Palmerston North Station, I attach a list of crimes and offences that passed through my hands at that station, and if Inspector Goodall (who was my Inspector then) was now in the service he would, I am certain, certify that I was then deserving of promotion. I attach two memos. that I received from him to show that it was not through outside influence that I obtained promotion from third- to first-class constable so long

ago as 1879. I also attach newspaper report of what was the direct cause of my promotion to first-class constable. Palmerston North district in those days contained a large population of half-civilised Natives, who, owing to land and other disputes, used to give the Government a deal of trouble, and I had many difficult and dangerous duties to perform amongst those Natives, but I managed the duties in such a way that when the Native trouble, and what is known as the late Mr. Ballance's 'one-policeman policy,' commenced that gentleman selected me as the most suitable police officer to be placed in charge at Parihaka to keep the peace there in those troublesome times. The *Evening Post* newspaper commented on the selection in words that gave a clear indication of what the late Mr. Ballance's opinion of me was. I attach the paragraph referred to. I did not go to Parihaka, because Inspector Pardy, who was in command of the district, wanted a man that he knew personally, I being a stranger to him at the time. Nevertheless, he selected me to fill the post vacated at the White Cliffs by the transfer of Captain Messenger and his armed force. Seeing that I have been passed over and left to make this application, I respectfully ask the Commissioner to ascertain from some of the Stipendiary Magistrates of the colony whom I have served under as Clerk of the Court what their opinions are in regard to my ability and general fitness for promotion to sergeant. (I attach names and addresses of the gentlemen I refer to.) I also attach for perusal Audit Inspector's report for Court work done at Foxton, my last station. At the time I was placed in charge of Foxton district it was a hotbed of crime and disorder, but, owing to the manner I dealt with the criminals and evildoers that existed there, the district became one of the quietest in the colony. The late Inspector Thompson, who was in command, on more than one occasion complimented me on the way I dealt with the law-breakers. Temuka (my present station), now proclaimed a borough, is, I submit, of sufficient importance to warrant my Inspector recommending my application from a district point of view. I hope that it will be understood that the cause of this application is only my desire to be placed on a level with men who were not in the Police Force until many years after the date of my appointment. I attach for perusal some newspaper remarks *re* my conduct, which are a fair sample of hundreds of other remarks made in newspapers from time to time concerning my doings and treatment. The Commissioner will no doubt give this my first application for advancement his earnest consideration. — JOHN GILLESPIE.—The Commissioner of Police, Wellington."

"Palmerston North Station, from June, 1877, to April, 1884.—List of crimes and offences that passed through the hands of Constable Gillespie when in charge of Palmerston North Station, from June, 1877, to April, 1884: Abusive language, 16; Animals Protection Act, 2; attempting to shoot a woman, 1; assault (common), 8; attempt to have carnal knowledge of a girl under twelve, 1; application for prohibition order, 3; assaults on police, 2; aiding and abetting to commit felony, 2; Arms Act, 1; breach of peace, 34; being in public place with intent to commit a felony, 1; Beer Duty Act, 4; cattle-stealing, 1; cruelty to animals, 6; cutting and wounding, 1; drunk, 192; distillation (illicit stills), 9 (fines, £400); embezzlement, 1; forgery, 9; false pretences, 7; gaming and lotteries, 3; horse-stealing, 11; indecent assaults, 1; illegally on premises, 14; insulting language, 1; indecency, 4; lunacy, 18; larceny, 35; Licensing Act, 30 (fined £20); murder, 3; minor offences, 105; malicious injury to property, 17; obscene language, 30; obstructing Government survey, 1; obstructing police, 10; other arrests, 7; Public Works Act, 28; perjury, 4; resisting police, 6; receiving stolen goods, 5; stealing from the person, 5; suicide, attempt, 5; Stamp Act, 3; vagrancy, 30.—Acted as Bailiff of Magistrates' Court nearly all the time I was in Palmerston North; Pound-keeper and Ranger; officer of Customs; Inspector of Weights and Measures; Immigration Officer; and General Government Agent. Attended about fifty inquests. Dog-tax collector for the Borough of Palmerston North and County of Manawatu. And, with the exception of the Offences Arms Act (1), distillation, illicit (9), and murder (3), I had no assistance from any person. I had the sole management of all cases that arose in the district."

"16th March, 1900.—Report and application of Constable John Gillespie relative to his application for promotion.—On the 1st day of October last I submitted to the Commissioner, through you, an application for promotion. The Commissioner, on the 7th day of October, duly acknowledged receipt of the application, and intimated that it would receive full consideration when future promotions were made. I now note by the *Police Gazette*, 1900, pages 34 and 46, that Constable Thomas Griffiths, No. 433, Alexander Cruickshank, No. 281, and Samuel P. Norwood, No. 416, have been promoted to the rank and pay of sergeants since my application was submitted. As the recently promoted men are years junior to me in the service, and I am not aware that any of them have ever publicly or privately shown any exceptional merit or performed any specially valuable service to the colony to entitle them to promotion before me, I am at a loss to know why I have been rejected and these men elevated to the position I claimed to be justly entitled to according to my past publicly proved efficient police service and personal fitness for promotion. After noting the recent promotions, I can only infer that my application has been fully considered by the Commissioner and rejected. I therefore respectfully ask for a return of my application papers. —JOHN GILLESPIE, Constable 192.—Sergeant Fraser, in charge of Police, Timaru."

"Police, 00/480.—Police Department, 19/3/00.—Memoranda.—INSPECTOR ELLISON,—Constable Gillespie's application is a departmental document, and cannot therefore be returned. To be plain with the constable, I may say I do not consider he possesses the tact, &c., required to make a good superior officer, and until I have reason to alter my opinion of him I certainly shall not bring his name forward for promotion. His latest report only confirms me in the opinion I have formed of this constable. Let him be informed as above, and return to him the documents he submitted with his application.—J. B. TUNBRIDGE, Commissioner, 19/3/00."

"SERGEANT FRASER,—Please inform Constable Gillespie accordingly, and return him the documents.—T. O'BRIEN, Sub-Inspector, 21/3/00.—For Constable Gillespie: C. Fraser, Sergeant No. 29, 23/3/00."

“Temuka, 26th March, 1900.—Report and explanation of Constable Gillespie relative to his application of the 16th instant, and the Commissioner's remarks thereon: I desire to respectfully explain that when I submitted my report and application of the 16th instant for the return of my application for promotion papers I was careful to word the application in respectful language, and submitted it in accordance with Regulation No. 71. I regret to find that my action in asking for the return of the papers in question has caused the Commissioner to come to the conclusion that I am not possessed of sufficient tact to make a good superior officer of the New Zealand Police Force. I submitted my application for promotion under the belief that my character, conduct, and manner in which I had performed my duties as a first-class constable during the past twenty-one years would be inquired into by the Commissioner, and that he would have judged my fitness for promotion accordingly. It was my first application for reward for past services, and it will be my last. I am thankful to the Commissioner for plainly intimating that I will not receive promotion. My reason for asking for the return of the papers was only my desire to know the result of the Commissioner's inquiry, and to know what chance I had of promotion, so that I might be in a position to consider whether or not it would be to my advantage to remain longer in the service. Surely after twenty-four years of honest service the Commissioner will not find fault with me in my desire to, if possible, better my position. Notwithstanding the severe censure of the Commissioner, I will, so long as I remain in the service, continue to honestly perform my duties as a constable, and will always endeavour to comply with the regulations, feeling satisfied that I have been the victim of misjudgment.—JOHN GILLESPIE, Const. 192.—Sergeant Fraser, Timaru.” That is my application.

4. You never renewed it?—No; why should I? I received a telegram two or three months afterwards from Commissioner Tunbridge asking me to meet him at the train, and I met him at Timaru. I am not going to repeat what he said, but he led me clearly to understand that it was not his fault.

5. Whose fault did he imply it was?—The Minister's.

6. Who was the Minister at that time?—I cannot say from memory. He gave me clearly to understand the Ministers were to blame, and not he. I should like to point out that he said I was not possessed of sufficient tact. In reference to that, I should like to remark that prior to the last election a high official came to Timaru to make a selection of a man to represent the Department in the electoral line, and he selected me, and I was appointed Registrar of Electors and also Returning Officer. I opposed taking these appointments, but they were forced upon me, and I will read letters to show the manner in which I discharged the duties to the satisfaction of the public and all concerned. [Letters read.] After such recommendations, I think I must possess some tact.

7. You see, the person who said you possessed none has left the Dominion?—That is so, but the Government is still here. I ask you, in Wellington, to place Sub-Inspector Norwood's application beside mine, and say whether I should not have received equal promotion. I am not finding fault with any one else's promotion; they are excellent officers—perhaps better than I; I only say my application received no consideration whatever.

8. What time elapsed between your receipt of the minute from Mr. Tunbridge and his conversation with you at the railway-station?—About two months.

9. What is your object in bringing up these matters now? You have apparently accepted the position?—In justice to those who are not receiving promotion—to show that the present system is unworkable.

10. If you can show me a weak point in the administration of the present Commissioner there might be something in it?—I have served under six Commissioners, and I believe Mr. Dinnie is the best we ever had in the Dominion.

11. If he is working on a new principle, how is that affected by these matters of years ago?—It shows that men who are really deserving of promotion are not receiving it.

12. Then, Mr. Dinnie is still liable to criticism?—Well, he is responsible.

13. Can you give any concrete instance in which the present Commissioner has failed to recognise the claims of men for promotion?—No. The men are not selected according to ability.

14. Whose fault is that?—I blame the Government, and the system the Commissioner is working under.

15. What system?—No proper system at all.

16. Are not promotions always rather a question of individual merit, and is it not largely a matter of personal opinion as to whether a man merits promotion?—That is so. I have no fault to find with the men who were selected before myself. But if a man applies for promotion the Commissioner ought to give the application consideration when making an appointment.

17. Can you give me an instance in which he has not done so?—My own.

18. But that is ancient history—I am dealing with the administration of to-day?—The same system is in force to-day.

19. Can you give me an instance in which you think political influence has governed promotion?—No; but it is a well-known fact that political influence is used in all branches of the service. I would also refer you to my defaulter's sheet, because it may be said that there was something against my character or reputation, and I can give an explanation to every one of those entries.

The Commissioner: I cannot go into the question of your defaulter's list, because every one of those matters has been already dealt with judicially by the persons in authority.

Witness: I should like the defaulter sheet read, because I am writing a book on my experiences in the police service, and in that book I shall be able to explain all those things. [Defaulter's sheet read.] As to the question of political interference, I should like to give one illustration of the manner in which men suffer through political interference, and how it is used in attempts to

deprive men of their stations. This particular complaint relates to myself, and it was sent by a member of the Legislative Council—the Hon. Mr. Jeremiah Twomey, a well-known New Zealand politician. I will read the whole of the official correspondence relating to the case:—

“Police—05/976.—New Zealand Police Department.—Received, 11/5/05.—From Hon. J. M. Twomey, Temuka, M.L.C.—Subject: Forwards complaint of Mr. M. N. Herapath against Constable Gillespie. Memorandum.—INSPECTOR GILLIES,—Please investigate and report.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, 11/5/05.

“SERGEANT WARRING,—For immediate attention.—R. J. GILLIES, Inspector, 13/5/05.

“CONSTABLE GILLESPIE,—Please report exactly what took place on the day in question. You will also call upon Constable Fraser for a report of the facts.—W. WARRING, Sergt., 15/5/05.

“CONSTABLE FRASER,—Please report, as requested.—JOHN GILLESPIE, Const. 192, 18/5/05.”

“‘Temuka Leader,’ ‘Geraldine Guardian.’ J. M. Twomey, Proprietor.—6th May, 1905.—The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—DEAR SIR,—As requested, I enclose to you the complaint of Mr. Herapath against Constable Gillespie, in Temuka. Mr. Herapath is a very wealthy English gentleman who, with his wife, has spent several fishing seasons in Temuka; both most courteous, urbane, and inoffensive people, and extremely well liked. Constable Gillespie must have known them, as they are known to almost everybody. I find on inquiry that on the morning in question Constable Gillespie, accompanied by his subordinate constable, made the annual inspection of the hotel between 10 and 11 o’clock. When they reached the Crown Hotel, where Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were staying, Mr. Phillips, the licensee, was at the bank. They were asked to delay the inspection until the landlord came back, but they refused to do so, and went through every room in the house, unaccompanied by any one. They entered the bedrooms and other rooms in the most unceremonious manner, and, amongst others, the private suite of rooms Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were occupying. I think that to inspect hotels at such an early hour is wrong, and that to enter rooms without knocking is outrageous. People here are highly indignant at the way Mr. and Mrs. Herapath have been treated. This is a sample of the manner in which Constable Gillespie does his duty. There is scarcely a man of standing in the town, and, indeed, in places beyond it, who has not asked me to try and get him shifted. I have always refused, telling them to make a report, although I am told that he has boasted that I have been trying to get him shifted for three or four years. You know, at any rate, that I never did anything of the kind. How I came to get Mr. Herapath’s letter is that I went in to the hotel immediately after the affair took place. Mr. Herapath asked me would I do anything in it. I told him if he put his complaint in writing I would forward on to you. I did not then know that he was leaving for Wellington that day; if I had, I would have recommended a personal interview with yourself. It is very easy to get other instances of his conduct just as bad as this, but it is no business of mine to report them.—Yours truly, J. M. TWOMEY.”

“52, The Terrace, Wellington, 5th April, 1905.—DEAR SIR,—I shall feel greatly indebted to you if you will kindly submit through the proper quarters a serious complaint that I wish to make against Inspector Gillespie, of Temuka. My complaint is as follows: On the morning of the 4th May, about 10.30, when my wife and I were in our private sitting-room (the door marked ‘Private’) in the Crown Hotel, Inspector Gillespie, accompanied by Constable Fraser, opened the door without knocking, giving no reasons for intrusion. My wife asked them if they were in search of any one, we naturally supposing they would not take such liberty without a search-warrant. Inspector Gillespie replied, ‘We are on the annual inspection of hotels,’ or words to that effect. He also asked if we had any complaints to make. I told him we found the hotel most comfortable and orderly. I must state that Mr. Phillips was out at the time they came, so I had to wait until his return to find out the meaning of their unwarrantable intrusion. I determined to speak to Inspector Gillespie myself, and waited till he and Constable Fraser returned up the street. I stopped Inspector Gillespie, and asked him if he would tell me on what authority he had intruded on us without asking our leave, or accompanied by the lessee, Mr. Phillips. With an insolent gesture, he walked away. I followed him, again asking him to give me reasons. He entered the Post-office letter-box room, where Constable Fraser was standing, and said, ‘Do you hear what this man says?’ I repeated my question, to which he answered, ‘Who are you?’ I told him I was a British subject, and as such had a perfect right to a reply to why he had intruded; and failing to get an answer, as he joined Constable Fraser and walked away, I told him that it was a most unwarrantable intrusion; and there are those who can vouch for what I have said. Now, sir, I consider that I am entitled to an apology from Inspector Gillespie. I do not know what the powers of the police in this country are, or if the Government will allow such treatment as I received to be passed over unnoticed, but I feel sure that if it were known the English travelling public would think twice before putting themselves in such a position. I think those with whom I have come in contact in Temuka will bear me out when I say I have not been wanting in courtesy, and I have certainly met with it always all over this colony until now. I shall be at the above address in Wellington for a fortnight should any official wish to see me. I have no intention of letting this matter drop; but I feel sure that you will see that this complaint of mine is quite just. I am much obliged to you for assistance in bringing this matter before the proper authorities.—Believe me, yours faithfully, MERVYN WILFRED HERAPATH.—The Hon. J. M. Twomey.”

“Police Station, Temuka, 19th May, 1905.—Report from John Fraser, Constable No. 807, relative to inspecting the Crown Hotel in company with Constable Gillespie, and the complaint of Mr. Herapath: I beg to report that about 11 a.m. on the 4th of the present month, in company with Constable Gillespie, we entered the Crown Hotel for the purpose of inspecting the premises, to report for the annual licensing meeting. The only person I saw when we entered was the barmaid. Constable Gillespie told her we were just going to have a look through the house for report

for the annual meeting. The porter came into the passage, and passed the remark, 'You had better wait till the boss comes in, or there will be trouble if you don't.' Constable Gillespie replied, 'There is no occasion for any trouble.' We then went upstairs, and had a look through some of the rooms, of which the doors were nearly all open. Constable Gillespie opened a sitting-room door. I was a few paces from him, standing on the landing at the head of the staircase. I heard him say, 'I beg your pardon, I thought there was no one in the room,' to some person inside. He had hold of the knob of the door, and when it was half opened I saw Mr. Herapath. Constable Gillespie told him that we were just having a look through the premises to report to the annual licensing meeting, and at the same time asked Mr. Herapath, who was exceedingly affable in his demeanour, if he was comfortable, or had he any complaints to make about the house; and Mr. Herapath replied that he was quite comfortable. Constable Gillespie said, 'I am very pleased to hear it,' and nothing further took place. We did not enter the room, nor did I see any other person there except Mr. Herapath himself. After inspecting the remainder of the premises we went up the street and inspected three other hotels. About 12 noon we returned to the Post-office. I went into where the private boxes are to see if there were any letters. Constable Gillespie entered and said, 'This man wants to know why we entered his room.' As I was closing the box Mr. Herapath said to me, 'How dare you enter my private room without a warrant?' He appeared to be very angry, so I did not give him any answer. Constable Gillespie walked out, and I followed him. We went across the street, in the direction of the Police-station. Mr. Herapath followed us across the street, and said, 'I will ask you one more question: will you acknowledge that you entered my private sitting-room without a warrant?' Neither Constable Gillespie nor myself made any answer, but walked towards the Police-station.—JOHN FRASER, Constable No. 807.—Constable Gillespie, in charge, Temuka."

"Police-station, Temuka, 19th May, 1905. — Report of Constable Gillespie relative to the attached complaint of the Hon. J. M. Twomey and Mr. M. N. Herapath, late of Temuka, but now of Wellington: I beg to report that on the 4th instant, at 11 a.m., Constable Fraser and myself (in uniform) entered the Crown Hotel at Temuka for the purpose of making an inspection of the premises in accordance with section 44 of 'The Licensing Act, 1881'; and section 180 of the same Act gave me, as the Inspector of Licensed Houses for the Geraldine Licensing District, power to enter the premises in question during business-hours and make such inspection. In section 4 of the Act of 1881 the premises to be inspected is clearly defined. On entering the hotel we saw no one about except the barmaid, who I informed that we had called to have a look over the house to make a report for annual licensing meeting. As we left the barmaid, a young man who is porter at the hotel saw us, and said, 'You had better wait until the boss comes in, or there will be trouble.' I said, 'There is no occasion for any trouble.' Then went upstairs, followed by Constable Fraser. Looked round the landing and bedrooms, the doors of same being open, and no person in the rooms. There are two public sitting-rooms opening on to the landing, with doors marked 'Private.' Both have been used as public sitting-rooms ever since I have been inspecting the house. The door of one of those rooms was open. We entered it, and looked around; then passed to the next room. The door was closed. I opened it, and saw a man and a woman there, and who I was afterwards informed were Mr. and Mrs. Herapath, who had been staying at the hotel for a day or two. When I saw the persons in the room I did not enter, but merely said, 'I beg your pardon, I thought there was no one in the room; we are just having a look through the premises to make report for annual licensing meeting.' I asked Mr. Herapath if he was comfortable, or had he any complaints to make about the house. He said, 'No; we are quite comfortable.' I said, 'I am pleased to hear you say so.' I did not enter the room; neither did Constable Fraser. I then closed the door, leaving both Mr. and Mrs. Herapath seemingly pleased and in good humour. We then looked over other parts of the house, but entered no private sitting-rooms or bedrooms used by the licensee, his servants, or his family. When I do inspect the whole of the premises I always give the licensee notice that I will do so at a time stated. On this occasion there was only an inspection of the public parts of the premises. After inspecting three other hotels we returned to the Post-office at 12 noon. Constable Fraser went in to the letter-box to get the letters, and just after he left me Mr. Herapath came from the Crown Hotel, which is just opposite the Post-office, and said to me, in an angry and most insolent manner, 'By what authority did you enter my private room without a search-warrant?' Mr. Phillips, the licensee of the hotel, was standing on the footpath in front of the hotel smiling and looking towards us. From Mr. Herapath's manner and the position of Mr. Phillips I formed the opinion that Mr. Phillips had influenced Mr. Herapath to accost me and endeavour to create some trouble for the purpose of doing what he has done — viz., to obtain matter for a report against me; and being of that opinion I merely said, 'Who are you?' I did not know Mr. Herapath by name, but had seen him about the district at times. He replied, 'A British subject.' He said nothing more, and I, being of the opinion as stated, walked away from him and went into the Post-office, where Constable Fraser was. Seeing Mr. Herapath following, I said to Constable Fraser in an undertone of voice, 'This man wants to know why we entered his room.' Mr. Herapath then addressed himself to Constable Fraser. I walked out on to the street; Constable Fraser shortly afterwards followed me, and so did Mr. Herapath, who again said, 'I will ask you one more question: will you acknowledge that you entered my private sitting-room without a search-warrant?' Neither Constable Fraser nor I answered him, but walked on towards the Police-station, and Mr. Herapath went over to Mr. Phillips. About 2 p.m. same day Mr. William Gregson Aspinall, who is a solicitor in practice at Temuka, informed me who Mr. Herapath was. The above is the true facts of all that took place on the occasion referred to, and, summed up, Mr. Herapath's complaint is simply that, while in the performance of my police duties, I opened the door of a public sitting-room in the Crown Hotel at Temuka at 11 o'clock in the day and looked in on him and his wife, who made no complaint at the time, but an hour afterwards, on being apparently influenced by Messrs. Phillips, Aspinall, and Hon. J. M. Twomey,

endeavoured to cause words, or some unpleasantness to take place, with the view of founding a charge of wrongdoing against me as a police constable, and which he has done to the Minister of Justice through the medium of the Hon. J. M. Twomey, who has seen fit to apparently arrange with Mr. Herapath to write the letter and transmit it from Wellington to him to enable him (Mr. Twomey) to submit the same to the Minister with his own comments thereon. Mr. Twomey says in his letter that he has made inquiry into the matter, and that we entered every room in the house, bedroom and others. That assertion is false, and his pointing out and submitting that my actions on the occasion mentioned is a sample of the manner in which I do my duty shows a very marked bias against me; and, further, in his letter he says, 'There is scarcely a man of standing in the town, and, indeed, in places beyond it, who has not asked him to try and get me shifted, and that he has always refused, telling them to make a report.' I respectfully submit that when a person who is a Justice of the Peace and a member of the Legislative Council of the colony deems it his duty to become the medium of transmitting a complaint to the Minister of Justice against a police constable, and in doing so pens a letter to the Minister condemning the constable and insinuating that all the respectable men of Temuka and places beyond it have endeavoured from time to time to influence him (Mr. Twomey) to get me shifted, some notice must be taken of the allegations made. No constable would be safe in doing his duty if such a person as Mr. Twomey is allowed to place on record such insinuations, and in not one single instance or manner does he seek to show or attempt to prove that I have at any time during my term of service at Temuka been guilty of any wrongdoing or neglected my duty in any manner or form; and Mr. Twomey further states in his letter that it is no business of his to report them. Then why has he deemed it his duty to assist Mr. Herapath? It certainly looks as if Mr. Twomey had asked Mr. Herapath to assist him in condemning me. I submit that, as Mr. Twomey has apparently no cause for any complaint himself against me, and as he is certainly unable to quote one single instance of wrongdoing or neglect of duty on my part, his insinuations and false assertions should not, and I feel sure will not, be accepted as proof that I have been guilty of any alleged wrongdoing, or even incivility, to any person whilst discharging my police or other duties here. On the 8th November, 1899, Mr. Twomey made a complaint of a similar nature as the attached against me with the view of getting me shifted from Temuka. On that occasion it was found that Mr. Twomey's complaint was in substance a falsity; and so it is on this occasion; and I feel sure that Mr. Twomey cannot name or produce a single respectable citizen of Temuka, or any person in the colony, who can prove (not insinuate) or even point to any neglect of duty or wrongdoing on my part as a police constable or private individual. I court the fullest inquiry into all my doings, either public or private, at Temuka or elsewhere; and it would be well for Mr. Twomey if he could court the same full inquiry into his character and reputation.—JOHN GILLESPIE, Const. 192.—Sergeant Warring, in charge of police, Timaru."

"New Zealand. Police—05/976.—Police-station, Timaru, 20th May, 1905.—Report of Sergeant Warring, No. 202, relative to attached complaint of Mr. Herapath: I respectfully report that, from inquiry made, I am inclined to think this complaint has been made by Mr. Herapath at the instigation of one or two others. Mr. Phillips at this time felt bitter towards Constable Gillespie for having only a week or so before summoned him for having served a Native youth, nineteen years of age, with liquor, he being then and there in a state of intoxication. I also find that Mr. Aspinall, solicitor, of Temuka, who is very friendly with Mr. Herapath, and also the Hon. Mr. Twomey, would like to see Constable Gillespie removed from Temuka, as the constable will not give him any information and bend to his wishes. The constable has no doubt crossed a few of the residents in that part over getting the pound removed off police grounds; but, apart from this, I am unable to find a single one who can point out anything he has done or left undone that would reflect on his conduct; and I am confident that were the Inspector to come to Temuka and hold a most searching inquiry nothing could come out against the constable but what would be to his credit. Constable Gillespie is of a very independent disposition, and very straight, so much so, in fact, that it doubtless at times causes him to be disliked by those who for motives of their own would like a more pliable man, but to my mind he is the right man in the right place. It appears the sitting-room Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were in, although marked 'Private,' was nevertheless a public room, and has always been counted as such by different licensees, and returned on the reports of licensed houses. The Hon. Mr. Twomey says 11 o'clock in the morning is too early an hour to inspect hotels; but I beg to differ from him. I think it is a reasonable hour, and that the rooms should be tidy by that time. It might have been better, seeing that Mr. Phillips was out, and that his wife was from home, if the constable had got one of the servants to accompany him upstairs and through the house. I always make it a point to do so myself, for many reasons; and I would certainly not enter any room if door closed without knocking, and Constable Gillespie tells me he would not have done so had he thought for one moment Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were there. The Hon. Mr. Twomey says the people about Temuka are highly indignant over the matter; if this is so, the people have a wonderful command over their feelings, for not a whisper of the thing can be got by me in or about the place. — WILLIAM WARRING, Sergeant No. 202."

"Submitted to the Commissioner.—I have never had a complaint against Constable Gillespie, and I have always found him to be a good officer with considerable ability, and it is hard to imagine that he would act as alleged.—R. J. GILLIES, Inspector, 23/5/05.

"The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—I consider Constable Gillespie one of the best constables in the service. His explanation in respect to the complaint requires little comment, beyond a remark that it would have been, under the circumstances, more discreet to have asked a servant to accompany him during his inspection. I am satisfied that otherwise nothing whatsoever can be brought forward but what is creditable to the constable, whose officers can testify thereto.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 27/5/05.

"I have carefully considered these reports, and I think Constable Gillespie acted most indiscreetly in his method of inspection, and he should be cautioned, and informed a like method should not again be adopted.—J. McG., 9/6/05.

"INSPECTOR GILLIES,—Please caution Constable Gillespie to be more discreet in his method of inspection in future, and to always invite the licensee or one of his servants to accompany him during inspection. (Not to be entered.)—W. DINNIE, Commr., 7/6/05."

"N.Z. Police Force, District Office, Christchurch, 10/6/05.—SERGEANT WARRING,—*Re* complaint against Constable Gillespie, who inspected the Crown Hotel, 'Temuka, offensively,' Police 05/976 attached. Please notify the constable of the remarks indorsed thereon by the Commissioner, dated 9/6/05.—JOHN DWYER, Sub-Inspector, for Inspector.—10/6/05. (366/05.)

"CONSTABLE GILLESPIE,—Please note.—W. WARRING, Sergeant No. 202, 12/6/05."

"Temuka, 7th July, 1905.—Report and explanation of Constable J. Gillespie relative to the attached correspondence: I note the remarks of the Minister for Justice indorsed on the correspondence, and respectfully submit to the severe censure contained therein. I also note the Commissioner's and my superior officers' remarks with much satisfaction; their approving remarks inspires me to still continue to discharge my police duties in an honest and faithful manner to the Department. I have been twenty-eight years an Inspector of Licensed Houses, and Mr. Twomey's complaint is the first occasion that any complaint has been made against me in connection with my duties therewith. I feel sure that that complaint would never have been made only I was directed by Inspector Gillies to prosecute Robert Vyse Phillips, the licensee of the Crown Hotel, for an alleged breach of the licensing law. I attach a newspaper report of the prosecution I refer to, and submit that it will be seen thereby that the police prosecution against the licensee of the hotel was the real cause of Mr. Twomey's complaint, and not my mode of hotel inspection. I would also like to place on record that Sergeant Warring is in error in believing and stating that I had crossed a few of the residents of Temuka by my action *re* the removal of the public pound from police reserve; that is not correct, for, as a matter of fact, the Chairman and all the members of the Temuka Road Board and myself are on most intimate and friendly terms. The same remarks apply to the Mayor and Councillors of the Borough of Temuka, and the citizens of Temuka are much pleased over the removal of the pound from the police reserve. It was a very great eyesore to the citizens, and was situated close to their domain gates. I can assure Sergeant Warring that I have the respect and confidence of all law-abiding and right-minded persons in the Temuka Police District. There are certainly a few rogues and evil-doers in Temuka who would like to see a more pliable constable here, but those persons are only a very few, and they are unworthy of notice except to know and pity them. I will certainly keep the remarks of the Minister for Justice in mind, and will in the future be extremely careful in my mode of hotel inspection.—CONSTABLE No. 192.—Sergeant Warring, in charge of Police, Timaru."

20. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish me to deduce from that? The matter has been dealt with by the Minister. Do you wish me to understand that the Minister has been influenced by Mr. Twomey?—I should call that political influence.

21. I see no evidence of it. The Minister, in the exercise of his discretion as political head of the Department, has dealt with the matter?—I think there should be some regulation under which a matter like that should be sent to the Stipendiary Magistrate for full inquiry.

22. There was some regulation to that effect, but I believe it is a dead-letter?—That is my reason for submitting these papers. I should like to say that during my period of service under the present officers I have no fault to find with them. I have always had justice and fairness from them.

23. Then, you have no fault to find?—No; but they are endeavouring to carry out a system that is unworkable.

24. How do you propose to improve it?—I would suggest that there should be an Appeal Board to deal with all complaints of a serious nature against constables.

25. It would affect the discipline of the Force. You have now the political head, the Commissioner, and the Inspectors, who ought to be capable of governing the Force. You consider you have suffered injustice, and you apply it to the general administration of the Force?—It is the fault of the system.

26. What is the good of my going into your complaint? The position is passed; you are past the age for promotion?—I am not looking for it, but it would show the injustice that has been done me.

27. But how is it going to be remedied?—The Government can remedy all injustice.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were asked some years ago whether you would accept promotion to the rank of sergeant?—You asked me yourself, and I asked you not to make me a sergeant.

29. *The Commissioner.*] I do not quite understand what your grievance is. Mr. Dinnie was apparently prepared to make good what had not been done in the past?—I would not put my case again in the hands of the Department, because I thought any application would meet the same treatment as on the first occasion.

30. But if you had been made a sergeant, would it not have wiped off anything said about your unfitness in the past?—I do not think so.

31. I presume Mr. Dinnie was prepared to recommend you for promotion?—That may be said, but the Minister in power might not have done it.

JOHN JOSEPH WEATHERED, Constable and Police Gaoler, examined on oath. (No. 60.)

Witness: I am stationed at Timaru, as gaoler. I have no prisoners at present. I do clerical work in the Police Department. I desire to read the following statement: "I beg to report for your information that I had no intention of making any suggestions or giving evidence before the

Commission until I read the report in the *Otago Daily Times* in which you express a desire 'that every man might regard himself as a sort of Sub-commissioner, and thus help you'; and it is in consequence of the foregoing that I make the following statement. To build up and maintain an efficient Police Force is, I believe, in some measure like the building of a permanent structure—to be a success you must commence at the foundation, with the best available material, and follow up that principle in all additions thereafter; and to obtain good material you must pay a fair and reasonable price. If good, bad, and indifferent material be mixed, defects will soon be obvious, with unsatisfactory results, and it is so with the New Zealand Police Force at the present time. The recruiting has been carried out from candidates whose qualifications are good, bad, and indifferent. Fortunately for the Government, a large number of candidates of good material have been enrolled at what I may describe as bargain prices—too low pay; while others are but poor value, and some dear at any price. It is an easy matter finding fault and pointing out defects, and, as you will have enough and to spare of this from others coming before you to give evidence, I shall, to some extent, refrain from so doing, and proceed to make some suggestions for the betterment of the Force as follows: Pay of constables to commence at 8s. per day, and advance to 10s. by increments of 6d. per day every four years. Pay of all other ranks to remain as at present. Candidates of a good class are attracted by the pay of constables; with reasonable pay at the commencement and the certainty of regular rises of pay for length of service and good conduct, and not influenced by the pay of Inspectors and detectives, who are nevertheless entitled to good pay. Constables of over twenty years' service, and not promoted to the rank of Sergeant, should be raised to a special rank—viz., that of senior constable, provided their conduct has been good and their duties satisfactorily discharged. The methods adopted, or, rather, the want of method, for promotion to the rank of sergeant has caused much dissatisfaction; and I cannot understand why, in the interests of fair play, a man is overlooked, year after year, while his juniors are promoted; and then he is promoted, and for the remainder of his service he suffers by these juniors in length of service taking a senior place for further promotion. If a constable has been overlooked for years (or for any period), and then promoted, it creates a suspicion in the minds of the whole Force that the Commissioner has been unduly influenced either at the time the constable has been overlooked or at the later period when he was promoted. I think the recommendations of Inspectors in charge of districts should have great influence with the Commissioner when electing constables for promotion; then he (the Commissioner) would have all the recommendations in front of him, and judge each man on his merits and length of service. I think eighteen years' service would be fair and just to all concerned if named as a minimum for constables eligible for promotion (not ten years, as at present), unless in cases of merit in the detection of offenders charged with serious crime, but not the merit of being a good storekeeper. The sharp line of demarcation of constables over fifty years of age being debarred from promotion is detrimental to the best interests of the Force, as there are many men at the age of fifty-five physically superior to others of forty-five years of age. I say this most disinterestedly, as I am not seeking promotion. I believe in the members of the uniform branch of the Force being granted a free supply of material for uniform, as at present, with the addition of a refund of the actual cost of making up on production of the necessary receipts for payment. I disagree entirely with the suggestion of free boots. The case of prison officers is different: they are on the spot where the boots are made by the prisoners, and have an advantage of being measured, whereas the police would likely be supplied with stock boots of a given size (according to order) from the Wellington store; and there are many members who have their boots made to measure and would not wear the ready-made-up boots even as a gift. In any case, I deem the request paltry, and do not give it my support. I suggest to pay the constables a reasonable salary, and let every man buy his own boots (although Gaoler here for over eighteen years, I have never applied for a free issue of boots). I consider there should be no difference in the amount of house-allowance allowed to constables and that given to sergeants and detectives. A constable has often a larger family than the sergeant or detective, and it is equally desirable and necessary that he should live in a respectable locality. The present scale of travelling-allowance is sufficiently liberal, except that which applies to men travelling by boat on transfer. I think saloon fare should be allowed by boat, as travelling by steerage is very uncomfortable, and I believe in most cases constables pay extra and travel saloon. The suggestion of a constable in Dunedin that constables or sergeants should travel first-class by train is so absurd that it requires little notice. I characterize the request as a piece of impudence, and I feel ashamed of it. I have no desire when travelling by train to enter a first-class carriage and obtrude my presence on a Judge of the Supreme Court, Stipendiary Magistrate, barristers, or others of high social standing, but feel it more in keeping with my walk in life to travel with those more on my social level. I have much admiration for Chief Detective Herbert in the matter of his ability as a detective officer; however, following the principle 'Honour to whom honour is due,' I am bound to disagree with his criticism of the finger-print branch. I hope I may be given credit, without any suspicion of egotism on my part, to speak with some authority on the excellent results of the finger-print system in New Zealand. I have been taking finger-prints of prisoners in Timaru Gaol since the system was inaugurated in New Zealand, and I can testify to numerous instances of old criminal offenders being quickly identified as soon as their finger-prints were forwarded to Wellington office, and this, in most cases, when the local detective—a very capable man—had no idea of the offenders' identity. Since the finger-print branch has been in charge of the present experts (Mr. Dinnie, jun., and Detective Quartermain) I notice a marked improvement in its results, and I have no hesitation in expressing my utmost confidence in the ability of these officers, and consider the finger-print branch a most valuable adjunct to the detective department, and well worth the money necessary for its maintenance. The publicity given to the success of finger-prints in various cases has done no harm, and the officers of this branch should not be held responsible for expert offenders having the intelligence to wear gloves; and even if this publicity had put some

on their guard, that same publicity had a deterrent effect on others. My correspondence with the officers of the finger-print branch has been strictly official, and I am not putting forth my opinions through friendship, but rather in the interests of fair play, with the view to assist the Commission arriving at a proper conclusion, since the subject has been thought worthy of criticism by Chief Detective Herbert, and apparently taken by the Commission as a matter for consideration. If the finger-print system had existed in New Zealand when Moses, ex-constable, was originally convicted of housebreaking, he could not have obtained admission to the New Zealand Police Force. Members of the Royal Irish Constabulary are granted thirty days' annual leave of absence by the County Inspector, and the District Inspector has authority to grant four days' quarterly leave, besides which station sergeants can grant a few hours at any time when it is believed to be required for legitimate purposes, such as attending entertainments, public or private. I think a request for fifteen days' annual leave, to be cumulative for three years, is not asking too much for the New Zealand Force; and in this matter the Minister of Railways might, with good cause, be asked to grant tickets to members of the Police Force travelling by train at half ordinary fare—viz., return tickets at single fares. It would be an easy matter for the Police Department to have printed certificates to be handed to the Railway Department when a police concession ticket is issued, and thus insure that such tickets are legitimately obtained for members of the Force on leave of absence only. The foregoing concession in railway fares is no more than that granted to the public at frequent intervals when, as a rule, the police cannot be spared from duty to any appreciable extent. My views are that the police, as servants of the State, who cannot obtain holidays at will, have a reasonable claim to the concession I name, but have no more right to a free pass on the railways on leave than has any member of the public. I do not agree with the suggestion of Inspector O'Brien that Inspectors should be empowered to enrol candidates locally for their respective districts; such action would be a retrograde step towards the days of provincialism. It is in the best interests of the Force and the public that a constable should perform his duties after appointment, for a time at least, in a district where he has no relatives or former companions of his civilian career. I consider the present standard of physique sufficient in measurement for candidates for the Force. If raised it would exclude many who would be excellent constables. The present education test is not too high. If sufficient pay is given, candidates with good education (or at least those who have passed the Fifth Standard) can readily be obtained. In the words of Commissioner Dinnie, 'Ignorance is an insuperable bar to promotion.' Ignorance should be a similar bar to appointment in the Force, and I feel confident that to a man in your position it will be obvious that it is greatly in the interests of justice that a constable should have a reasonable education; it may sometimes mean life or liberty to a prisoner how a statement of his is taken down by a member of the Force, even to the proper placing of a word in a sentence, or the leaving out of a word. In the interests of discipline, good moral conduct, and general welfare of members of the Force stationed in barracks, I think it highly desirable that reasonable restrictions should exist, and be carried into effect, in the matter of being indoors at a fixed time at night; and if any man wants to be out later he should give a reason; and I am sure the good sense of the station sergeant to see that no hardships were inflicted would be the result. I think the hours at present in force should not be extended except under special circumstances. To be physically fit for doing good work while on duty men should have (and in some cases be made to take) reasonable rest when off duty. In reference to Circular 17/06 (*vide Police Gazette* of 31st October, 1906), I made a report to Commissioner Dinnie expressing my pleasure at the rises of pay to the various ranks above that of constable, and regret that no consideration in the matter of rise of pay was given to constables, and asking his favourable consideration to my application that all constables having over twenty years' service might have a rise of pay. I respectfully ask that you call for that report of mine, which I presume is filed in the Commissioner's office (dated November, I think), and see for yourself the answer I received. Being mindful of 'the boy and the nuts,' I asked in that application and report only half of what I thought should be readily given even without application. In conclusion, I wish to state that I gave evidence before the Commission of inquiry in Mr. Tunbridge's time (*vide blue-book*, pages 520–23, and page 525). If you have time I shall be glad if you will read my evidence there, as I believe I was a marked man thereafter as a result of my truth and candour in evidence, much of which was not published. Nevertheless, I have the utmost confidence in the present Minister of Justice, and his desire to put the Force on a proper basis; further, that if any man can elucidate the cause of dissatisfaction, at present and in the past, existing in the Force, it will, with all earnestness, be done by you; and it is largely on this account that I take the trouble to place my views in writing before you. And, lastly, I am satisfied that the present Commissioner, Mr. Dinnie, has performed his duty to the best of his ability. What that ability is, or whether it is sufficient for the proper administration of his important office, I trust may be manifest at the close of the evidence given before you." I joined the Force in 1883, and after ten months was selected to take charge of a sub-district, and was there for six years and nine months, giving satisfaction except in one instance, when I was fined 10s. by Inspector Bullen. That is the only mark on my sheet. I went to Christchurch for nine months; was transferred to Timaru, where I have been Gaoler for 18½ years. I am 52½ years old. I was for seven and a half years in the Royal Irish Constabulary. During the time I have been here I have had 3,500 prisoners to lock up, and never had a return sent back for correction. There have been over 4,000 arrests, 500 of which were between 9 in the evening and 6 in the morning. I have had 2,246 prisoners received on remand for trial and under sentence; included in this number were 812 suffering from delirium tremens, forty-four male lunatics, and six females; and during all this time there was only one case of death, and he was in a state of collapse when brought in, and never left the cell.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you ever apply for promotion?—About five years ago. I recognised I was under a disadvantage in being unknown to the Commissioner, and also personally to Inspector Gillies, and thought it desirable to state a little of my history, and the fact that I had

never, except in the one instance, been reported for any offence. The indorsement of the constable in charge of the papers was, "Constable is sober, intelligent, and capable, and thoroughly understands his duties." Inspector Gillies said, "I have very little knowledge of the constable, owing to the short time I have been in the district, and his not being directly under my observation." This went to the Commissioner, and he indorsed it: "This application will receive due consideration." I was satisfied for the time being, but very soon afterwards I saw that a man who was a year and nine months junior was going to be promoted before me—Constable Mullany—and I was right in my anticipations about him.

2. Why did you anticipate that?—An officer then in the Force told me that unless I had strong influence I would never be promoted. He is not alive now, or I would not say this for fear of injuring him

3. Have you had any instance yourself of that?—Not in connection with promotion, but I have had strong circumstantial evidence of undue interference to the detriment of one man and the advantage of another. Mullany never passed the examination, and he was made a sergeant. I passed the examination in 1890, and took ninth place, with 136 marks, out of thirty-four successful candidates, and no doubt a larger number did not pass. I am referring to the second examination, not the first, which I did not go in for, as I thought it would be no advantage. In the first examination Norwood passed, and took 117 marks in a paper simply in regard to Police Regulations; in the matter of law I took 78 per cent. Then Sergeant King in the same list took 111 marks. This shows that I was possessed of some relative intelligence. In applying for promotion I quoted this list, and expected I should be favourably considered by Mr. Dinnie. When I was overlooked I felt so disappointed that I made application to withdraw my application for promotion, as since that I would not have applied except under certain considerations. I interviewed Mr. Dinnie, and said if I were offered promotion as junior sergeant where there were two I did not want to go out into the street, but would take it in the position I hold. I want you to call for the file, and see why my name is on the black books.

The Commissioner: I will call for the file.

Witness: I cannot understand why Mullany, with no brilliant record, should have been promoted over my head. Then, in regard to Sergeant Muggeridge, it is not claimed that he did anything particular, and I want you to compare his record with mine, and see whether the position I am in is not equally responsible to that of Muggeridge, considering I have kept all these prisoners without putting the Government to expense in the matter of any escapes and the serious responsibility of being in charge of persons charged with murder and other serious offences. As to keeping books, I am prepared to undergo a competitive examination with any district clerk. In regard to influence, I know a case where there is strong circumstantial evidence of political influence being used. Four years ago a sergeant told me in confidence that Mr. Dinnie wrote a memo. to Inspector Gillies saying that if Constable Findlay wanted Palmerston he should apply for it in the proper channel. Findlay reported that he did not apply for Palmerston, but his wife was in such a state of health that she thought a change would do her good. It was a remarkable occurrence that shortly afterwards Constable Hillyard—a most intelligent man—was sent up in Findlay's place, and the latter—a most illiterate man—was sent to this important station. There must surely be something in the file to show under what circumstances this man went to Palmerston, and the intelligent man went to the other place, where his intelligence could be of no advantage in the service. I made application to Mr. Dinnie, and he replied, "This application will receive due consideration"; but this is the part I take exception to: "I wish it to be understood that I don't wish any old or broken-down men to remain in the service; I had rather they would retire." I think he was going out of his way in saying that.

The Commissioner: I will call for the papers, and look into them.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You applied to Mr. Tunbridge for promotion, did you not?—No.

5. He did not consider you eligible, or he would have given it you?—I did not expect it. I think he would have done a great injustice to other men in the Force if he had done so.

6. But if he considered you eligible for promotion, would he not have considered you the same as the others?—I was not entitled to it in his time.

7. Were any junior to you promoted in his time?—Yes, but very few.

8. Was there any question in regard to your promotion as to whether you would go on street duty?—It was an unconditional application I made.

9. Was there not some question of going on the street?—No.

10. About your fitness to go on the street?—No.

11. You have not had good health?—As good as many who have been promoted, although I do not put myself forward as a robust man.

12. You say greater notice should be taken of you by your superior officers?—I do.

13. How do you know notice is not taken?—When I made the application I said I was under the disadvantage of not being actually under my Inspector for some years, and I would be obliged if he thought me fit if he would recommend me, and he promised to do so.

14. *The Commissioner.*] Were you physically fit at this time?—I was, in my own opinion.

15. As regards influence, how many cases do you know of?—I have mentioned the only case.

16. You do not know from your own knowledge?—No, only circumstantial evidence.

PATRICK BOWMAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 61.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Timaru. Was enrolled on the 20th November, 1878, and was promoted to be sergeant in January, 1898. I was in charge as sergeant at Clyde for three years, and was then transferred to Lawrence.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Why were you transferred?—I applied for a transfer, as I wanted to get away further north, but was transferred to Lawrence. When I had been there for three years I again applied for a transfer, and was sent to Timaru.

2. Have you any general statement to make?—I have no grievance. With regard to political influence, I only want to say that it was not half as rampant before the year 1887, when the franchise was given to the police, as it is now.

3. Are you in a position to give any instances of political influence being brought to bear?—It is much talked of now, but there are no special cases that a man dare give.

4. Do you think men go to members of Parliament?—I think it is done indirectly. They get their wives or some one else to interview a member, and the member may go to the Minister. I am not in favour of the suggestion that the detectives should have the right of promotion to the uniform branch. There are five Chief Detectives in New Zealand at the present moment, and they have far more opportunities of going round and pulling the wires than have the uniform men, who have to stick to their regular round. The detective goes much more amongst the people, and has better chances of using influence. If the uniform man sees these men being put in front of him he has no hope of promotion, and he is likely to lose all ambition.

5. That is assuming political influence is used. But putting that to one side, would you say that a Chief Detective should not have the right to promotion if he is suitable in every respect?—I think he might be made a Detective Inspector, or something of that sort, but I do not think he ought to enter the uniform branch.

6. Do you think a Chief Detective is not qualified for the position of Sub-Inspector?—I think he should have to do some uniform work before he gets it. I notice that it has been said by one Inspector down south that the standard of education for entry into the Force is too high. I think it should be higher, and that the pay also should be higher. An ignorant policeman is not a safe man.

7. I admit an educated constable or an educated sergeant is all the better for his education, but assuming there is a falling-off in the numbers of men available for recruits, how are you going to remedy that?—I would make the pay higher.

8. Do you know what proportion of boys pass the Fifth Standard before they leave school?—I should think there was a very large proportion at the present day.

9. Have you noticed any difference in the physique of the men joining the Force in recent years?—As compared with the time I joined, they are not so tall or so well built, nor have they the appearance they used to have.

10. They have still to pass the physical test?—I do not think the test would stand in Mr. Weldon's time. I refer to the men we used to see a good many years ago in Dunedin.

11. To what do you attribute that falling-off?—I think it is because there are other avenues of employment now, and that better inducements are offered to the good men elsewhere.

12. Why should the weedy men go into the Force?—Perhaps because they cannot get anything else to do.

13. What have you to say as regards the general conduct and sobriety of the men?—In Timaru they are all steady, sober, and intelligent men, and they do their duty well.

14. Do you know of any discontent in the Force with regard to promotion?—There is none that I know of.

15. But you still hold to your opinion that there is political influence at work?—I think there is, owing to the police and their wives and relatives having votes.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Can you tell me one instance of political influence being used?—As I have said already, I cannot give an instance.

17. Can you tell me of any one who knows of such a case?—No.

18. Do you not think, if it were so rife, you would have heard of something definite?—No; people take care there will be nothing definite.

19. It seems to be the general belief that it is used, but we have tried all along to find a case in which it has been used, but we have been unable to do so?—Of course, if we have your word that it is not so, we accept it.

20. I am glad to hear that there is someone who will accept my word. You think the physique of the applicants is not so high as it was in years past?—Of course, we had a splendid class of men in Dunedin in the old days.

21. You have not much trouble here?—I think we have a superior class of men in Timaru.

22. If I tell you that a batch or two we had three or four months ago were all over 6 ft. high, and chest measurement accordingly?—I am pleased to hear it; but some of the towns do not show that class of men.

23. Have you heard anything about a "useful" man being stationed in each district by me to report everything that is going on?—No.

24. If this was the general belief from the extreme north to the extreme south you surely would have heard of it?—Very likely I would, but I do not think it is true.

25. Do you know anything about inquiry into the qualifications and character of candidates for enrolment?—I have had papers passing through my hands.

26. Is the inquiry strict?—Yes, very strict. If a man wanted to become a clergyman he could not have stricter inquiries made into his character.

27. Has it been more strict since I came here?—I think so.

HENRY GREEN, Sub-Inspector, further examined. (No. 62.)

Witness. I am in charge of the South Canterbury sub-district. I joined the Force in 1874, and was promoted to sergeant, I think, in 1886. Have never been a station sergeant, as I was appointed before that rank had been inaugurated. Was appointed Sub-Inspector in September, 1901.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make touching matters for inquiry by this Commission?—My idea is that there should be some sort of Board or Council before which the men could ventilate their grievances.

2. Do you mean a Board of Appeal similar to that existing now in connection with the Railways and the Post and Telegraph Department, because, as you know, there is still the Ministerial veto?—There are many occasions when the men are not satisfied with the decision of the Commissioner or the Minister, and I think there should be a Board before which the men could have their grievances discussed apart from the Commissioner or the Minister.

3. You must give them a legal status, otherwise they would not have power to administer the oath?—I should not go so far as that.

4. How would you have the Board constituted, and who would you have as president?—I would let them elect their own president.

5. You would have no nominated representative upon it at all. Do you not think that the Government, who would have the greatest interest in the deliberations of the Board, should have some representative upon it?—My idea is that the grievances of the constables and others should go before the Board, and that the Board, after considering them, should pass them on through the Commissioner to the Minister, with their recommendations. The men feel now that in many cases their grievances do not reach the Minister.

6. It would be reviewing the action of the Commissioner?—Yes.

7. But if the Minister had the power of veto, what effect would that have?—I think it would do away with a principal cause of grievance the men have or consider they have.

8. The matter will be considered, but I must say at once I do not favour the constitution of a Board on which the Government is not represented. Have you anything to say as regards any other subject within the scope of the Commission?—I think, when a man is transferred from one station to another, the officer in charge of the district to which a man is sent should be given some information as to the man's character and disposition, as well as a copy of his defaulter's list. At present a man may be sent to me about whom I know absolutely nothing, and I cannot find out without asking the Inspector. On the question of promotion, I am of the same opinion as most of those who have given evidence already. Recently I have been passed over by a junior officer, and perhaps without due consideration.

9. Who is the officer?—Inspector Dwyer. I am the senior Sub-Inspector. I have had no reprimand nor anything recorded against me, nor any intimation that I was to be debarred from further promotion, but I have been passed over.

10. Would you contend that in all cases seniority should hold as regards promotions?—I think mine is the only instance in which it has not been recognised in the senior ranks of the service.

10A. Might there not have been special circumstances?—I am quite willing to concede special circumstances, but what they were I do not know. I was in Dunedin for three years, and, of course, there was some trouble there. There are now, I think, four men in Dunedin to do the duty I had to do there for three years.

11. It was lack of control over the uniform force that led to the trouble there?—That may be a matter of opinion. I think, sir, you reported that it was practically impossible to supervise the Force there. When I heard that promotion was about to take place I brought the matter under the notice of the Commissioner, and, as I found out afterwards, the Inspector strongly backed up my application. In the Commissioner's office it was simply noted "File." I think it should have gone to the Minister. I think it is dated 19th August of last year.

12. I will call for the file. What have you to say about the physique of the men at the present day?—I think some of them are scarcely up to the standard that should obtain, although I do not think there is any all round falling-off.

13. They have all to pass certain tests, have they not?—I think there must be some concessions somewhere. There is one man here who I think must be below the standard. I think he has been about twelve months in the Force. As regards promotions from the detective force to the uniform branch, my idea is that they should have an equal chance with the uniform men so long as the detectives promoted are not out of proportion to their numbers.

14. Do you know anything about political interference?—I think there is political influence to a certain extent, but I do not know how far it affects promotions and so on. Probably it gets credit for a great deal more than it deserves.

15. What have you to say as to the conduct of the men generally?—The men I have come in contact with of late years are fairly sober and steady.

16. How would you deal with cases of insobriety?—I think a second offence should entail dismissal, unless perhaps there is a very considerable lapse of time between the offences.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Would you not take into consideration a man's length of service? If, say, a man had served fifteen or twenty years at the time of his first offence, and he commits a second offence within a few months?—Yes, I should take his length of service into consideration.

18. Suppose the second offence was within a few weeks of the first?—I should be very doubtful as to what I should do. I would not make a hard-and-fast rule that if a man was drunk twice he should go.

19. And if he was drunk three times?—I should have no doubt about it.

20. As regards the defaulters' sheets of the men who are sent to your district, you can have them if you apply for them?—Yes. I think some information as to character and disposition of a man should be given to me when he comes, perhaps not his defaulter's sheet.

21. You have suggested that an Appeal Board should be constituted to consider any grievances the men may have?—Something of that kind.

22. Do you not think the Commissioner or some independent party should be on that Board?—I do not think so. The Board would be practically reviewing the Commissioner's decision; but any recommendation the Board made would go through your hands to the Minister.

23. You do not yourself know of any cases in which political influence has been used?—No, and I have never heard of any definite case, but I think it is recognised throughout the Department that there is such a thing in existence.

24. You know that the Minister has already addressed the men in Dunedin on the evils of political influence, and that he endeavoured to dissuade them from any attempts to use it?—I take it he did that because he thought it was necessary to do so.

25. No one disputes for a moment that men try to use it, but has it any effect upon promotions?—As I have said, it probably gets credit for a great deal more than it deserves.

26. How old are you?—I am just sixty.

27. What is your retiring-age?—The compulsory retiring-age is sixty-five.

28. What is your opinion with regard to age being a consideration in promotion?—I think it should be against promotion; but if there had been a hard-and-fast rule to that effect I should not have said a word about my case. The man promoted was only two or three years my junior, and I know of a man older than I am who was promoted recently.

29. What is the difference between your age and that of Inspector Black?—I could not say.

30. But Inspector Dwyer is a much younger man than yourself?—I think he is fifty-six or fifty-seven.

Inspector Gillies: He is fifty-two. According to the papers, he was born in 1857.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you heard anything about this “useful” man who is reported to be in every district from the north to the south?—I have never heard anything about it.

32. *Inspector Gillies.*] How long have you been in charge at Timaru?—Three and a half years.

33. During that time have you ever asked for any man’s defaulter-sheet from me?—No.

34. Have you any reason to believe that you would not get it if you asked?—No.

This concluded the Timaru evidence.

CHRISTCHURCH, TUESDAY, 27TH JULY, 1909.

The Commissioner: Mr. Laurenson, certain reference was made to you during the course of the evidence taken at Invercargill by a constable who was at one time a detective at Lyttelton, and I instructed the Secretary to give you notice of the main heads of the statement, so as to enable you, if you so desired, to meet the allegations made. The allegations come properly within the scope of the Commission, because I think they can fairly be held to be *à propos* to the paragraph of the order of reference in regard to political or other interference. Therefore, it is only having regard to your official position as a member of Parliament that you are imported into the matter, because if the statements made were correct it would certainly lead to the inference that political interference had been used. It is for you to deal with the matter as you think proper. The constable has been brought from Invercargill, and you can examine him.

Mr. Laurenson: I am much indebted to your Worship. Mr. Dougall has been instructed to appear for me.

JOHN CONNELL, Constable, further examined. (No. 63.)

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] I understand you made a statement that about two months before the election of 1905 Mr. Laurenson approached you with reference to pilfering that was going on at Lyttelton?—I would not be sure that it was two months, but it was some time before the election.

2. Do you remember when the complaints were made about you?—Yes.

3. Can you locate the time by those complaints?—It was a good while after the complaints.

4. Are you quite sure?—I am quite certain. I have not any doubt about it.

5. Yet it was before the general election of 1905?—I think it was some time before.

6. And after all the complaints?—Yes.

7. Will you repeat now what you allege Mr. Laurenson said in your office?—He came into my office, and was going to use the telephone, and he said to me, “Hullo! Connell, old man; how are you getting on?” I said, “All right.” He said, “How are you getting on with those rascals down the wharf?” I said, “You ought to know.” “Well,” he said, “I suppose you have heard about me seeing Mr. Dinnie; but bear in mind that when I saw Mr. Dinnie in reference to you I told him the character of the men on whose behalf I was complaining. I did not misrepresent you in any way to Mr. Dinnie.”

8. He said he had seen Mr. Dinnie, and spoken to him about you?—Yes.

9. Was it in the nature of a complaint that he spoke to Mr. Dinnie?—Yes; but he said that in making the complaint he represented the character of the men who were making it.

10. Was this prior to the written complaints?—The complaints were then all over.

11. Was this interview with Mr. Dinnie before the election of 1905?—A good while, I should say.

12. You are not mixing up your dates at all?—I do not think so; but the files will show. It was a good while after the complaints.

13. And before the election of 1905?—I think so.

14. When did you leave Lyttelton?—I think, in March, 1906.

15. The election was in the previous December?—I suppose so.

16. When you gave evidence before you used these words as having been said by Mr. Laurenson: “Before you got amongst them [the wharf labourers] they could furnish their houses and get boots and clothes from the ships, and a great many are leaving”: do you repeat that?—He said before I was appointed some could furnish their houses and get boots for their children—not clothes; and I said, “How do you come to make complaints about a man who has tried to do his duty?” That was when he said he did not misrepresent me to Mr. Dinnie.

17. I want you to be quite clear as to what you allege Mr. Laurenson did say?—He did not say “all the men.” The papers seem to make a great deal of what I did say. I lived eleven years amongst the wharf lumpers at Lyttelton, some six or seven hundred, and they are as decent men

as are to be found in the Dominion. I do not mean to say either Mr. Laurenson or I tried to make out that they were all pillagers. But he did say, "I dare say there are some bad rascals amongst them, and they no doubt furnish their houses and find boots for their children." He went on to say he thought it pitiable to see the number of them hanging round and drinking beer, and some of them only working two or three days a week.

The Commissioner: There can be no doubt about what the constable said, for when he made the reference to Mr. Laurenson I appreciated at once the seriousness of it and I pulled him up, and pointed out to him that he had better seriously consider the effect of what he was saying—that it was tantamount to accusing a member of Parliament of being privy to theft. My reason for referring to this, Mr. Dougall, is that you are asking him whether he is not departing from the words he used. I wish to emphasize the point that there is no doubt whatever as to what he said and intended to say, because I gave him an opportunity in the most explicit way of withdrawing from the position he was taking up; and where that is done I cannot entertain any evidence in regard to the difference between what he said then and what he is prepared to say now.

18. *Mr. Dougall.*] Am I right in gathering from what you say that Mr. Laurenson did not make such an emphatic statement as we were led to believe?—According to the papers, it read as if I said—

19. *The Commissioner.*] Never mind what appeared in the papers?—I am giving exactly what took place. I am trying to repeat the conversation.

20. *Mr. Dougall.*] Am I right in inferring that Mr. Laurenson did not make such an emphatic statement as you previously said in Invercargill?—I did say boots—not clothes; some of them.

21. You qualify it by saying "some of them"?—Yes.

22. And what about a great many of them leaving?—Some of them were leaving, and have left since.

23. Since when?—That particular time. This was a private conversation with Mr. Laurenson. I did not wish to attach great importance to it, because it was only in private conversation.

24. *The Commissioner.*] But you brought it in yourself; nobody knew anything about it except you; you voluntarily tendered the evidence?—It is true. After speaking to me he rang up Mr. Taylor's house. I do not think Mr. Taylor was in, and I heard him make arrangements as to meeting Mr. Taylor. I remarked then that I did not think Mr. Taylor would have done such an action as Mr. Laurenson did.

25. *Mr. Dougall.*] What did you mean by that?—I did not think he would go and complain, seeing Mr. Laurenson was so friendly, and wanted me to take an out-station rather than have to meet these fellows at 12 o'clock at night—that it would be much better at an out-station such as Little River; and he mentioned one man in particular—I do not know whether he said he got him transferred—who was better off then.

26. *The Commissioner.*] In what connection did he mention that?—He said, "Look at So-and-so that used to be here, and is now at an out-station."

27. *Mr. Dougall.*] Did you infer that Mr. Laurenson had him promoted or transferred?—That he had him promoted, because he referred to the person he married.

28. To get him out of the way?—Oh, no.

29. No inference of that sort?—Not at all.

30. What is the connection between this and your suggestion that Mr. Laurenson wanted you to stop investigating thefts, practically?—He said I would be much better out of it. But he had previously tried to get me out of it in another way—by other means.

31. How?—By going to the Minister and Mr. Dinnie.

32. How do you know?—From his letters, because I had to explain them.

33. Inquiries were held as the result of the letters?—Yes.

34. What was the result?—I came out of it all right.

35. You say these inquiries were all antecedent to these complaints you talk about?—Yes.

36. How long before you left Lyttelton were these inquiries held? These inquiries in connection with Campbell and Wood and Bowman—were they not two or three months before you left?—Bowman came to me on the Lyttelton platform, and told me I could go to—somewhere, and that he was going up to Laurenson to fix me up.

37. Was there any inquiry as the result?—There was.

38. You came out with flying colours?—I could not do otherwise; the thing was absurd.

39. As a matter of fact, you were promoted after you left Lyttelton?—Yes.

40. It was only after you had been in Christchurch some time that any question arose regarding your conduct?—I do not know.

41. You were disrated again after you came to Christchurch?—No.

42. Where, then?—In Dunedin.

43. You were sent to Dunedin as what?—As detective.

44. There were complaints about you in Christchurch?—Very trifling ones.

45. Still, there were complaints?—You can always find complaints.

46. In Dunedin you were disrated?—Yes, for meeting with an accident.

47. The suggestion was that the accident was the result of incapacity?—There was no proof.

48. But they disrated you?—Without any inquiry whatever.

The Commissioner: It was not altogether on the ground of the accident; it was on account of general inefficiency as detective. The accident may have been the immediate cause that led up to the general question of fitness, but it was only an incident.

49. *Mr. Dougall.*] To come back to the conversation with Mr. Laurenson, you say Mr. Laurenson said a great many wharf labourers were leaving?—He said many, or some of them.

50. You are modifying every word of this original statement of yours?—I am trying to tell the truth as near as possible.

51. Let us get at exactly what Mr. Laurenson did say?—I have told you.

52. Tell us again?—He said, "How are you getting on with those rascals?"—I think that was the word—"down at the wharf"? or something to that effect. He said exactly what I stated.

53. *The Commissioner.*] Repeat his words?—He said, "Before you went amongst them they could furnish their houses and find their youngsters in boots, and I dare say there are not many of those now," or something to that effect; I am not sure of the exact words.

54. *Mr. Dougall.*] You inferred from what he said that the men had left Lyttelton?—That some of them had.

55. And what inference did you draw? What was the object of Mr. Laurenson in saying that?—I do not know at all.

56. It was not with the idea of getting you to mitigate your investigations into these matters?—I do not suppose so. I could not say.

57. Did he come into your room and make that remark in a casual manner, without any reason?—He came in to use the telephone, but before doing so spoke to me.

58. In a purely casual sort of manner?—Yes.

59. If what you now say is correct, were you justified in making the statement you did in Invercargill?—What I said was true.

60. You know what was inferred?—I simply repeated the exact truth—I did not concoct anything.

61. You said you were a marked man as the result of Mr. Laurenson's complaint?—If a man like Mr. Laurenson makes complaints about you it does not do you any good.

62. But that is not what you said. Did you or did you not say that as the result of Mr. Laurenson's complaints you were a marked man?—I took it at that.

63. Subsequently to these complaints and to this conversation and subsequently to all your work in Lyttelton you were promoted in Christchurch?—Yes.

64. Did Mr. Laurenson have anything to do with your subsequent reduction?—I do not say that.

65. Was Mr. Laurenson the only one in Lyttelton who complained about you?—Yes; the only person of any note. He did not complain himself. We have always been on friendly terms. He forwarded complaints on behalf of others. But I did not think it just to me for him to go to Wellington with a complaint without first of all consulting the officer in charge of the district, and letting him inquire into it.

66. Did you repeat this conversation you had to any one, or talk about it to any one?—I do not know that I did. I do not think I ever spoke to any one about what Mr. Laurenson did. I have never given it publicity. I never told a member of Parliament about it. I never tried to do him any harm, although he tried to do me injury.

67. Did Mr. Laurenson complain at all about your prosecuting the wharf labourers?—What he said was, "I wish you would let me get you this out-station; you would be much better off; you would get more money, and these rascals would not be bothered with you." He said, "There was never anybody here in this capacity before you, and I suppose that is the reason they do not like you."

68. Had you been prosecuting any of these men about this time?—Not the ones he complained for.

69. I think there had not been a prosecution for two years prior to this?—I do not know.

70. I have a record here which shows that from 1900 to 1906 only four men who could possibly come within the definition of wharf-labourers were charged with petty theft, and during the two years preceding your conversation there was not a charge of theft against any one. How was it that Mr. Laurenson came to talk about this, seeing that there had been no charges for two years?—He said the reason was that the men did not like to be looked upon with suspicion when they were going home at night.

71. You said in your previous evidence something about a lot of lumpers passing through your hands: as a matter of fact, no lumpers had been through your hands?—Some of them.

72. Can you give me any instances during the two years before you left?—I have not a record.

73. You made some reference to an incident with an air-gun that was the ultimate cause of your being shifted: did you pay for the gun?—No.

74. Did you break it?—No, I did not.

75. Did your daughter go over to Mrs. Roderick's house with a handful of money?—I could not say if she did.

76. Had Mr. Laurenson anything at all to do with the air-gun business?—No.

77. Have you ever at any time brought charges against any individual of a similar nature to this against Mr. Laurenson?—Not that I remember.

78. Did you make a charge against Father Salvatore before the Police Commission in 1897?—No; I was summoned in regard to a report I made about him.

79. You did not make a complaint similar to this in regard to interfering with your duty?—No; I had to make a report in connection with a disturbance at a hotel, and that came up before the Commission. That is what you are referring to.

80. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say Mr. Laurenson told you of a constable who was transferred from Lyttelton, and you inferred he had got him removed?—In this way: He said, "Look at So-and-so; is he not much better off than among these fellows at night?"

81. What did you infer?—He told me he got him away.

82. Will you give the constable's name?—Hastie. He is not a constable now.

83. Do you suggest he was the means of that man's promotion?—I do not.

84. But you inferred that he got him moved?—No. He said why did I not take an out-station? I said I could get a country station myself without his assistance.

85. Did you infer Mr. Laurenson was the cause of this man's transfer?—He was leading me to believe he wanted me to let him get me removed.

86. Did you believe it?—I did not.

87. The reason of your removal from Lyttelton was the matter with the air-gun?—Yes.

88. Nothing else?—That was the last.

89. Nothing Mr. Laurenson did?—I was continually having to explain in connection with letters he wrote to Wellington.

90. What was the cause of your being moved?—There was no cause, although I was moved.

91. Is not the cause on record in the file?—Yes; but I am sorry to say the record is not correct so far as I am concerned.

Mr. Dinnie: This is my minute: "I am not satisfied with acting-detective's action or reports in this matter. Unless he intended to prefer a charge against one of the boys he should not have taken possession of the gun at all, but seen that it was returned to its owner, and the boys and their parents should have been cautioned. The acting-detective also withheld the fact from me that he had, or his daughter had, paid for the damage done to the gun. He now denies knowledge of this, but fails to call his daughter to prove his statement. I cannot believe his daughter could pay for the gun without his knowledge and approval, and therefore strictly caution him for misleading me in this respect. As we have had so many complaints recently about this acting-detective I will arrange a change at Lyttelton."

The Commissioner: There you have it.

Witness: I want to say, in reference to this, that I had no idea that the gun was paid for.

92. *Mr. Dinnie.* How long were you in Christchurch after you got advancement?—Two or three years.

93. Your conduct was satisfactory?—Yes; I was advanced to the rank of detective.

94. What was the cause of your transfer from Christchurch?—I got reported over a trifling matter.

95. Was not this the cause: "The detective's excuse for failing to report himself is unsatisfactory. Detective Kennedy reported himself to the sergeant in charge. Why not Detective Connell, who seems to have wandered about and done nothing, and ignored the officer in charge? The making of a false entry in diary is proved by the detective's own statement that he left Christchurch about 10 a.m. for Lyttelton, whereas the entry in diary is 9 to 11 at office. That prompt attention was not given to the complaint of a burglary occurring at boardinghouse is obvious from the statements of the persons interviewed, and disobedience of orders in neglecting to attend the detective office at stated times is not satisfactorily explained by the detective. Altogether, the detective seems to have no energy for his work, and it is questionable if he should be retained in the detective branch. He is fined £1 on all charges, transferred to Dunedin, and a report is to be submitted in three months on his conduct and fitness for detective work"? That was why you were transferred to Dunedin?—Yes.

96. You had not been in Dunedin three months before you were in trouble again?—It was not my fault.

97. You were reported?—Yes.

98. For uselessness as a detective?—For being drunk, I believe.

99. That is not so: it was for being useless, and other complaints?—Very likely.

100. And reduced to constable?—Yes.

101. You have seen the files in respect to Mr. Laurenson's complaints?—Yes.

102. The complaints which he received from private individuals were simply sent by him?—Yes, in a particular way.

103. I will read the letters: "28/9/05.—To the Minister of Justice.—I have received the following letter from Mr. D. Campbell, of Lyttelton, in which he complains very bitterly about the conduct of a police constable in searching his house. I met Mr. Commissioner Dinnie yesterday, and mentioned to him that I had received this letter, and would send it on for inquiry to be made. I now do so, and will be pleased if the matter is carefully inquired into.—G. LAURENSEN." The reply was: "I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of 28th instant *re* complaint of Mr. Duncan Campbell against the police for searching his house at Lyttelton, and, in reply, to inform you that the matter will be carefully investigated, and result communicated to you.—J. MCGOWAN." A further letter on the same subject is dated the 10th October: "With further reference to your letter of the 28th ultimo, *re* complaint of Mr. Duncan Campbell against police for searching his house at Lyttelton, and insulting his wife, I have the honour to inform you that, as a result of inquiry, it appears that a search-warrant was obtained on information given by a respectable inhabitant of Lyttelton concerning a larceny of clothing, and two constables executed the warrant. They both strenuously deny using any insulting language to Mrs. Campbell, who was apparently excited on the occasion. The circumstances of the case appear to have justified the action taken, and I do not therefore consider my interference is necessary.—J. MCGOWAN." The next is a letter from Mr. Laurenson, dated 18th October: "When I was in Lyttelton on Monday last one or two of my constituents visited me to complain about the conduct of Constable Connell. One of these parties has since put his complaint in writing, and I now enclose it for your consideration. The others who complained were the Mr. Campbell whose complaint has already been put before you and Captain Clark, the Harbourmaster at Lyttelton. If half of what I hear about this constable is true, then there ought to be an immediate and exhaustive inquiry into his conduct." This was acknowledged the following day, to the effect that inquiry would be made, and on 25th October the Minister wrote as follows: "With further reference to your letter of 16th instant, enclosing a complaint against Acting-Detective Connell, of Lyttelton, I have the honour to inform you that, as a result of inquiry, it appears that about twelve months ago Mr. Wood, who is well known to local police, was observed moving about the railway yard at Lyttelton in a suspicious manner with a bundle under his arm, and, having been previously seen under suspicious circumstances at night,

Acting-Detective Connell asked him what he had in the parcel, when Mr. Wood at once opened it and produced some clothes which he said he got from a railway hand. The acting-detective was satisfied, and never laid hands on Mr. Wood, or searched him in any way, nor has he had occasion to speak to him or search him previously or since, so that his allegations as to being searched three times are apparently without foundation. The acting-detective further alleges he never searched the man Beaumont as alleged. As regards the Harbourmaster, I should be glad to have his complaint in writing, as it seems the acting-detective has never had occasion to interfere in any way with him, although about three months ago his son was arrested for drunkenness and using obscene language, hence probably his motive for complaint. Observing, therefore, that the two complaints received against this acting-detective are in the same handwriting, that the complainant and Beaumont referred to are associates, that Mr. Wood's complaint is in respect to a matter occurring twelve months ago, and that the allegations made are apparently groundless, the motive for such being obvious, I do not propose to take any further action in the matter." The next letter is dated the 30th November, from Mr. Laurenson to the Minister: "Enclosed I hand you another complaint against Constable Connell, who is stationed here. Without expressing any opinion as to these complaints, I certainly consider that the least which you can do is to order an inquiry into these charges (this is the fourth which I have brought before you within three months), so as to see what is in them." The reply to this, after inquiry, is as follows: "With reference to your letter of the 30th November last, *re* complaint of one Arthur Beaumont against Acting-Detective Connell, of Lyttelton, I have now the honour to inform you that, as a result of careful investigation made by the District Inspector, it is quite apparent that there is no foundation for the allegations made in Beaumont's letter. I cannot find any respectable persons who have the slightest cause for complaint against the acting-detective, and the investigation held clearly demonstrates that the suspicious actions of the complainants have been the cause of police interference, which was justified under the circumstances. Although this is, as you allege, the fourth complaint against the acting-detective, I regret I can only treat the four as one—viz., an attempt to remove an officer who has done good work at Lyttelton and vicinity in bringing offenders to justice." These are all the complaints made by Mr. Laurenson, and you have seen the whole of them?—Yes.

104. What harm do you suggest Mr. Laurenson has done you?—I asked him about Clark. I said, "What about this man Clark; I do not know about him?" He said, "As a matter of fact, Clark came to me and told me he had been insulted by you." I said, "That is not true"; neither it was. "Well," he said, "I do not know. I simply told what was told to me." I asked him what his object was.

105. Do you suggest that influence was brought to bear?—I suggest that Mr. Laurenson tried every way he could to get me out of Lyttelton.

106. Do you suggest anything fruther than the ordinary sending on of complaints in these letters?—I suggest this plainly: it does not matter who it is, if there are a number of complaints, no matter how good a man may be, if the head of the Department has a number of complaints, they go down as something against him.

107. Do you suggest the letters were written with a view of bringing influence against you?—With a view to getting me out of Lyttelton.

108. But private individuals complained to Mr. Laurenson?—Any one who heard a complaint, without knowing whether there were any grounds for it, should not go to you or the Minister, but to the officer in charge of the district—to Inspector Gillies, who is quite competent to investigate any charge against a constable.

109. Do you not think it is the duty of every one who receives a complaint against the police to submit it to the head of the Department?—Not at all. If the outside public knew that, they would be running to the head of the Department all the time.

110. You know they do write to me frequently?—I pity any one they write about.

111. Do you not know it is a common occurrence?—It may be so.

112. Why should you pity any one?—Well, I do.

113. In what way?—If the head of the Department is troubled with complaints, it matters not how good a man is, there must be something done to quieten those who are complaining.

114. Do you not think every matter is inquired into, and the result shown?—Is there nothing against me in what you have read to justify my reflection?

115. *The Commissioner.*] What can be fairer to you than the replies by the Minister? Mr. Dinnie wants you to admit that it is apparent from the papers that there is nothing in this correspondence between the Minister and Mr. Laurenson to justify an inference that there was any connection between the correspondence and your removal from Lyttelton?—But I wish to point out what is a justifiable conclusion, that I was removed for taking a gun from the boys in the street.

116. But that has nothing to do with the correspondence of Mr. Laurenson. Mr. Dinnie wants you to admit that?—I want to point out that the decision of the Commissioner is contrary—

The Commissioner: Never mind that; that has nothing to do with Mr. Laurenson; we are only dealing with your complaint about Mr. Laurenson.

117. *Mr. Dinnie:* These files show it was not owing to this that you were transferred?—Yes.

118. You admit Mr. Laurenson had nothing to do with the gun?—The decision says there were other complaints.

119. *The Commissioner.*] You cannot say the mere fact of Mr. Laurenson forwarding this correspondence to the Minister, which was dealt with to your entire satisfaction, has had any bearing whatever on your subsequent position in the Force?—I would like to know the motive.

120. Why were you promoted if the Laurenson correspondence had anything to do with your subsequent removal to Dunedin?—But all these things tell. It matters not how good a man has been, so long as complaints are made against him by a man like Mr. Laurenson it has a tendency to do him harm.

121. The question is this—it is a very broad question, and one on which you will find a majority of people will have a different opinion: what is the duty of a member of Parliament when he receives a complaint from a person in regard to the conduct of a member of the Police Force?—I should say, to acquaint the officer in charge of the district.

122. It seems to me that would raise more the presumption of political interference than by appealing to the political head of the Department; the officer in charge of the district is only the creature of the political head?—Mr. Laurenson never told me he had forwarded complaints behind my back.

But he simply forwarded complaints, and asked for inquiry. That was held, and the Minister told Mr. Laurenson in the plainest terms I ever read that there was no ground for the complaints, and he was not going to interfere. I do not follow you in the view you wish me to take of the correspondence. It may be a matter of opinion whether a member of Parliament has a right to forward a letter to a Minister. I should prefer a member to forward direct to the Minister than to go to the local head.

Mr. Dinnie: I should like to have your ruling in this regard—as to what a member should do in the event of complaint being made to him.

The Commissioner: Would it have any weight?

Mr. Dinnie: It might bear out my opinion.

The Commissioner: I understood you to say a member of Parliament is not supposed to communicate with any head of a Department.

Mr. Dinnie: I suggest, the Minister.

The Commissioner: That, I say, is the proper thing. If they go to the officer in charge, they practically go to the creature of the Minister—using the word “creature” in its technical sense. Instead of that they should go to the political head. That would be the best security a constable could have that he would not be dealt with in an improper way. If they went to the lower head, it would raise the presumption that he might be liable to do an act to please the member for the district.

Mr. Gillies: To make the position clear, I might mention that the detective was transferred from Lyttelton to Christchurch on the 5th March, 1906, and was promoted detective on the 1st June, 1907.

The Commissioner: He did not fall in your estimation at that time through the correspondence?

Mr. Gillies: If he had he would not have been promoted. Up to that time I was very well satisfied with him.

The Commissioner: Then he seemed to lose interest in his work?

Mr. Gillies: Yes.

123. *The Commissioner:* I have been through the file, and have read every letter and paper, and have formed a deliberate and judicial opinion in regard to the evidence on the file. It may be hard on you, but there it is?—In regard to Mr. Laurenson’s interference, it was impossible for me to do my work in Lyttelton.

124. And you were removed from Lyttelton and promoted. Therefore his action did not prejudice you. But you are now running away from the main issue—your very grave allegation against Mr. Laurenson made at Invercargill, when I gave you the opportunity of withdrawing what you said. I explained the inference I should draw—that Mr. Laurenson was apparently making himself privy to acts of dishonesty. I pointed out the gravity of this, having regard to the fact that Mr. Laurenson is a public man, and I suggested you should reconsider the effect of what you were saying. If I remember right, you said, “I stick to what I said”?—I should be sorry to allege that Mr. Laurenson was a party to any of these things.

125. I pointed out to you what was the logical and moral effect of what you were saying—there can be no mistake about that?—I simply repeated as well as I could remember what he said to me.

126. What you said was directly in the direction of showing that his sympathies were with law-breakers?—I do not say that. I did not mean to put it in that way.

127. I am glad to have that explained; but if you had given me that explanation at Invercargill I should have taken a different view of what was said. You have forced this position on me?—My object was to show that I do not think he had any right to interfere in the manner he did.

128. You consider Mr. Laurenson had no right to forward those letters to the Minister of Justice?—I do not. He knew the class of men they were—one especially. I was surprised at Mr. Laurenson taking up the attitude he did.

The Commissioner: There can be no mistake about the position. The witness made certain statements in evidence at Invercargill. I do not think he fully comprehended the effect of them, and so much did I think so that I pulled him up and explained to him the effect. I used very plain language. I try, and I think I do, convey exactly what is in my mind, and I conveyed to him the effect of what he said, and gave him the opportunity of withdrawing it. He did not do so, but stood by what he said. There was an undoubted inference against Mr. Laurenson, and I believe it went all through the Dominion. It is all very well for him to come to-day and say, “I did not mean that.” If so, why did he not tell me so at the time?

Mr. Dougall: He modifies his statements, and leaves us to the inference that it was owing to Mr. Laurenson’s action his reduction took place. There cannot be any doubt that the letters written by Mr. Laurenson were written in absolutely correct language, and that he acted in a manner one would expect a member to act. Mr. Connell sets up that the men were of bad character. Whether they were or not I am not prepared to say. Mr. Laurenson knows the men, and will probably say something about it. I should like to refer to another point in Connell’s evidence—

the time at which he says this took place. He was quite emphatic, and I gave him an opportunity of correcting himself. He says it took place prior to the election of 1905, and some time after the complaints were made and inquiries held. The first of these complaints was made in September, 1905, the last on the 30th November. The election took place on the 6th December, and the last complaint was not investigated—at least, the reply was not sent—till the 8th January following—a month after the election, less than two months prior to Connell's removal to Christchurch, which was consequent upon an entirely different matter, and one with which Mr. Laurenson had nothing to do. It is obvious that, as a matter of continuity, if nothing else, Connell is entirely astray regarding the time of this conversation. He says that Mr. Laurenson made certain remarks which Mr. Laurenson will deny he could ever have made—that such a thing never entered his head, nor would he be willing in any way to associate himself with matters such as Connell alleged. In Connell's evidence to-day the sting has been entirely taken out of the matter, because he says he did not intend to make any imputation, nor did he consider any such inference could have been drawn from anything he said.

The Commissioner: In regard to certain general statements made by the constable in his evidence in regard to the wharf-labourers or stevedores generally, I do not think he intended to say that they generally were a dishonest community. The way in which his statement has been used and advertised was liable to cast a stigma on the general body of wharf-labourers, but that was not the impression left on my mind, and I do not think it would be on most people's. He was dealing more with individual members amongst the labourers. Therefore there is no ground whatever for their saying their honesty as a body was impugned. I should say there is nothing in the evidence to warrant that view, and if anybody asked me to believe, on the evidence of a disgraced detective, that the wharf-labourers as a body were dishonest I should scout the idea. It would make no impression on my mind. It is one of those wild statements that are very difficult to answer. At the same time, the wharf-labourers would not like to guarantee that every member of their body was absolutely honest. No doubt pilfering does take place at Lyttelton. I do not suppose there is a port in the world where it does not, labourers being placed in the constant way of temptation. The wharf-labourers approached me with regard to clearing up this question of their honesty, which I do not think at all necessary, and should be sorry to make myself a party to any such presumption. I say this openly, because they are labouring under what they consider to be a grievance, and think they ought to come and declare their honesty. I refused their request because it is not necessary.

GEORGE LAURENSEN, Member of Parliament, examined on oath. (No. 64.)

Witness: I am a member of Parliament for Lyttelton, and I reside in Lyttelton.

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You have read a copy of the evidence given by Constable Connell in Invercargill?—Yes.

2. You have also heard what he has said here to-day?—Yes.

3. Did any conversation of the kind referred to by Connell ever take place between you?—Never.

4. Did you ever at any time suggest to Connell that he was too active in the performance of his duties?—Never once.

5. Did you ever offer to get him a better position if he would leave Lyttelton?—Never.

6. Those letters which you wrote to the Minister were written, I think, in consequence of complaints having been sent to you?—Yes.

7. And at one of your political meetings you were questioned on this point?—Yes.

8. And that is what caused you to write and to forward the written complaints?—May I explain? When I was verbally complained to about these matters, I refused to have anything to do with them until a written complaint was put before me. I said that if any of the men who considered they had a grievance under which they were suffering liked to give me a written statement of their grievance, I would forward it to the Minister of Justice. As the letters on the file will show, I was careful not to say a single thing against Constable Connell. I did not suggest for an instant that he should be reduced, shifted, or anything else. I simply asked that an inquiry or investigation should be made into the allegations made in those letters. I recognise the difficulties of a constable's duties, and, although complaints were made to me in writing, I was careful not to follow them up by asking that anything should be done to the injury of the constable. It is only right that I should say also that Constable Connell seems to be under the impression that I have used some influence outside those letters to his detriment. Commissioner Dinnie and Inspector Gillies are here, and, as both those officers were in charge of their respective departments when this took place, they are in a position to say whether I have in any way asked that any injury should be done to Constable Connell, or that he should be interfered with in any way at all. When I read the evidence he gave in Invercargill I was thunderstruck, because I had not thought for an instant that he had any grievance against me. As far as I knew, we were on friendly terms enough, and, in fact, I felt that if I could have done him a good turn in any way I would have done it. But when he stated in Invercargill that I had said Lyttelton was losing its population on account of his action, and that people were furnishing their houses and finding boots and shoes for their families, I wondered if the man was in his judgment.

9. You never at any time, either directly or indirectly, tried to get Connell moved from Lyttelton?—I never interfered further than to forward those written complaints, which were given to me by men whom I knew, and who came to see me about his conduct.

10. The election took place on the 5th December, 1905?—Yes.

11. And those complaints had come in just prior to the election?—Yes. Connell, in his evidence, stated that this would be about two months before the election of 1905 that this alleged conversation took place. Well, up to within five weeks of that election I was in Wellington, and

—I looked up *Hansard* last night to be sure about this—I took part in the last division of that session. Sometimes during the session I would come down to Lyttelton to attend a meeting of the Harbour Board, and on those occasions I generally arrived in the morning and returned to Wellington by the steamer in the evening of the same day, so that I was generally pretty busy during that day. I could therefore hardly have had such a conversation with him as he alleges two months before the election of 1905.

12. As regards the men who made the complaints, you say you knew them personally: Connell has stated they were men of bad character?—I do not think he is justified in saying that. One of the men, I understand, has had one or two convictions against him for drunkenness, but I know of nothing against either Beaumont or Campbell. The former has not been long in Lyttelton.

13. So far as your knowledge extends, they were men who were worthy of credence?—There was nothing wrong about the men so far as I know, with the exception I have mentioned.

14. Were any other complaints made to you about Connell which you did not forward on?—Yes; I remember that one man, who was a strong supporter of mine, wanted me to forward a complaint, and, in fact, he wanted me to interfere with Connell in connection with his duty, and I refused to have anything to do with it. The man I refer to is here to-day.

15. Who is he?—Thompson.

16. I suppose in your capacity as a member of Parliament you are besieged with all manner of complaints and requests?—Yes, I get a good few.

17. And, as a result, you get a considerable quantity of correspondence?—Yes; last year I forwarded over 3,000 letters, and I suppose my interviews average from eight to sixteen a day, and there are telegrams and various other matters besides.

18. And you absolutely deny that any such conversation as Connell alleges ever took place between you?—I am positive of that. As to his statements—of course, he has considerably modified them here—but the statements he attributed to me in Invercargill I could never have made unless I were mad.

18A. You have not since you have been a member of Parliament attempted to get Connell or any other constable moved?—I do not remember having ever interfered with a single constable in the Force. I recognise what the difficulties of their duties are. The chiefs of the Department are here to-day, and they can certify to what I say. Sergeant Rutledge, who has been in the district about sixteen years, can also certify as to whether I have ever used any influence in any cases of prosecution or otherwise.

The Commissioner: Do you wish to ask the witness any questions, Constable Connell?

19. *Constable Connell.*] I do not know that there is any use asking any questions, as he denies having had any conversation with me. I would just ask Mr. Laurenson whether he remembers on any occasion speaking to me in the Lyttelton office?—Yes, I have spoken to you often.

20. Do you remember on one occasion ringing up Mr. Taylor on the office telephone?—The telephone bureau at Lyttelton is always closed after 8 o'clock in the evening, and consequently the only way in which we could get connection with Christchurch was through the police office.

21. Do you remember speaking to me about a "rascal" called Wood? When I say "rascal" I am using your own expression?—I am positive I did not call Wood a rascal, nor do I remember ever speaking about Wood to you.

22. Do you remember remarking that Wood had a respectable family?—I do not. I know that Wood has a very respectable family, and, in fact, a rather distinguished family.

23. I said something to you about Wood writing letters, and you said, "Yes, I believe he did write. That rascal is always drunk." Do you remember saying that?—I do not.

24. Do you remember saying anything about Little River—what a nice station it was?—I do not.

Do you expect me to remember a conversation of four years ago?

Constable Connell: That is all I have to ask.

WALTER DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, further examined. (No. 65.)

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You know Mr. Laurenson?—I do.

2. Have you, in your official capacity, ever known him to interfere in any way with any constable or any one in the Force?—No.

3. Have you ever known him attempt to use influence of any sort?—None whatever. He never has, so far as I am concerned.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Perhaps I should take this opportunity of asking you whether any other members of Parliament have done anything of this nature. What is the practice?—The practice is for members of Parliament to write to the Minister.

5. Do you think that is the proper course, rather than going to the local head?—Sometimes members have written to me, but I do not send the reply. The Minister sends the reply.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 66.)

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You are in charge of the Canterbury District?—Yes.

2. You know Mr. Laurenson?—I do, very well.

3. You have come into contact with him at different times?—Frequently.

4. Have you ever known him, either directly or indirectly, to attempt to influence you or any one in connection with the Force in any way?—Never.

5. How long have you known him?—For seven years and a half—since I have been in charge of this district.

6. *The Commissioner.*] With regard to Constable Connell, I notice on the papers you speak highly of him in connection with work he did at Lyttelton. How do you account for his deterioration?—I cannot account for it. He did exceedingly good work while he was at Lyttelton, and I

recommended him for acting detective's pay, and I got him his allowance afterwards. He was afterwards transferred to Christchurch. It was after he became a detective that he seemed to fall away in his work. Up to that time I had not the slightest ground for complaint against him; in fact, he was very energetic.

7. Did you acquiesce in the action of the Commissioner in moving him to Dunedin on account of the deterioration in his work?—Yes; he was not giving satisfaction to me, and I thought a change might be the means of giving him a fresh start. I considered the punishment he received to be most just.

8. He has had his opportunity again?—That is so.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think his falling-off may have been owing to family troubles?—That may have been so to a certain extent. I know his wife died, and I believe he has had some family troubles. That may have made him careless.

CHARLES RUTLEDGE, ex-Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 67.)

Witness: I was formerly a sergeant of police, stationed at Lyttelton, and I was there during the whole of the time Acting-Detective Connell was there.

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You know Mr. Laurenson fairly intimately?—Yes; I have known him during the last sixteen years.

2. During your experience, had you any reason to think that he interfered with the work of the constables there?—No.

3. You never knew or heard of his attempting to get Connell moved?—Never.

4. Did Connell ever complain to you about Mr. Laurenson?—No, he did not.

The Commissioner: I have gone carefully through these papers, and I considered it only right that Mr. Laurenson should have the fullest possible opportunity, as a public man, of putting himself right in the eyes of the public, if he could do so, with regard to this particular matter; and it was on account of my realising the seriousness of the position that I instructed the Secretary to forward him immediately a copy of the evidence reflecting upon him. Of course, I am not going to express any opinion now, as my report goes to the Governor. Of course, it will have to be seriously considered at a later date what will be the effect upon the constable as to the evidence he has given. That is a matter I shall not refer to at all. However, we will pass over this incident for the present.

Mr. Dougall: I have other evidence which I am ready to call, but perhaps it would be only waste of time.

WILLIAM HENRY SYMES, Police Surgeon, examined on oath. (No. 68.)

Witness: I am a duly qualified registered medical practitioner, residing in Christchurch. I am Police Surgeon.

The Commissioner: I should like you to make your own statement.

Witness: I wish to bring before you a few matters bearing upon the health and upon the efficiency of the Force. As regards the present overcoats supplied to the men, they consist of a mackintosh, which is worn in the day time in wet weather, and a heavy overcoat, which is compulsorily worn every night all the year round. This overcoat weighs 8 lb., and with accoutrements 13 lb. If the refreshment-flask is added, that still further increases the weight; but that is not usually carried, on account of its cumbersomeness. When this overcoat is soaked with water it weighs about 19 lb., exclusive of accoutrements. The men would prefer some coat such as that used by the tramway conductors, which is lighter in weight and of a closer texture. I produce specimens of the two kinds of cloths I have referred to. They would like to wear such an overcoat in cold weather, when standing for some considerable time at a street-corner in the day time, as standing without an overcoat in cold weather is very trying, and they cannot possibly use the present regulation overcoat, not only because it is too heavy, but also because it is practically soaked with oil which has leaked from the lamps which are used at night. The men would like to have a uniform pattern overcoat which they could use both day and night. If it were decided to adopt this newer pattern of overcoat, I would suggest that it could be rendered comparatively waterproof by being soaked in a solution of acetate of lead alum, which is very effective in preventing the penetration of rain. This solution has been used now for some considerable time, and has been found very satisfactory. It might have to be renewed, say, every couple of years, but the cost would be so trifling that it is hardly worth considering; and waterproofing of that kind could be done anywhere by anybody at any time. But supposing it were considered inadvisable to change the present pattern, the men would like to have permission to leave it off on warm nights in the summer time. At present it is compulsory to wear this heavy overcoat all the year round—summer and winter alike; and it is obvious, from its weight, it must be a considerable hindrance in the pursuit or the arrest of a man. If the new pattern I have recommended is adopted, the men would like it to be fitted with a movable collar, which could be worn at night. The regulation pattern has no collar, and the consequence is that the rain gets in at the neck and wets their underclothes. They would also like to see the present shako abolished, and the helmet substituted. They say the shako affords no protection against blows on the head or against falling *débris* in the case of fire or against rain and snow, whilst the helmet which is used in many other countries does afford such protection. The shako is also said to be uncomfortable, as all the weight comes on the forehead, whereas with the helmet the weight is equally distributed, and the weight is not greater than that of the shako, I understand. Then, with regard to the night-lamps: The colza-oil used in them becomes very hot, and, as the lamp is kept burning from 9 o'clock at night to 5 in the morning, the heat becomes oppressive. I have felt them myself after they have been burning quite a short time, and I could not bear my hand on them. Then, the smell of the oil is

offensive, and, as the lamp is worn in front, the fumes rising up into the men's faces tend to cause sickness and headache. I should recommend the substitution of electric lamps such as are used in Sydney. One advantage is that the light is completely extinguished when not in use, whereas in the case of the oil-lamp, when it gets old and knocked about, a glimmer of light may be seen in some cases. The electric light would be more powerful, quite light to carry, and they are not expensive. Then again, these oil-lamps all leak more or less, with the result that the men's overcoats are practically soaked with oil; and this is all the more apparent if a man has slipped down or has been knocked down. This naturally gives the overcoat a most discreditable appearance, and they are not fit to be seen. Then, with regard to supplying the men with refreshments at night, this matter has been under discussion by the Inspector and myself for some years past, and, though several plans have been suggested, the only one we have tried is a tin (a sample of which I will ask the Inspector to hand in) which will hold a little coffee or other suitable fluid which the spirit-lamp underneath will heat up in a very short time. The tin weighs about a couple of pounds when full. The men, however, seem to object to carrying it about with them at night for a number of hours. The tin holds about a pint of liquid. Only four of these tins have been used so far, owing to the objection the men have to carrying them. Now, to obviate the necessity for carrying these tins about all night, I would suggest the establishment of three pillar-boxes in this city—one at the clock-tower, which would serve beats 3, 4, 5, 9, and 10; one at the Bank of New Zealand corner, which would serve beats 1, 2, and 6; and one at Victoria Square, to serve beats 7 and 8. The remainder of the beats are close to the station, and would not require a box. The Postmaster informs me that the cost of these boxes would be about £1 10s. each, but if attached to a telegraph-post the cost would not exceed 15s. The only thing the Postmaster asks is that the boxes should be so painted as not to resemble the letter-boxes. Then, these pillar-boxes could be fitted up with the telephone, connected with the central station. Not only could these refreshment-tins be deposited in these boxes, but the men could leave their overcoats and other things there if necessary. Then, I should strongly recommend the establishment of a gymnasium at the station. The men at present are on their feet all day, but they do not get enough muscular exercise. Living in the open air as they do, they probably eat too much meat, and their mode of living probably accounts for a good deal of the sickness from which the men suffer. I believe if they had a gymnasium it would greatly contribute to the health of the men as well as to their recreation, and generally to the efficiency of the Force. The next matter is the library. The library has had no new books supplied to it for something like ten years. The Inspector has a scheme for establishing a library fund, and the men are quite willing to contribute, but they think such a fund should be subsidised to some extent by the Government. I would recommend, if a proper library is established, that books and periodicals should be sent to the country stations from the library from time to time, and when returned others should be sent in exchange. There is a splendid dormitory at the Police-station, but there is considerable complaint on the part of the men at being unable to sleep, on account of the noise of the traffic that goes on just below them, and they want a door or curtain to screen off the entrance, to minimise the noise and to shut off the draught which comes through that entrance. The only drawback to this fine dormitory is that the ceiling is rather low, and the draught from the windows is thrown down too directly on to the men's beds. This matter has been complained of to me a great many times, and if a door or curtain such as I suggest were put up it would greatly minimise the draught. Then, there is another subject I am anxious to bring before you, and it is one which I have already mentioned to Mr. Dinnie. It is that the men joining the Force should be put on twelve months' probation before being made permanent. Although the men have all been subjected to a very careful medical examination, we find that after three months' or six months' work they often show signs of certain defects which it was almost impossible to recognise at their examination. To mention an instance: One man came to me a few months ago suffering from very bad varicose veins, and that was within six months from the time he was originally examined elsewhere. Now, if that man had had two or three weeks' complete rest, perhaps lying on his back, before his examination for entry into the Force, those veins might entirely disappear.

1. Very improbable, surely?—I admit it is not probable, but the effect of rest upon varicose veins is most remarkable; and after such a rest the condition of the man applying might be such that the surgeon would not consider himself justified in refusing him. We have considerable difficulty in regard to the examination of these candidates, and in doubtful cases I sometimes take as long as an hour and a half to two hours over the examination. Of course, in a straightforward case it might not take me more than half an hour or twenty minutes. In cases where I have had to refuse a man I frequently receive inquiries as to why the man has been refused, and all kinds of pressure is sought to be brought to bear upon me with a view of getting me to pass him.

2. Pressure from whom?—From his friends and others.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Not from the Department?—No; the Department is only too anxious to get at the truth. Looking to the scarcity of men for enrolment in the Force, it is somewhat remarkable that the men should show so much disappointment at being refused.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Your report goes to the Department, I assume. How is it, then, that the friends know what you have reported?—The man asks me himself. I do not tell more than I can help, but I like to be as straightforward as I can with the men. I also get asked by his friends why I have refused him.

5. I do not see how any man can make a grievance against you for reporting adversely upon his physical condition. I do not think the friends should go to you?—Perhaps not, but I do have some considerable difficulty in the matter. Now, as I have said, I would recommend that the men should be put on twelve months' probation. The test of having to walk about in the streets from 9 o'clock to 5 every night for a fortnight is a very severe one, and walking about for eight hours

seems to try some men more than others. Some of the men will begin to show defects in a very short time, defects which it would have been almost impossible to discover at the time of examination. And even a three months' probation would bring out some of those defects; but I think twelve months would be best.

6. I am strongly in favour of a period of probation, and I intend to report in favour of it, but on other grounds than those you have mentioned. I, however, quite recognise the force of your argument?—Of course, there are other defects than varicose veins, and I may say that standing about is often a more severe test than walking.

7. What proportion of the men have varicose veins which have appeared subsequent to their being passed?—It is very difficult to say. The trouble is much more prevalent in the last ten or fifteen years of a man's service. Then, again, a man may have a certain constitutional weakness, such as a slight tubercular tendency, which, though it would not be sufficient to cause the surgeon to reject him, might make him more liable to catch cold. There are some constitutions that can stand exposure night after night in heavy rain in overcoats that are never properly dried, but others cannot, and they are very liable to get bad colds. Looking at the sick list, the first thing that strikes one is the number of cases put down as catarrh—a general term used for catching cold. There is another matter which I would bring forward merely by way of suggestion, and it is one which relates to pensions. In every body of men there is a certain number who, while they cannot be classed as drunkards, have what may be called "nipping habits," which, in my opinion, has a very serious effect upon their health. Now, the pension fund has to be used, of course, to the best advantage for the benefit of the Force as a whole, and it appears to me to be somewhat unfair that men who exercise self-control should have their pensions reduced proportionately by the fact that a certain class of men indulge in a habit which tends to the injury of their health.

8. Are you sure there is such a proportional diminution of the pensions, or would it not only go to the root of the stability of the fund itself? You see, the men are entitled to a certain pension by statute. I quite agree that a man who brings himself into a state of unfitness by his own misconduct should not be entitled to claim the privileges of the fund. I have known of a medical man certifying that a man was medically unfit when I have held a strong opinion personally that his unfitness was due to his own fault?—When reporting on claims for pensions there is no provision for dealing with that aspect. If a man has been convicted of drunkenness that might be another thing.

9. In any case, this does not come strictly within the scope of my inquiry?—Well, I will pass on to the next matter. In view of the decision come to at Home to give the London police a weekly day of rest, I think it would be reasonable to consider the question of giving a weekly or a fortnightly day of rest to our own Force, as I believe it would contribute to the health of the police. Now, I notice that at the present day there are fewer men coming forward for examination, and that there is distinctly less desire on the part of able-bodied men to join the Force. I think the pay on joining should be increased to 8s. a day. If that were done I feel sure there would be a greater inducement to men to join. A man can get 8s. a day in any other employment in town.

10. You recognise, of course, that he gets now 7s. 6d. a day every day of the week?—Yes; but he would much rather not work seven days in the week.

11. I only mention the point as it should be taken into consideration when making a comparison?—The question is whether for the seven days' work he should not get extra pay. With regard to that refreshment-tin of which I spoke, and a sample of which you now have before you, there is no objection to it, but we want a box in which to place it.

The Commissioner: Surely a constable can always find some corner in which to place it until he wants it.

Inspector Gibbies: There is only one man in the city who uses the tin, although every one can be supplied with one.

12. *The Commissioner.*] How do you account for that, Dr. Symes?—It is very awkward to carry about. I think, if a box such as I have suggested were provided it would be more convenient.

13. There would be no hardship in a constable taking it out with him and planting it in some doorway?—No, I suppose not. There is one other thing I would touch upon. In my opinion, political influence is the moral cancer of the Force.

14. Upon what do you base that opinion?—It is an extremely difficult matter to deal with, because members of Parliament are our masters, and it does not do to quarrel with them.

15. I am afraid I do not quite follow you. In what direction do you think political influence is used?—I think promotions should depend on merit rather than on seniority. If a man is not promoted on account of his seniority he at once applies to a member of Parliament.

16. Then what does the member do?—I suppose he sends it on to the Minister.

17. What then does the Minister do?—I would not like to say.

The Commissioner: I do not see how you can prevent a member communicating with the Minister; but I cannot conceive that a Minister, in his responsible position, would injure a member of the Force. We have heard a good deal about political influence; we have had no instances of its having been used with success.

Mr. Dinnie: We quite admit that members of the service do seek political influence, and I know that constables have been to members of Parliament.

Witness: I have been written to by members of Parliament occasionally about the examinations I make.

18. *The Commissioner.*] I do not think they have any right to approach you on that matter at all. With what object are the letters written?—I suppose they are written to show that especial interest is taken in the candidate.

19. Would they influence your judgment at all?—No; I have always endeavoured to do my duty, irrespective of anything of that sort.

20. Do you think this political interference affects the efficiency of the Force?—I believe it affects it very seriously.

21. How?—It is very dangerous to mention facts. I reported years ago to a certain Inspector certain men who were in the habit of drinking—I do not say they were drunkards; I think worse of a man who nips than of the occasional drunkard. That Inspector said to me, “I don’t think it is advisable to interfere with these men; they have more political influence than I have.” That was not the present Inspector. In my opinion, continual nipping has a more serious effect on health, and leads more to early invaliding, than occasional drunkenness. Another matter came under my own observation. A constable who had a record for drinking was sent home from the racecourse in a cab for being very drunk. He was in charge of a much smaller constable, whom he nearly killed, and who had to be rescued by the cabman. This constable was dismissed from the Force, and was reinstated by Mr. Seddon within twelve months.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When was that?—It was some years ago; before your time. I should like to say that, in giving the evidence I have, I have been actuated solely by a desire to promote the health and efficiency of the Force.

23. In regard to the gymnasium, do you know that very few men use it?—No.

24. Very few indeed?—But they might have an instructor, and be compelled to go through a course. One of the sergeants might take it in hand. If the men had systematic gymnastic exercise it would conduce greatly to their health.

25. *The Commissioner.*] They have plenty of opportunity in the towns?—But they do not take advantage of them.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You suggest it as part of their discipline?—Certainly.

27. As regards the greatcoats, do you know we are introducing a new pattern?—No.

28. The old ones have been in force for many years, and have always given satisfaction?—Not to the police.

29. There have been no complaints?—They have complained to me.

30. As regards helmets instead of shakos, do you know it was put to the men as a whole while Mr. Tunbridge was here, and the great majority voted for the shako?—I heard something about it. The men here seem to be unanimously in favour of the helmet.

31. As regards draughts in the dormitory, did you not mention something about a door once before?—Yes; a door was placed to cut off the lobby.

32. It was attended to at once?—Yes.

33. Did you mention anything about the dormitory to the Inspector?—We talked over it many times, and I said what I thought was necessary. Mr. Gillies thought it would entail too much expense.

34. Are many men rejected on account of varicose veins?—Yes.

35. But you have not had many cases to re-examine after men have been in service for some time?—I cannot say I have.

36. That is a most exceptional thing?—Yes.

37. You have compared the police pay with that of the labourer: which is best off, the policeman with 7s. 6d. and a certain amount of clothing free and underclothing at wholesale price, or the labourer with 8s.?—Many of the men are carpenters, who would get more than 8s. And constables live harder, owing to night work, while the labourer only works eight hours.

38. But he loses time, and the policeman does not?—A policeman would rather lose time than stand for hours in the rain.

39. Do you know of any case of political influence within the last ten years?—I cannot recall dates exactly; the case I mentioned was, I should think, within the last six years or so.

40. Any other cases?—I do not keep a diary of these things.

41. But it is a serious thing to allege that influence obtains if you cannot mention one instance?—I can only say that is my conviction.

42. Is it hearsay?—No; it is based on experience.

43. Let us have your experience?—I cannot give facts, because I have no record.

44. You think a man who gets drunk occasionally is not so bad as a continual “nipper”?—It is not so bad for his health.

45. If he is a continual “nipper” it interferes more with his duties?—Yes, I think so.

46. Then, it is better for us to get rid of the continual “nipper” than the man who gets drunk occasionally?—Yes.

47. The men who gets drunk occasionally might reform, but not the continual “nipper”?—I have known a good many “nippers” reform; I have reformed a good many myself.

Mr. Dinnie. In regard to the electric lamp, I desire to say that we have tried them of various kinds, to see how long they would last, and have not got one so far that is satisfactory; they give a good light to start with, but they gradually grow weaker, and they have to be refilled very frequently. We are waiting for a suitable lamp before we make the change.

48. *The Commissioner.*] Have you noticed any deterioration in the physique of members of the Force during late years?—We have not the same selection of men.

49. Do you attribute that entirely to the pay?—Not at all; it has more to do with the general increase of wages in the country. Indirectly, of course, it has to do with the pay, which has not been increased as the wages of the working-classes.

50. Do you think the standard of education is rather high?—It appears to me it is higher than it used to be.

51. You say the physique in the Force has deteriorated because the area of selection is not so large?—Yes.

52. How do you find the morality at present?—I think it is very good; I have reason to believe it is.

53. Do the men consult you about their ailments?—Yes, largely.
 54. They can go to an outside doctor?—Yes; any doctor they like.
 55. There is no ground for assuming the morality at present is any worse than it was?—
 I should say on very good grounds that there is less immorality in the Force now than formerly.
 56. You are about the station a good deal?—Yes.
 57. What is the general conduct of the men?—Very good.

ERNEST ALEXANDER REGAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 69.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1907. I appear, with two other delegates, to speak on behalf of the Christchurch police. The first matter is in regard to the pay. We agreed to ask that the pay should begin at 8s., with the present increments every three years instead of every four as at present; that is, in the constables' grade.

Mr. Dinnie: A recommendation has been made in respect to pay.

Witness: Our reason for this is, in the first place, that a man applying for enrolment has to be of exemplary character before he is taken on, whereas outside a position does not depend upon character.

1. *The Commissioner.*] That is rather a bold statement to make. You do not say a man in business would employ a man without inquiring into his character?—No; but his character is not inquired into to the same extent. A man's character has to be fairly perfect before he gets into the Force. Another reason is that constables many times have to do overtime—more than eight hours—attending Court especially. When on night duty, and they have a case to come before the Court, they get to bed at half-past 5, and have to come to the Court in the morning in their own time. They are not allowed time off for coming to Court, and it means working overtime. When taking prisoners to Lyttelton the men are allowed the travelling time.

2. If a case did not come on till midday, what is the position then?—I have in two cases experienced getting time off in such a case, but if a case is finished before midday we are allowed no time off. Another thing is that men who apply for enrolment have to undergo a medical test, which in many other positions they have not to do. Then, as regards the house-allowance to married men, it is at present 7s., and we ask for an increase of 6d. per day.

3. Have you worked out the average rents that men have to pay in Christchurch?—It comes to about 13s. 7d. I think that is a fair estimate for the last five or six years. Some of these places are outside the boundary. A policeman must reside in some area close to the police-station, and rent within the boundary is far dearer than that outside. Then, a working-man can occupy a small house in no matter what locality, whereas a policeman must be in a respectable locality. In regard to the question of annual leave, we ask for an increase of four days; at present it is twelve days. Men stationed at a distance from their homes—say, between Auckland and Dunedin—have to travel so far that twelve days leaves them very little time to see their people. Gaol warders are allowed eighteen days. Then, we ask for a free railway-pass during our holidays.

The Commissioner: The difficulty about that is that the Minister refuses it.

Witness: The ground we go on is that constables have to take their holidays at a different time from the general public holidays, and therefore cannot take advantage of the excursion fares. Then, constables are, as a rule, known to nearly every guard on the line, and perhaps when on their annual leave are called upon to do their duty if there is a row on the train.

4. *The Commissioner.*] If Court proceedings followed, and their leave were broken, would they get it again?—I could not say. Again, if an accident occurs on the train the constable would be compelled to take charge of a body, and would be put to inconvenience and loss of leave. We also ask for one day's rest in a fortnight. At present we are allowed Sunday leave one Sunday in four when convenient; but sometimes we might go six or eight weeks without a Sunday off. It depends on the number of men who are available. It could be worked by allowing one man off each night, with the exception of Saturday.

5. Is there any reason why the clerks in the district office should not take their turn of relieving?—They are a separate branch from ours; they are not in uniform.

6. You have not considered that matter?—No, I should not like to touch on that.

7. But you must show how time off can be given without impairing the efficiency of the Force?—The district clerks are a distinct branch.

8. But they are constables?—Yes; they get Sunday off always. They are looked upon as being of more ability than the men doing uniform duty—of more clerical ability.

9. But none the less they are constables?—We never broached that subject. Another matter is the coat for day duty, which would be more suitable than the mackintosh. The mackintosh is not a warm coat by any means, and you cannot wear it without the cape, and it looks absurd to wear a cape when the sun is shining.

10. What do you suggest in lieu of the mackintosh?—Something more after the style of coat the tramway men wear, only longer. At present we have to wear night-duty lamps, which leak and spill the oil over the coat, and it could not be used for day-wear. Another matter is in regard to the 11 o'clock regulation—having to be in barracks by 10.30, and all lights out at 11. We ask for this to be extended to 12 o'clock. We can at present, by applying, be out till 12; it is never refused; but we ask to be allowed to be out till 12 without applying. One may leave the station in the early part of the evening without intending to stay out, and one may meet with a friend who asks you to go to the theatre, and you might get back five or ten minutes late, and be reported by the sergeant. It is not that we want to stay out always after 11, but on many occasions one is kept after 11 through no fault, and the sergeant has to report you. If men do not, as a rule, come in in proper time they are not fit to be in the Force. We do not want the rule done away with, but only extended to 12.

11. Reserving the right to ask for a further extension if necessary?—Yes, in case of wishing to attend a dance. Then, in regard to uniform, we ask for a free uniform and a pair of boots a year. The average cost of making up a uniform is £2 5s. A pair of trousers is supposed to last us nine months, but if you ride a bike or get rough usage they will not last that time. We are allowed a tunic twelve months after we join, and then one every eighteen months. Then, in regard to the regulation that married men must go to and from the station in uniform, we ask that that shall be abolished. A married man may want to do shopping with his wife, and women do not like being seen walking with a policeman in uniform. I have known of an instance where a man, it being a wet day, took his wife home in a cab, and it caused a crowd to gather round to see if she was going to be locked up. Then, the men here ask for a gymnasium at the station.

12. The Commissioner says the one in Auckland is not much used?—That is so, but the men here take a great interest in that kind of thing, and go in for it on their own. Another matter is the night-duty lamp. At present it has to be worn alight from 12 o'clock on the inside beats, and on the outside beats alight all the time. The heat of the lamp weakens the back, and also the front when making use of it, and the fumes give you a headache.

13. What do you suggest as a remedy?—Electric flashes.

14. The objection to the electric lamp that has been produced is, I understand, the shortness of time the charge lasts?—The present lamps are considered to be very unhealthy and very dirty, as they all spill the oil; I have used a great number, and they are all alike in this respect. Another matter is that we are asking to be allowed to use our own discretion in regard to discarding the night-duty coat. At present we are compelled to wear them all night, as well as accoutrements, and in summer nights this becomes very hard. We are not allowed to discard them. If we took them off we could put them in some place where we could get them again. It is a big handicap to have to wear these heavy coats for eight hours. We also ask for a more suitable headgear than the shako. With the present one the rain comes down all over your face and the back of your neck. If it had a covering over it for a wet night it would be a great help.

15. Do you prefer the shako to the helmet?—I have had no experience with the helmet; I know the Victorian helmet, which is more suitable than the shako.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to the lamps, you mean they run over when held down?—Yes, or if you are walking very fast, or if they knock against you.

17. Do you know the reason why men are not allowed to go home out of uniform?—I believe, on account of the last Commission over the Dunedin scandal.

18. Was it not because they used to go into the single men's quarters?—I heard something of that.

19. It is desirable to keep the married men out of the single men's quarters?—Yes.

20. It would necessitate having a room for the married men's clothes?—There is one now.

21. For single men; but the married men should not mix with them?—At present there are pegs for each man, and each man could keep his own peg.

22. They have to go home in uniform here?—Yes.

23. There is a room in which they could keep their clothing?—Yes.

24. In regard to Sunday leave, do you say you have had only one day in eight months?—No; I said I had experience of only getting one Sunday in eight. The general rule is one Sunday in four.

25. Did you apply for more?—At one time. It is not that the superior officer would not grant it; but say you apply on the fifth Sunday; a senior man is granted in preference to you; then, you may be on night duty, and that carries you on two weeks more.

26. There is a possibility, then, of having eight weeks without a Sunday off?—Yes; but it is very rare. If you take the average, a man gets about one Sunday in five during the year.

27. The difficulty is that we have not many men?—That is the trouble.

28. Do you not think 11 o'clock is late enough to stay out?—As a rule; but many a time a man goes out not intending to stay out after 11, but comes in ten minutes or so after. If a man cannot be trusted to come home at 12 he should not be in the Force. Many a man applies for an extension to 12 as a safeguard.

29. It is always granted?—Yes; it has never been refused that I know of. But a man who can be trusted with police duty could be trusted to come in before 12; the remedy, if he does not keep proper hours, is to dismiss him.

30. Do you not think it necessary to call the roll at night?—Yes.

31. Do you think it should be done away with?—It would be better if we could report ourselves instead of being disturbed by the sergeant turning the lights on.

32. To whom?—To the sergeant or the watch-house keeper.

33. But we want a superior officer?—If a man's staying out comes under the notice of a superior officer there is another remedy.

34. *Inspector Gillies.*] Do you think a constable coming in at 12 would be fit for duty at 5 o'clock in the morning?—No, not if he made it a rule; but one night now and again would not injure him.

35. Do you know of any case on this station where a man has been punished for being out after 11?—No.

36. Why this complaint, then?—I am only representing the Force; it is not my own suggestion.

37. Do you think it is desirable, yourself, that men should be allowed out at 12 every night?—No.

38. Would you think it desirable for every man you know to be allowed out till 12 every night?—No.

39. Where do you wish to draw the line?—If constables were allowed leave till 12 any night, and a man stayed out generally till that time he should be reported.

40. *The Commissioner.*] But he would have the right to do so?—If men are fit to be constables they would look after themselves, and provide themselves with enough sleep.

41. *Inspector Gillies.*] Have you ever known of a constable being refused leave till 12?—There was some time ago, but I think you intimated that every man who applied for leave would not be refused so long as he gave suitable reason.

42. Have you ever known a constable refused leave till 3 or 4 if he explained what it was for?—No; we have no grievance at all against the present conditions of the station. The conduct of the men as a whole is very good, and they are treated very well.

43. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction existing among the men owing to the present conditions of the police?—No.

44. Have you heard of any rumour that I have a special man appointed at each district with a view of obtaining information?—The first I heard of it was from the evidence given in Dunedin.

45. But this is said to be rumoured from north to south?—I never heard it here.

MARTIN JAMES CARNEY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 70.)

Witness: I was enrolled on the 25th October, 1906, and have been in Christchurch ever since. I am one of the delegates appointed by the members of the Christchurch Force to appear before the Commission. The first thing the men advocate is an increase of 6d. a day in their pay, and that there should be a rise of 6d. a day every three years instead of every four years, as at present. It is felt that if the men started at 8s. a day there would be greater inducement to a better class of men to enter the Force. The cost of living now is much higher than it has been for some time past, and we think the rise should be given every three years. If, as the Commissioner has said, a man is qualified for promotion at the end of twelve years we think he should be worthy of his full pay at the end of three years as he would then have a good grasp of his police duties. House-allowance to married men, we think, should be increased to 1s. 6d. a day. At present it is 1s. As a married man, I am paying 11s. a week for a house just over the South Belt, on the Sydenham side, and it is not much of a house at that. I only know of one married man who is paying less than what we are asking as rent-allowance, but I believe if he could afford it he would have a better house. The rent of houses in the centres, I think, is a good deal higher than it used to be. With regard to annual leave, we ask that we should be granted an extra four days, making sixteen days in the year; and we think we should be allowed one day off in each fortnight, and that we should get Sunday off without having to apply for it. Under the present system we have to make application before getting Sunday off. Even if it were only once in every three weeks, when there are sufficient men available, it would be a great advantage to get a Sunday off, and it should not be less than every four weeks. As to the extra holidays in the year, I would say that during the Government gazetted holidays some of the men have to work overtime, and they get nothing for it. And then again, we have to take our holidays at the slack time of the year, and not when most other people are taking their holiday. Considering the fact that the men have to work at night in all weathers, I think it is reasonable that they should get sixteen days' holiday in the year, so that they may go away and have a spell, more especially at a time when they may not feel very well. We also think, when a constable who has been on duty all night has to attend the Court next morning, he should be allowed time off. In some of the Australian States if a man who has been on night duty has to appear in Court the next morning against some drunk he has arrested he gets from one hour and a half to two hours off duty the next night. It is nearly 6 a.m. before a night-duty man gets to bed, and he has to appear in Court at 9.30, so that I think our request is reasonable. Then, we think we should be allowed free passes on the railway when on our annual leave, or some concession similar to that granted to the railway employees. We have to do duty connected with the Railway Department, and even when on leave we are liable to be called upon at any time for duty. I understand most of the employees of the other branches of the service get some concessions when travelling on leave. We also ask to be supplied with free uniform. The cost, on the average, is about £2 5s. And we think we should be supplied with one pair of boots a year. We are under the same Minister as the warders in the gaols, and they receive fifteen days' annual leave, and get every second Sunday off, as well as every second Saturday afternoon off. Every warder gets two uniforms and two pairs of boots a year. They also get £30 a year house-allowance as compared with our £18 5s. a year. As to their pay, I believe it runs a little higher than our own. Then, we ask that a coat suitable for cold weather should be supplied to the men, in place of the mackintosh supplied at present, and which does not keep the men warm. I am told also the mackintosh is injurious to health if one is perspiring at all. The present coats tend to hamper a constable when he is effecting an arrest, and we think it is not necessary to wear the cape on a fine day, more especially if it happened to be windy. A coat similar to those worn by the tramway men would be very acceptable. We suggest that an electric lamp be supplied in place of the present night-duty lamp. Not only is the present lamp injurious to health, on account of the fumes and heat on one's back, but no matter how careful one may be, the oil will leak out. Also, when a constable is arresting a violent prisoner, if he falls on his back the lamp may cause him an injury which might be the cause of his having to leave the service. We consider, also, that saloon passages ought to be allowed to men when on transfer. At present the constable has to go into the steerage with a class of men, probably, that a constable should not be with. And when we are escorting a prisoner, I think some arrangement ought to be made with the Union Steamship Company to allot us some suitable place for our prisoner. The stewards have usually been very good in doing what they can in the matter, but I think arrangements should be made by the Department for a steerage cabin for the prisoner. It is suggested that the helmet might be substituted for the present headgear of the Force. I have seen the helmet worn in Australia, and I think they afford more protection from

the sun and rain than the present shako. With regard to the regulation by which single men have to be in bed by 11 o'clock, I understand that if they wish to be out later they must apply for leave before 5 o'clock that evening. If, therefore, they go to the theatre or a dance, and want to take a girl home, or anything of that sort afterwards, they run the risk of being reported if they get in late, unless they have applied. The men also object to the sergeant coming into their cubicles at 11 o'clock with his lamp to see if they are in bed. They say it is of no use going to bed before 11 if the sergeant is allowed to come round and wake them up just when they are comfortably asleep. Then, the married men want to be allowed to go home in plain clothes, and this is a sore grievance with them. They are in uniform for twelve hours in the day. When they leave off duty it would be simply a matter of changing their coat and putting on a hat instead of the shako, and they could go and do any little business, or see anybody. Under the present system they have to go home to change their clothes if they want to do any private business, and they have to go home again to get into uniform. I would ask the Commission to give especial attention to this grievance. It is true some of the married men might not avail themselves of the right to wear plain clothes, but they think the right should be given in case they require it. With regard to the gymnasium, I heard the Commissioner say that it was never used in Auckland, but I think, as a constable has no opportunity of joining in any outdoor sport such as cricket or football, they should have a gymnasium where they can enjoy themselves, and keep themselves in form, and get physical exercise. That is all I have to bring before you, sir.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I understand the matters you have mentioned are not grievances, but merely some suggested alterations?—That is so. Up to this time we have not had an opportunity of bringing them forward as a body.

2. How often do you have an arrest during night duty which would cause your attendance in Court in the morning?—Sometimes it might be three or four in a week, and at other times we might not have more than one in a month.

3. It does not occur every day, or every second day or third day?—I should not like to express an opinion.

4. Do you think a constable would be likely to turn a blind eye to an offence if that occurred?—I do not know. But I would like to say for myself that on several occasions when I have had to appear in Court in the morning I have been granted time off.

5. You say you are paying 11s. a week for rent. Do you know that in a few years you would be entitled to a station?—I do not know about that. The position is that if a single man who is living at the barracks and who joined three months before me happens to get married he would be more entitled to a station than I am.

Mr. Dinnie: That may be; but I am just showing you that you have something to look forward to.

6. *Inspector Gillies.*] With regard to Sunday leave: provided there is the full complement of men at the station, have you ever known less than seven or eight men to be allowed off on Sunday?—I think that is so.

7. You know that we have been shorthanded occasionally?—Yes.

8. And, notwithstanding that, there have always been from seven to eight men off on Sundays?—I have never counted them up, but there have been a fair number.

9. If more men were allowed off, would the public be getting fair treatment?—I do not think the number doing duty should be lessened. We are not complaining of the administration here in any way, but we think that some arrangement might be made to give us more Sunday leave, so that we can have it regularly without application.

10. Would that not entail an increase in the number of men, unless the duty is to be neglected?—That is so.

JUSTIN ERIC MCCARTHY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 71.)

Witness: I am a constable, at present performing the duties of assistant district clerk in Christchurch. Was enrolled on the 1st November, 1906. I am delegated to represent the uniform branch of this city. I have no complaints to bring forward, but the question of pay seems to be the greatest item of trouble in the Force. They think constables should start at 8s. a day. The two former delegates considered that we should rise by increments of 6d. a day every three years. Well, I and others I have been speaking to think it should be 6d. every two years, so that the maximum salary would be attained at the expiration of eight years. At the present time a constable starting at 7s. 6d. a day takes sixteen years to reach the maximum of 9s. 6d. Now, a young apprentice in a trade can become a journeyman in five years, and can participate in a journeyman's wage of, say, 10s. 6d. a day, and we think it would be a fair thing to allow us to reach our maximum in eight years. With regard to house-allowance, I should say a married constable has to pay on an average 12s. 6d. a week. I know of one who pays 15s., and another 16s. A constable has to live in a good locality, and I think it should be ascertained where every constable is going to reside. A gaol warder receives £30 a year house-allowance, while the constable receives only £18 5s. Another reason why we think constables should receive more pay is that he is compelled to work on public holidays, and on such occasions as, say, the Christchurch Exhibition it is impossible for him to get away on account of the great rush of work. And as regards Sunday duty, men in other services, such as the Tramway service for instance, if they are called upon for Sunday duty, get paid double time or time and a half, while the policeman receives his 7s. 6d. a day the same as usual. We ask that we should get an extra four days' leave a year, making sixteen days in all. The warders in the gaols get eighteen days a year, and every second Sunday off, as well as every second Saturday afternoon, I believe. They also get all the gazetted public holidays. We also think we should get free uniform. The average cost of making up, which is about £2 5s., is a very big item to us. As against that, the men in the gaols receive two suits a year

free, I believe, and two pairs of boots. We ask that we should be supplied with one pair of boots a year; and a policeman must be very much harder on boots than the gaol warders. We also ask that we should be given one night off during our fortnight's night duty. In the winter time particularly night duty is very severe on the men, and a night off would be a great boon to them, and would allay any little discontent that there might be as regards night duty. As to Sunday leave, I would advocate that it should be given to the men in turn without their having to apply for it. I agree with the previous witness that the present mackintosh should be abolished, and, apart from the fact that it does not keep one warm, I will quote an instance as to how it hampers a constable in the performance of his duty. A constable in this town on one occasion when effecting an arrest was attacked, and in the struggle his cape was pulled over his head, and three of his ribs were broken. The present shako, while it has its advantages, certainly does enable the wet in rainy weather to run down the forehead and gain an entry at the neck. I have not had much experience of it myself, but I have seen the patent-leather helmet used in Victoria. It is waterproof, and appears to be satisfactory in the winter time, but I do not know how it would affect one in the summer. I agree that it would be desirable to substitute an electric lamp for the present oil-lamp that is in use. When the lamp is more than half-full—and it must be filled when you go on your beat—if you increase your pace, or happen to slip, the oil runs out through the little air-hole in the lamp, and gets on to your clothes, and when the dust gets on that you are in a pretty pickle. The night-duty coat would last very much longer, and its appearance be improved, if that lamp could be improved. With regard to the question of railway passes, I can assure the Commission that the withholding of these passes is a universal grievance with the men. After their twelve months' continuous work, when they have to go away on a holiday they should be given free passes, more especially as they are practically on duty all the time. To quote an instance: There is the case of a constable who was travelling, and had paid his own fare. Between Dunedin and Port Chalmers about two years ago a man jumped from the train between the carriages, and was cut to pieces, and the constable, having been appealed to by the guard, was in duty bound to go and give a hand. I think if a constable is liable to be called upon for duty at any moment like that, in the interests of the Railway Department, it is worth their while to give him some concession, however small. If there is a row in one of the second-class carriages and a constable happens to be there on a holiday, he is the victim. And when a constable is travelling on transfer by steamer, or is on escort duty, it is not altogether pleasant for him to have to mix up with some of the people who are in the steerage. When he is returning by boat it may happen that he has to occupy a bed alongside one of the men he has had in the lock-up. Then, there certainly seems to be a complaint on the part of the men owing to their having to be in bed by 11 o'clock at night. It is true that in Christchurch, if you apply for it, you can get late leave pretty well every night of the week, provided you state why you want it; but in Dunedin we could only get it twice a week. Referring to the gymnasium which has been advocated, we do not want the Government to go to a large expense in putting up an elaborate gymnasium. In my opinion, if we had a suitable room, provided with a wrestling-mat, it would go a long way towards giving the men exercise. With regard to Mr. Dinnie's remarks as to the Auckland gymnasium being very little used, I would suggest that might be due to climatic conditions in Auckland, as on account of the warmer climate the men would not be so inclined to go in for heavy exercise; but here the men seem to be very partial to it. Even on the asphalt down here you see the men tackling one another. Others have spoken on the subject of having to appear in Court occasionally after night duty, and it has been my personal experience to attend on three consecutive mornings after night duty, and it is not pleasant to have to break your sleep. With regard to other matters, I indorse what the previous delegates have placed before you. I may say personally, with regard to the coffee-can which has been handed to you, that in Dunedin these were dealt out, and I carried one for some four or five months, and there is no doubt, if one has an opportunity of taking them on to the beat, they are a great boon. The drawback is that the lamp underneath can be lighted only once, and that is when the tin is full. If you want to light it a second time—say, at about 3 o'clock in the morning, when the tin is about half full—the solder will melt, and it runs down. Apart from this, they are a great boon.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How is it that only one man uses it in Christchurch if it is such a boon?—Perhaps they have not been exhibited here as they have been in Dunedin. Of course, it is rather a big item to carry about when it is full.

2. Surely any constable can find some corner in which he can place it?—Well, when there are small boys about, and they see a policeman looking into a corner, they must go and see what he has been after.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service owing to the present control?—I cannot say that I do.

4. If such did exist you would be likely to know of it?—Yes.

5. Have you heard any rumour at any time during your service that I had a special man in each district with a view to getting information?—I have no knowledge of it.

6. Do you believe it to be the case?—I do not.

7. If you had heard it stated that such was the case would you have repeated it publicly?—No.

8. *The Commissioner.*] What is the average cost to each constable of messing?—The cost in Christchurch is considerably higher than in Dunedin. The average in Dunedin would be about £2 12s. 6d., and in Christchurch about £3; but in Christchurch we employ a waiter and in Dunedin they do not? In Dunedin, also, they go in for a Chinese cook, which makes a difference.

9. How long have you been in the district office?—Seven or eight months.

10. Did you seek it yourself?—I applied for it.

11. Do you prefer that to ordinary uniform work?—I do.

12. On what ground?—The conditions are more favourable.

13. But having regard to your future in the service?—Well, personally I am more favourably inclined to clerical work.

14. Might you not as well be out of the Force, then?—No; I have always worked hard in the Force, and take a great interest in it.

15. Do you know that the district office is a position much sought after?—Yes, I believe there was keen competition for it when I was appointed.

16. Is there any reason why the men in the district office should not do a little outside work occasionally?—Well, personally, I am not permanently a district clerk. If I were I should consider I had a grievance if I were put on the street.

17. Even if you were asked to do occasional Sunday duty?—Yes; because I look upon it to some extent as promotion when a constable is put into plain clothes in the office.

18. He gets 1s. a day extra, and has only five and a half days' work, and he has no night duty?—That is so.

19. Is that what you mean by promotion?—Yes; and, apart from that, a man requires to possess a little more than the ordinary ability to fill that position; and I think if I am considered fit for that work I should have preference as regards promotion; and personally I cannot see why I should be placed on a level with the uniform man, who is content to walk about the streets.

20. Perhaps he is not content. What do you look forward to in that position as regards rank?—I have not studied the question seriously from that point of view. I have not looked so far forward yet as ranking as a sergeant, but if I go on and rise to 9s. 6d. a day I am not getting a bad salary. When I get a permanent footing in the office I may look forward a little further perhaps.

21. Are you not all the time getting out of touch, to a certain extent, with the uniform branch of the service?—I do not think so. All the routine of the service is constantly before me, and I should say it rather fitted me for the higher branches.

22. Is there any difficulty about the work in the office—any more than an intelligent man can do with a certain amount of education?—I think there are a good many of the uniform men who could do the work if they set their minds to it and enlightened themselves a bit with regard to it.

23. Do you think it would be a good thing for constables to take their turn in the district office, so as to qualify themselves for stations, and so forth, or do you think it is better that a man once in the office should be always in the office?—Personally, I think it would be a difficult thing to try and train any large number of the men into the work of the office. I think a man would require to be in the office a couple of years in order to get a thorough grip of the work.

24. The system is not a difficult one at the present time?—No; but one requires a good deal of experience.

25. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have simply been in the office from time to time relieving while others have been away?—Yes.

26. You have drawn no extra pay?—No.

27. How long have you been working in the district office altogether?—This last time has run me into about three months.

28. Do you think in twelve months you would have thoroughly learned the duties of the district office?—No.

29. You know there are three departments: do you think it would take you twelve months to learn all the routine of the first department which you are in now?—It might take me that.

30. Would you then be efficient?—I dare say there might be some things I could be told then.

31. How long would it take you to become efficient in the next stage?—Well, the work there is so much above my present stage that I could not pretend to estimate it.

32. Could you get six men in this district on street duty who are capable of doing the work of assistant clerk in the office?—I could not name them.

33. You know very well that the work in that district office is enormous?—Yes, there is a lot of work to be done.

34. Could you get a better training for an advanced position than in that district office?—I do not think so.

WEDNESDAY, 28TH JULY, 1909.

EDWARD MCKAY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 72.)

Witness: I am stationed at Rangiora. I was enrolled in 1877, and was promoted sergeant in 1894. Since then I have been stationed at different places. I have been at Rangiora for a year and a half, having been transferred there from Mount Cook, Wellington. From my experience, I consider the pay in the Force is not sufficient to enable one to keep up to the required standard, as we are supposed to go about in more decent style than the ordinary run of men, and to keep ourselves in such a way that the pay is not sufficient for. I have free quarters at Rangiora.

1. *The Commissioner.*] The position of sergeant in charge of a country district is better than that of one on the beat?—I would not say that, for the reason that, although the beat is pretty constant work, the man in charge of a country district has longer hours, and is more liable to be called up at all times of the night.

2. What was your experience of the difference between rent in the city when allowed ordinary house-allowance and your present position?—It varies in different towns, rent being very much higher in Wellington than the other four centres.

3. How much more did you pay in Wellington than your allowance?—I was allowed £1 for quarters; the house rented by the Department was £1 a week, and the rent of the house was £1 7s. 6d.

4. What is your opinion in regard to the general efficiency of the Force at present as compared with your previous experience?—We have not the same class of men coming into the Force.

5. Do you mean physically, morally, or intellectually?—I do not think we have the same stamp of men altogether.

6. Although they are up to the standard?—Yes; I would not say they were intellectually up to previous standards in point of general intelligence.

7. Have you noticed anything in regard to the conduct, sobriety, and morality of the men?—I have not noticed anything wrong.

8. Do you know of any general feeling of dissatisfaction on account of promotions?—I can only speak personally; I have felt it so; others have been promoted over me, and I have been placed under them to do duty, which I naturally felt to be hard.

9. What men have been promoted over you?—Inspector Mitchell is junior to me—he was promoted sergeant at the same time as I was; Sub-Inspector Dwyer is my junior—I was sergeant for some considerable time before him; Inspector O'Donovan is junior to me—I was sergeant before him; Sub-Inspector Norwood is my junior both as sergeant and in the service; Sub-Inspector McGrath is junior to me in the service; and Station Sergeant King is my junior both in rank and service. There are others who are junior to me in service but not in rank. I can only suppose they were overlooked when I got promotion.

10. You have a general feeling of injustice over your treatment?—Yes.

11. Do you know of any reason for your being passed over?—No.

12. Is there anything in your police history that would justify it?—I do not know of anything that would keep me back.

13. Had the Nelson affair anything to do with it?—Perhaps.

14. From your knowledge of the men promoted over you, having regard to their efficiency in the Force and the merits of the position, do you consider yourself as well qualified as they?—I do. I consider myself as capable as they are.

15. When did your feeling of injustice first begin to affect you?—When I found that Inspector Mitchell was promoted to Sub-Inspector and then to Inspector. I thought that was a high jump, considering I had no advancement.

16. Have you ever reported your dissatisfaction to the Department?—No.

17. Have you ever used political influence?—No.

18. Do you know of its use in any direction except by rumour?—No, not of my own personal knowledge.

19. Have you ever been offered promotion?—No.

20. When the rank of station sergeant was instituted, were you offered promotion?—No.

21. Was it ever suggested to you that you could have promotion if you applied?—No.

22. How old are you?—Fifty-three.

23. You were much younger when the case of Inspector Mitchell occurred?—Yes.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Inspector Mitchell, Sub-Inspector Dwyer, and Inspector O'Donovan were promoted before I took charge?—Yes.

25. *The Commissioner.*] How about the other station sergeants besides King?—I do not mention them, because they have prior service to me, though I was promoted before them. I was their senior as sergeant, but not in the service.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you say promotion should go by seniority alone?—No.

27. Why were you transferred from Wellington?—I made a request to yourself, I believe, to get some quiet station, as I had been injured.

28. Did not your Inspector report on your conduct for some time past at Wellington?—The only intimation I had of that was when I was before you with the Inspector. As to his reports, I did not see any.

29. Were the files not referred to you?—Not so far as I recollect. There was no report against my conduct. What was the conduct?

30. Were you not transferred here because you had not performed your duty satisfactorily in Wellington?—Not that I know of. When I was in front of you Inspector Ellison said I did not keep the supervision over the district he thought I would.

31. He was not satisfied with your conduct?—I asked him the question whether the Mount Cook district was not in a better state than when I came, and he said Yes, it was. If that was so, there could have been no neglect on my part.

32. Did he not say that at first you did your duty well, but of late years you had not done it as satisfactorily as it had been done by another sergeant?—Yes; but I might mention when I went there they increased the area of the district from what it had been; so if I was remiss, why did they place extra duty on me in the district? I must have been competent, or they would not have extended my district.

33. Your feeling is simply a personal one?—Yes.

34. There is not a general feeling of dissatisfaction amongst the members of the Force?—I do not say there is. I do not undertake other people's complaints.

35. You are not aware of any?—Only from rumour.

36. *The Commissioner.*] You mean in regard to promotion?—Yes.

37. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You do not believe in promotion being entirely on a seniority basis?—Not altogether.

38. *The Commissioner.*] All other things being equal, seniority should be taken into consideration?—Yes.

39. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards candidates for the Force, you know the standard has been raised the last few years?—Yes.

40. Therefore the men would naturally be more intellectual than before?—Well, some are and some are not.

41. But all are qualified to pass the Fifth Standard?—Yes; I think those who were not were not taken on.

42. You know they pass an examination when they enter the depot and another before leaving it?—Yes.

43. And are two months in training?—Somewhere about that.

44. You had a free house in Wellington, rented by the Department?—The Department paid £1 and I paid 7s. 6d. in addition, prior to having purchased one myself.

45. It was because you wanted to live in a certain house that the arrangement was come to?—I bought a house, and went to live in it. I am receiving £1 7s. 6d. for it now, though I let the Department have it for £1.

46. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion in regard to a period of probation on which constables should be placed prior to being finally enrolled as members of the Force?—I think they should be placed on probation after coming out of the depot for six months. It would be to the advantage of the Force.

47. It would be more difficult to get rid of them after enrolment than during probation?—Yes.

48. You think insufficiency of pay is the principal matter in keeping men back from enrolling?—Yes; because a common labourer gets 8s., and works only eight hours. A policeman's time is never done. I have often worked fifteen to seventeen hours a day myself. That cannot be altered, because on country stations it is necessary it should be so. A man undertakes that when he goes there.

49. Is the position of station sergeant sought after by the outside sergeants?—I never sought after it; they think it is an advancement in pay. There is one thing I should like to mention. I have been transferred very often, and I think it is hard for a man with a grown-up family that they should only be allowed a second-class passage by steamer. Let him go steerage, but do not make him pay the difference between steerage and saloon for his family. No man should be asked to put his family into the steerage. I have had to pay very considerably over this. I think when a man is transferred his family should be allowed first-class fare. There is another matter which I consider an injustice. Detectives are allowed 8s. a day when they travel, while sergeants and constables only get 6s. There are places where the charge for board is more than 6s. Speaking personally, I have been refunded the amount of my actual expenses, but the thing is we are placed on a different basis from detectives, and perhaps a man with only nine years' service is getting 8s., while a man with twenty years' is only getting 6s.

50. Is there any reason why detectives should be allowed more? Are they put to extra expense?—I do not see it. I have travelled with them, and have had to make the same inquiries as they.

Mr. Dinnie.] How often have you been transferred within the last six years?—Only once.

WILLIAM JAMES WHATMAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 73.)

Witness: I am stationed at Little River.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is the date of your enrolment?—That is what I came to speak about. I do not agree with the date of my enrolment. I wish to bring before the Commission the position of district constables. Some have joined as district constables, who have afterwards been admitted into the Force.

2. How long were you district constable before you were enrolled?—A year and nine months. I was enrolled in February, 1896. I was sworn in by Inspector Broham, and appointed district constable at Cheviot. My duties were the same as any constable with five or ten years' service in charge of a station.

3. You think, as a matter of common justice, your service as district constable should be allowed to count?—Yes. The work is more onerous and responsible than that of a constable who has just joined. The Department practically had a trial of one year and nine months before I was admitted permanently.

4. Was there no break between your service as district constable and your permanent appointment?—No; I came directly into the Force.

5. Have you ever applied to be enrolled as a regular constable?—The reason I applied was that the work was too severe for the money paid—£50 a year. There are forty men on the list who are above me, but who joined after me, and who have had less service counting my district service. During Mr. Tunbridge's time I made application, after joining the Force, for that time to be allowed. My application was declined, without any reason being given. I spoke to Mr. Dinnie, and from what he said I gather he thought I was entitled to some consideration. Since I have been in the Force I have received the utmost consideration from my superior officers, and I have no other complaint to make. There is a question I should like to bring up: whether some allowance should be made to constables in charge of country stations who provide their own horses. I provide my own horse and a bike. The Department treat my horse the same as the Government horses, and allow free fodder, shoeing, and cover.

6. Is that the regular rule?—Some time ago the Government found the horses. After that they introduced a better system, any man who wishes finding his own horse.

7. What advantage is that to him?—It is his own, and he can drive it and use it as he likes. I prefer this system, but it is a question whether some small allowance should not be made for deterioration and risk of accident in the Government service.

8. What is the value of your horse?—I have had two, one worth £40, and the one I have now about £20.

9. How long does a horse last?—I have had mine for about three years; it is not worth so much now.

10. Have you had much work of your own out of it?—Practically none.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you bailiff in the district?—Yes.

12. Do you not use your horse for that work?—Yes.

13. *The Commissioner.*] That makes a great difference?—But would I not use a Government horse for the same work?

14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The Government would not find you in a horse, and give you 1s. a mile?—I believe that is the custom.

15. Do you know the system now is for the men to find their own horses, and to receive a certain amount per annum?—I did not know that. I know a circular was issued some years ago, but I never heard of it since.

16. Were you not permitted, when district constable, to carry on a business of your own?—Yes; but I was in charge of a large district, and it took the whole of my time.

17. That was the reason, perhaps, your time was not counted?—I do not know what the reason was; perhaps I did not make my application as clear as I might have done.

18. If your whole time had been devoted to police duties, and you had been paid a regular salary, would you not have been contributing more towards your pension?—The duties are more responsible than those of an ordinary constable in town.

19. But if this period were allowed to count for general service, it would mean you were not contributing according to the service you rendered to the general fund?—I would be quite prepared to do so.

20. But you did not contribute?—No.

21. *The Commissioner.*] Have you ever considered at all the question of promotion? Are you ambitious?—If I were offered promotion I should probably refuse it. I reckon I am better off as I am. I am married, with no children.

22. You prefer being in a satisfactory country station to promotion on street duty?—Yes.

23. Is that the opinion in the Force generally?—Judging from sergeants who have been promoted, they seem to be sorry they took promotion. I can understand men with large families whom they want to bring into town being anxious for promotion.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say some sergeants are sorry they have accepted promotion?—That is the opinion I have formed.

25. Do you know of any sergeant who has said so? You know they are only two or three years on the street before they get charge of a station as sergeant?—They do not seem particularly pleased with the change at first.

26. *The Commissioner.*] How old are you?—Forty-two.

WILLIAM FOUHY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 74.)

Witness. I am stationed at Ashburton. I was enrolled in 1882, being transferred from the Armed Constabulary. I was promoted sergeant in 1902.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views in regard to promotion?—I have nothing to say. I am quite satisfied, and have no sense of having suffered injustice.

2. Can you express any opinion as to the physique and general intelligence of the men now as compared with years ago?—They have gone back a good bit.

3. In what direction principally?—In physique, and also a bit in intelligence.

4. If they pass the test they are not up to the old standard?—No.

5. To what do you attribute this?—I think principally owing to the pay being too small to induce the best class of man.

6. The conditions of the Force are not attractive?—No.

7. That has caused a general deterioration?—Yes.

8. The remedy would be increase of pay?—Yes, the only one I know of; and a little more vigilance being exercised in selection.

9. But there are inducements in the police which there are not in other walks of life?—The cost of living is a great deal, and the pay is not in proportion.

10. A single man gets free quarters?—Yes; but a man's prospects are a good deal limited, and he is tied down.

11. You think the pay is the main trouble?—Yes; if the pay were better, you would get better men to select from.

12. Do young men ever ask you any questions in regard to admission to the Force?—Very seldom. I have spoken myself to some, and they do not seem very keen, for some reason. I know a case in which a man who has passed all the requirements was called on to report himself, but he did not go; he had engaged in other business.

13. What is the general conduct of the Force now as compared with years gone by?—I do not think they have gone back at all, but they have not the same energy as policemen used to have. The general conduct is fairly good.

14. Is the discipline as good as it used to be?—Fully.

15. The Force is well governed and controlled?—As well as ever it was, if not a little better.

16. Do you know of any political influence?—It is supposed to exist. It is not easy to put one's finger on a thing of that sort. One assumes a good deal that does not come out. A man may suspect another man of having got influence.

17. In what way would the influence be used?—Through members of Parliament, reaching Ministers personally; that is only surmise, of course.

18. You know of no instance?—I have suspected a few.
19. In cases of men being advanced over the heads of others?—Yes.
20. There being nothing in the particular merits of the case which would afford another explanation?—Yes.
21. Seniority cannot always count?—No.
22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have no cause for complaint?—No.
23. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction existing in the Force owing to the present control?—No.
24. It is principally in regard to the pay?—Yes; that is the root of all the dissatisfaction.
25. Do you know there have been certain changes and improvements in the Force during my time?—Yes.
26. As regards candidates for enrolment, can you say anything as regards inquiries now as compared with those made previously?—They are much more strict now. If you slip anything at all, the correspondence is sent back to you, and you have to find out about almost every day of a man's history.
27. You have had a good number through your hands?—Yes.
28. You think the inquiries are sufficient?—I do not see how they could be increased or improved; every hour of a man's life is inquired into, and often after a man is accepted a second inquiry is made.
29. You know a system of classes has been adopted in the cities enabling men to get a good knowledge of their duties?—I believe so.
30. You know a system of drill has been adopted?—Yes.
31. And a finger-print system organized?—Yes.
32. You think with an increase of pay a better selection of men could be made?—There would be a greater number to select from.
33. In regard to promotions, do you agree with me that seniority cannot always count by itself—you must study efficiency?—Yes.
34. Have you heard anything about my having a special man in each district as a sort of scout?—Never, till this Commission started.
35. Do you believe it?—Not in Canterbury, at any rate.
36. The discipline now is equally strict with that in days gone by?—Yes.
37. *The Commissioner.*] Are you in favour of a period of probation before final enrolment?—Yes; six months; till they get some idea of what a man is. I think twelve months would be too long.

JOHN GILLESPIE, Constable, further examined. (No. 75.)

The Commissioner: In regard to the case of Constable Hammond, it seems to me the whole of the evidence in this case is contained in the papers. I have read the Commissioner's memorandum. I do not want to express any opinion on the matter. If I differ from you it is a mere difference of opinion in regard to the way in which the matter was treated, but there is nothing to be gained by threshing it out now. I asked Constable Gillespie why he brought the matter up, and he said because he considered there has been a miscarriage of justice—that instead of the matter being dealt with departmentally Constable Hammond should have been prosecuted for perjury.

Mr. Dinnie: You saw the circular I issued immediately afterwards?

The Commissioner: Yes; you said in future cases of the same sort would result in prosecution.

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, I have reason to believe it has been done elsewhere.

The Commissioner: The only question is whether that was the wisest and best way to deal with the matter, seeing that there was *prima facie* evidence of a technical offence, and whether it would not have been well to let the law deal with it. But I do not see why Constable Gillespie should be the mover in a matter of this sort.

Mr. Dinnie: I did not see the probability of a conviction.

The Commissioner: But that is not a question for the Commissioner of Police. If every case were waived on that hypothesis, it would be usurping the functions of the jury.

Constable Gillespie: Do you think my action was wrong?

The Commissioner: I am not expressing any opinions about it. But I do not see now what benefit will result to the service, or any individual, by going into the matter beyond what is contained in the papers. I will read the Commissioner's minute. I am bound to give publicity to the matter, because you gave it publicity in the south. The Commissioner says:—

“Police Department, Wellington, 18th July, 1907.—The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—I have to submit, for your information and consideration, the following facts in respect to the action of Constable Hammond in making a false affidavit in respect to the service of a civil summons. It appears that on the 1st instant Mr. Michael Scannell, of Coal Creek, Temuka, complained by letter to the Clerk of the Court, Temuka, that a charge of 10s. for the service of a summons on him had been made, whereas the summons had not been served personally on him, but given to his daughter at Pleasant Point. As a result, he was interviewed, and stated that on the 18th June his daughter Margaret handed him a summons at Coal Creek, which she said had been given her at Pleasant Point by Constable Hammond to hand to him. Margaret Scannell, the daughter, says, on the 18th June Constable Hammond accosted her at Pleasant Point Railway-station when she was returning from school at Timaru, and handed her a letter for her father; that she took it home, and gave it to him. She also remembers seeing the constable a week previously at her home at Coal Creek, when he asked her if her father was at home, and she told him he was not; but the constable did not say what he wanted. Constable T. F. Hammond, stationed

at Pleasant Point, says that on the 12th ultimo he went to Coal Creek to serve two summonses: one he served personally, and as regards the other, which was for service on Mr. Scannell, he ascertained from Margaret Scannell that her father was away from home, and he, in consequence, could not serve it, but returned it for enlargement. That he subsequently saw Mr. Scannell at Pleasant Point, and told him he had been to his residence with a civil summons, but finding he was absent, had returned the summons for enlargement. That on the 18th ultimo he saw Mr. Scannell's daughter at Pleasant Point Railway-station, and gave her the summons—enlarged—in an envelope to hand to her father, which she promised to do, and that he saw her subsequently, when she told him she had given it to her father; that he made the annexed affidavit of service on 20th ultimo (in which he swore the summons was served personally on defendant), believing that as defendant knew the summons had been issued and was returned for enlargement, that his daughter said she had delivered it to him, the service was tantamount to personal service, and the 10s. charged as mileage was incurred through his visit to defendant's house on 12th ultimo. Now, I cannot believe that any constable is ignorant enough to consider that such service as described herein is personal service; the wording of the affidavit is so explicit (*vide* following copy): 'I, T. F. Hammond, constable, of Pleasant Point, do hereby swear that I served the within named Michael Scannell with a summons, a true copy of which is within written marked A, together with a copy of the statement of claim hereunto annexed marked B *by delivering the same to him personally, at Pleasant Point*, on Tuesday, 18th day of June, 1907.—T. F. HAMMOND, Signature of deponent.—Sworn at Pleasant Point, this 20th day of June, 1907, before me—JOHN CRAWFORD, J.P.' Printed on the margin of affidavit are the following directions: 'If summons served *otherwise than personally state precise mode of service.*' The action of the constable is serious and inexcusable, and must be dealt with in a severe manner. I do not think that a prosecution for perjury would result in a conviction under the circumstances, as I cannot conclude it was wilful and corrupt perjury. We have a precedent in which a constable was prosecuted, but the result was that the bill was ignored by the grand jury, the constable dismissed from the service, and subsequently granted compassionate allowance by the Government. The complainant desires that no notice be taken of his complaint, and the mileage charge of 10s. made was justifiable, as the constable had been to Coal Creek to serve the summons. Under all the circumstances, and subject to approval, I will fine the constable £1, and remove him from charge of a station.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police.—Appd.—M.J., 19/7/07.

"Inspector Gillies.—This constable has been treated somewhat leniently, considering the seriousness of his offence. I fear this is not the only instance in which similar action is resorted to by constables, although not brought to light as in this instance. I intend issuing a circular on the subject. Please have Constable Hammond transferred to Timaru, and replaced by Constable Collins (911) if you consider him suitable for the post.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 20/7/07.

"Sub-Inspector Green.—For Constable Hammond to see and note.—R. E. GILLIES, Inspector, 22/7/07.

"Inspector Gillies.—Note and return.—W. GREEN, Sub-Inspector, 25/7/07.

"Respectfully noted.—T. F. HAMMOND, Constable No. 702, 24/9/07."

The Commissioner: The Commissioner evidently appreciated the seriousness of the offence, and the only point on which we could join issue is as to whether his action was right and proper.

Constable Gillespie: The facts as stated are not altogether correct: Scannell informed me repeatedly that Hammond had not been seen about his place at any time.

Mr. Dinnie: The girl was there alone.

Constable Gillespie: But her father says that was not so.

The Commissioner: That is beside the question. I cannot conceive that a constable who appreciated the fact that he had committed a serious crime would persist in claiming an amount for mileage to which he was not entitled.

Constable Gillespie: I should like to state that since the affair happened the constable has cast a reflection on me as being the cause of his removal. I may say I have no hostile feeling towards him. I never had an unpleasant word with him or a grievance against him. But, seeing so much had been said about the matter in the district, I thought it my duty to place the documents before you for investigation.

The Commissioner: It seems clear to me, in your capacity as Clerk of the Court, this summons coming under your notice as not being properly served, you would have been lacking in the proper exercise of your duty if you had not drawn attention to the fact. So far as you are concerned, you were perfectly within your rights, and were doing your duty properly in drawing attention to it. But that has nothing to do with the ultimate issue of the inquiry to-day. There is ample *prima facie* evidence of the committal of an offence, and the only point at issue is whether the constable was dealt with in the proper way. He was dealt with in a certain way, and punished. There is nothing on his defaulter's sheet except that. This having been dealt with, and the Commissioner having recommended a course of action which was approved by the Minister, it only remains for me to say whether I should consider that was the most judicial treatment. You do not want the man prosecuted now?

Constable Gillespie: I should be sorry to see it.

The Commissioner: I never remember any case in which I could say a constable has deliberately made a false affidavit, but I have seen affidavits made by constables which I knew were not legally and perfectly correct. I am not prepared to labour the matter any further. The mere fact of the publicity is a certain amount of punishment to the constable, apart from the way he was dealt with. There is a matter in regard to the evidence given by you in Timaru. Mr. Twomey has taken exception to that evidence. He was only brought into it by the correspondence.

Constable Gillespie: I explained that to Mr. Twomey.

The Commissioner: What, then, is his grievance?

Constable Gillespie: He is always looking for a grievance.

The Commissioner: He writes: "Excuse me for saying that where the names of private citizens are dragged into the inquiry you are holding at the present time by malicious policemen, I think such private citizens should be invited to attend. In some cases you would not allow the inquiry to proceed without the persons affected being present, yet you allowed Constable Gillespie, of Temuka, to state that Messrs. Phillips, Aspinall, and Twomey conspired to induce Mr. Herapath to report him (Gillespie). This is an atrocious falsehood." I want to emphasize the fact that I am under no obligation in the order of reference to give notice to private individuals—I am only under an obligation to give notice to members of the Force where they are affected. I have given notice in one instance to a private individual, but I specified my reason—because he was a member of Parliament, and therefore to a certain extent a public man. The Commission is quite clear on the point. I presume the instance Mr. Twomey refers to is my refusal to go into the case of Hammond till he had notice. I wish to emphasize the difference between private individuals and members of the Force. "Mr. Aspinall and myself are ready to swear that we never spoke to each other on the Herapath incident until we saw the report of Constable Gillespie's evidence in the paper. We have now no remedy except to follow you to Christchurch, at our expense, and tender evidence. Will you kindly cause a copy of Mr. Herapath's complaint and also a copy of my own letter to the Minister to be supplied to me? I think that under the circumstances I am entitled to this courtesy at your hands. I never used any political influence to remove Constable Gillespie, and, though his conduct towards myself has been atrocious, not a single line has appeared in the local papers of which I am proprietor and editor to the detriment of Constable Gillespie. The fact is that Constable Gillespie's malicious temperament sometimes clouds his reasoning faculties; that is as mild and charitable as I could put it. By forwarding me copies of the letters I refer to you will oblige." I want to make it clear that I am not going to allow this Commission to deteriorate into a medium for the ventilation of private grievances between private citizens and the police. If I do that, I shall never get through the work which has been intrusted to my care; and if it had not been for that correspondence which you read, and which you said you had the right to read, so far as I can see Mr. Twomey would never have been brought into it.

Constable Gillespie: That is so. I may state that prior to my going to Timaru I went and saw Mr. Twomey, and told him I was going to read his letter, and I asked him to be present when I read it. He asked me not to do so, but I said it was connected with one point I had to make, and that I was going to read the letter. I told him I had nothing to say against him, but that he had better be present when I brought the matter up.

1. *The Commissioner:* You actually gave him notice that you were going to bring this matter before the Commission in Timaru?—Yes; I gave him notice two or three times. He has written scores of letters to the Government, condemning me in the most severe terms, and every one of them is a falsity.

2. So far as I know, I never saw Mr. Twomey in my life, but I certainly do object to have blame cast upon me for something for which I am not responsible. It came up on the question of political interference, and although Mr. Twomey approached the Minister there was nothing done to you?—I was cautioned.

3. The only peculiar circumstance about it is that the Minister dealt with the matter instead of the Commissioner, and you would infer that it was through Mr. Twomey interfering?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not quite follow your remark, sir, on the point that the Minister dealt with it.

The Commissioner: You will remember that the Minister put a special minute on the papers, to the effect that he was not satisfied with Constable Gillespie's conduct in respect to that incident.

Mr. Dinnie: That is from what I told him.

The Commissioner: Had you formed a different impression about it?

Mr. Dinnie: I do not think so.

The Commissioner: Unfortunately, the minute has not yet been copied into the evidence, but I can clear the matter up when I get the file.

Witness: I remember the minute perfectly well. It said that I might have acted more discreetly, and that I should have knocked at the door before entering the room. My only fault was in accidentally opening the door without knocking.

4. You evidently considered the gravamen of the matter was contained in the Minister's minute, because you say in your memo. in reply that you note the remarks of the Minister of Justice, and that you respectfully submit to the severe censure. So that it was the Minister's action and not the Commissioner's?—Yes; in fact, I looked upon it that Commissioner Dinnie had tried to shield me.

5. What are your general relations with Mr. Twomey?—During the past four years we have been on the best of terms. But when I first went to Temuka there was an opposition paper started in the township, and he wanted me not only to prosecute that man but to persecute him, and get him out of the district, and because I would not do that he began to make complaints. Of course, he could do nothing, because I have been there eleven years, and I do not think there is a man in the district who can say a word against me. Mr. Twomey has made plenty of insinuations, but he could never prove anything, whereas if I turned round I could prove a great deal as regards his reputation and character.

6. You were not concerned with his character or reputation so long as he did not commit an offence?—That is so, and therefore I did not trouble him.

7. He is a Justice of the Peace?—Yes; but owing to his drunken habits he has not sat upon the bench for several years—in fact, he is a disgrace to the list of Justices.

THOMAS FREDERICK HAMMOND, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 76.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Bingsland. I had fourteen years' service on 12th March, 1908. I was at one time in charge of Pleasant Point. I understand that when a constable has any complaint to make against another notice should be given to the man against whom the complaint is to be made. I believe some evidence has been taken from Constable Gillespie against me.

The Commissioner: No. When there is any evidence submitted which is likely to cast a reflection personally upon any one it is my duty to refrain from proceeding with the inquiry until twenty-four hours' notice has been given to the person interested, and on that ground I refused to go into the matter at Timaru.

Witness: But the thing might not have come before the Commission at all if Constable Gillespie had not taken advantage of the opportunity to make public a matter which had been dealt with over two years ago by the Department, and for which I was punished. When Constable Gillespie brought the matter up I had not the faintest idea what the complaint was, and, as a matter of fact, I have only seen the papers this morning. Now that it has been made public, I am known to the public as a man who has made a false affidavit. It places me in the position of having to speak now, and, seeing that the thing has gone so far, I would ask that the Commission rehear this matter.

The Commissioner: This is a question which, so far as the Commission is concerned, relates only to the general discipline and control of the Force, and it is not a question as between you and Constable Gillespie. The question for me is whether the action of your superior officers was in the best interests of the service or not. I will allow you to make any statement you wish on oath, but it cannot alter my view of the facts so far as the evidence on the papers is concerned.

Witness: I would like to ask Constable Gillespie a question or two. (To Constable Gillespie): Seeing that it is now over two years since this matter was first brought under the notice of the Stipendiary Magistrate, and it was dealt with by the Department; and looking to my explanation when called upon to give one; and to Sub-Inspector Green's minute on the papers, in which he says he does not consider there was any malicious intent on my part, and that I had always performed my duties in a fairly satisfactory manner; also the Commissioner's minute to the Minister, in which he says that he does not think that an action would result in a conviction for perjury under the circumstances, and that he himself did not believe there was any intention of wilful and corrupt perjury, I ask you, what is your reason for bringing this matter up again, and taking advantage of this Commission of making the matter public?

Constable Gillespie: So that the Commission can inquire into it, and see whether it has been dealt with rightly by the Department or not. I have no grievance against you whatever.

Witness: You, as a fellow-constable, notwithstanding the ruling of the Department on the matter, are of opinion that I should have been prosecuted?

Constable Gillespie: I have no opinion at all on the matter.

Witness: If you have no opinion, why did you bring the matter up again?

Constable Gillespie: If you want my opinion, I think you should have stood your trial for perjury.

Witness: I am sorry you were disappointed. I should like this matter reviewed by the Commission. I felt at the time that I had been pretty severely dealt with, and, seeing that prior to this I had had thirteen years' service and a clean sheet with a "note in favour" attached, and considering all the circumstances surrounding this false affidavit, I would ask the Commission to review the matter.

1. *The Commissioner.*] But you admit the affidavit was false, and what is the good of going into the matter again?—I do not consider I received any consideration for the circumstances surrounding that false affidavit or my previous record. When I made the affidavit I made it conscientiously, and thought no more about it, and, in fact, when Sub-Inspector Green saw me about it I was surprised, and for the moment could not imagine what he was referring to.

2. What do you call personal service?—I know exactly the point. When I delivered the paper to the daughter, a girl of sixteen years, I looked upon it at the time as personal service, and no harm could have been done to any one by what I did.

3. But you claimed mileage?—Yes, because I had done the journey, and I therefore thought I was entitled to it.

4. The only grievance you can suffer now is that the matter has been given publicity to after this lapse of time. Is that not a personal matter as between you and Constable Gillespie?—Yes; it is hard on me that publicity should have been given to it. I could express my opinion of the action of Constable Gillespie in strong terms, but I will not do so.

PATRICK JAMES FITZGERALD, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 77.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Lyttelton. Was enrolled on 9th December, 1893.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make a statement?—Yes, sir. I was present yesterday when the delegates from the Christchurch Force were giving evidence, and I agree with everything they said, and I only want to make a few remarks on one or two points they did not touch upon. First, with regard to the circular issued by the Commissioner that the married men should go to and from their homes in uniform, the intention was, I believe, to keep the married men from the single men's quarters. Well, the necessity for that does not exist in Christchurch at all, as there is a special room set apart, with proper pegs for the men to hang their uniforms upon, and they are not obliged to go near the single men's quarters at all. Then, with regard to work in the district office, the Inspector yesterday asked Constable McCarthy what some of us considered a very unfair question. He asked if there were six men in the district who were fit to take a

second clerk's place in the district office. Well, apart from anything else, we feel that the constable who is a comparative stranger in this district was not in a position to answer that question, as he could not possibly know what the men's qualifications were; and we also feel that the suggestion conveyed to the Commission was that the men are unequal to the task.

2. You mean to say that there are other men who consider themselves as fully qualified as the men who are there to act as second clerks?—Yes. Every man who has had any length of service knows that the work of Constable McCarthy as acting third clerk in the office amounts to nothing more nor less than copying manuscript reports into a book. With regard to the second clerk, it is different; but there are several constables in this district who, with a few months' experience, would be equally as capable of doing the work as the men who are there.

3. That is, below the chief clerk?—Yes. There are men who have served not only in this district, but in other districts, who can get officers to vouch for their ability. There have been various causes for dissatisfaction in this district, especially of late years. I have served under three Commissioners, and I have served under nearly all the Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, and non-commissioned officers at present in the Force. I think the only exceptions are Sub-Inspector Norwood and Inspector O'Brien, of Dunedin. I joined the Force here in 1893, under Inspector Broham; was transferred to Wellington, and then to Blenheim; back to Wellington, and on to Auckland, and then again down here. When I joined the Force the members of the Force had no vote at the parliamentary elections, and I say without hesitation that since we have been granted the franchise our interests as a body of men have suffered. There is not the slightest doubt in the world that political influence is being used largely. And if it stopped at political influence it would not be quite so bad, but there are other influences which are quite as pernicious. My statements now may appear to be exaggerated somewhat, but whatever I say I shall try to support with evidence of witnesses and by correspondence which can be produced. Now, I do not want to make any attack upon Masonry, as I know hundreds of Masons who are upright and honourable men, but every honest Mason will admit that there are a number of men who are hanging on the outskirts of Masonry, and who are exploiting it all they can. It may be said that I am prejudiced in this connection, and perhaps to some extent I am, but I do not want to say anything that I cannot prove. I would first refer to the late promotions, and the manner in which they have been made. I have a list of promotions made from August, 1906, to the 1st July, 1909. The first was Sergeant Edwin Eales, No. 649. He was promoted on the 17th August, 1906. I have known that man since he has been in the Force, and I knew him in the Artillery before that. I served with him in Wellington, and I have kept in touch with him ever since. Now, the last promotion outside those of district clerks is that of Richard Hodgson, No. 621, who was promoted on the 1st July, 1909. Constable Hodgson, in service, is senior to Constable Eales, who is promoted three years in front of him. Knowing both men personally, I say that Hodgson is Eales's superior mentally, physically, and in every way; and I know of nothing that Eales has done which would entitle him to promotion before Hodgson. The same kind of thing applies right down through this list, which I have drawn out roughly from the *Gazette*. Hodgson is senior to J. C. Griffiths by some considerable time, and also to C. Kelly; also to O'Grady, and to Green, and to Harvey by a number of years. He is senior to Ferguson by some considerable time; senior to Rowell by some years; as well as to Miller by a number of years. He is also senior to Eccles and McCrorie. The position now is that Eales, who is Hodgson's junior, has three years' seniority to him as sergeant. I do not know whether Hodgson is dissatisfied or not; but I say, if anything is required to show that there are some influences at work in regard to these promotions, this list will go to prove it. If you go right through the *Police Gazette*, the same thing applies, but not to such an extent as recently. And when the men compare the records of these men who are promoted, these are the things that prick. Another thing that has caused dissatisfaction is the examination system introduced by the present Commissioner. Since this system has been introduced there have been a number of men promoted, and the idea was, I believe, that the men before being promoted must have passed this special examination. I think, out of the twenty-eight promotions, six or eight only have passed the examination. By some of the men this examination is regarded as having been specially instituted to block certain men from promotion. I am speaking for others besides myself. Personally, I am looked upon as a man who is a dangerous man, or a marked man as it were, in this district. But I will refer to my own treatment later on. Another thing which has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction is the circular which appeared in the *Police Gazette* of 1908, page 374, which says, "In future applications for situations outside the Police Department should not be made without the sanction of the Commissioner being obtained." There have been several comments made at the time as to the reason of that circular, and I do not pretend to know the reason, but it has been suggested that it was issued to prevent any constable from coming into competition with the son of the Commissioner for a position outside the Police Force—the position which that officer fills now. I would now refer to treatment meted out to two men under exactly similar circumstances. A complaint was made—I do not know the nature of it—about two constables who were stationed at Lyttelton. One of those constables was transferred to Christchurch, while the other was allowed to remain in Lyttelton. The man who was transferred to Christchurch has since been transferred to Wanganui, while the other is still in Lyttelton. The constable who was transferred is not a Mason, while the other is, and capital is made out of the suggestion that one man gets better treatment than the other on account of some political or Masonic influence. With regard to my own position, when I was stationed at St. Andrew's I applied for promotion, and the Commissioner minuted my application to the effect that "This constable's application cannot be entertained, as he has not passed the annual examination." Now, my only reason for applying for promotion was that the country station I had was a bad one. The house I rented was owned by a Mrs.

Weathered, whose husband is the police gaoler at Timaru, and she occupies the position of female searcher. I applied to the Department to have the house repaired, but Mrs. Weathered resented the idea, saying it was good enough for better people than I to live in. I was sent to St. Andrew's in March, 1906, when the weather was fine, but in the winter it was another matter. The rain was coming in through the door, and the paper was hanging from the walls from the wind coming in, and the passage, front room, and bedroom were saturated with water whenever a shower of rain came. Well, I stood that during the first winter, but in the second winter I represented the position to the Department, but they said they understood the house was in good enough repair to last for a number of years. When I understood they would not move in the matter I offered to get the Department another house at a lower rental, and to remove the only property belonging to them—namely, the lock-up—at my own expense. As they would not agree to that, I notified them as early as February, 1907, that if I did not get accommodation for myself, my wife, and family before the winter came on I should have to send my wife and family away. As a matter of fact, I did send them away to Wellington, and I had myself to live in the lock-up of that station; and the residents of the district, as soon as they found out that my wife and family had cleared away, went into Timaru and saw Sub-Inspector Green, and threatened, I understand from one of the men who interviewed the Sub-Inspector, to write to the paper with regard to the treatment I had received. The man who said this is a reliable man and a Church of England clergyman. The others who waited upon Sub-Inspector Green were the Rev. Mr. Brady, of St. Andrew's; the Rev. Mr. Tattle; Mr. George Lyall, a farmer down there; Mr. Beasley, and Mr. Stowell. They are all men who are prepared to come forward and testify as to my treatment, and the correspondence you can see for yourself. With regard to the whole thing, I consider I have been unjustly dealt with from the time that matter started right to the finish. Then, the house that I and my wife and family had been living in at St. Andrew's was burnt to the ground, and everything I had was burnt with it. An inquest was held, and I was called to give evidence. I was then living in Wellington on sick leave. Even in the matter of the inquest, it seems to me that that inquest was not really into the fire, or as to whether there was a fire at all, but from the police point of view it was to see whether I was drunk or had been drinking during the time I was stationed at St. Andrew's. That seemed to be the only thing that Sub-Inspector Green troubled about. In connection with that, I feel that I was badly treated. In the first place, the man who made the inquiries into it I consider should not have been sent to make such inquiries. The Department, knowing what they did about him, must have seen it was unfair to send him, and, as a matter of fact, that it was an insult to me that he should be allowed to inquire into anything in connection with the matter.

4. Who was that man?—Detective Kennedy, of Christchurch. With regard to my application for promotion, and the Commissioner's minute thereon, I referred the Commissioner to a number of officers—some of the most prominent men in the Force, and recognised as the most able members of the Force—as to my suitability for promotion. This is a copy of my application: "Police Station, St. Andrew's, 18/7/07.—Report of Constable P. J. Fitzgerald, relative to my application for promotion.—I beg to report that I applied for promotion some time ago. In support of that application I referred the Commissioners to several Inspectors and sergeants as to my suitability or otherwise for promotion. The Commissioner said in his minute on the correspondence that he could not entertain my application unless I passed the examination introduced by himself. I would like to be respectfully allowed to point out to the Commissioner that I never had an opportunity to qualify for this examination, as I did not have the necessary statutes of New Zealand to refer to. This station has never been supplied with the statutes of New Zealand. I applied for a set in February last; they are not to hand yet. I called at the district office, Christchurch, in May last. The District Clerk informed me that he requisitioned for the statutes applied for by me in the usual way, and he could not understand why they had not been forwarded. Since I applied for promotion I notice by the *Gazette* that James Coghlan Griffiths—a man some six months junior to me—has been promoted. I know him well, but I never knew he possessed any special abilities; nor did I ever hear he had done anything that would specially mark him out for promotion. I have never used political influence, as I did not think it was very effective, but I am told now that a man must have political influence, and what is still better religious influence, and use both if he wants promotion. I do not like to commit a deliberate breach of the regulations, to which the Commissioner has so often referred to, but if any more junior men are promoted I will be compelled to either tender my resignation or else do as I know others have done. I respectfully ask that this correspondence be forwarded to the Commissioner.—P. J. FITZGERALD, Constable No. 661.—The Sub-Inspector of Police, Timaru." That is what I wrote in July, 1907, to the Commissioner, and that is my opinion still with regard to influence. When I first came to Canterbury I was transferred to Sheffield or Annat, in this district. On my arrival in Christchurch I had my wife and five young children with me. I left them at a boardinghouse near the railway-station, and went to the district office. I am a poor sailor, and am usually seasick, and when I went to the district office I was not feeling too well. I saw Sergeant McClelland, a man I have known for a number of years. I reported my arrival to him, and he asked me to go in and report myself to the Inspector. I told the sergeant that I would sooner not go in, as I was not feeling too good. I said I thought it was quite enough to report myself to him, and I would go on by the first train to Annat. However, he advised me to go in. Now, I knew Annat was a mounted station, but I did not know there was a troop horse attached to it, but, as was mentioned by Constable Whatman, I gathered that where the horse was owned by the constable the Department simply gave food for the horse and a paddock, and paid for the shoeing. Every constable who has had any experience of that system believes in it, because he can use his own horse for either riding or driving, whereas a troop horse, according to the regulation must not be put in harness. When I went to see the Inspector in his office I mentioned that I had just heard there

was a troop horse on the station. I think the first question the Inspector put to me was, "Are you in good health?" I said, "Usually"; and he replied that I did not look very well. He then asked me if I was a mounted man, and I said I had not been officially mounted, but that I had a knowledge of horses. I said I had been relieving at out-stations, where I had had to do a certain amount of horse work. He then asked me how long I had been in the Force, and I said I had had about ten years' service. He said, "Well, you ought to know what to do." I then went from the office, and I did not know what occurred from the time I left until nine or ten days afterwards. I then had notice through Sergeant Fouhy that I was transferred from Annat to St. Andrew's. I had no knowledge of what it was for, but I have been told since that Inspector Gillies represented to the Commissioner that he did not think I could do mounted work. I was transferred to St. Andrew's, and I never made any protest against it. There is the correspondence on the subject, but I have never seen it. I consider it was unfair that, before the Inspector could have had any knowledge of me as a constable, I should be treated in that way. So that almost from the time I came into the district I must have been prejudiced in the eyes of the Inspector. I am sorry to have to say it, but it does seem to me to be the case. I would not refer to the treatment of other men transferred under similar circumstances for the purpose of comparison. Constable John Harvey, who was in charge of Cheviot, was transferred to Christchurch station. I do not know what was the cause of the transfer, but I saw from the public Press that during the time he was in charge of that station a man hanged himself in the cells. Now, Constable Harvey did not come into the Christchurch station as what one might call a defaulter usually comes in. He came straight to the watch-house, as it were to some sort of a position made for him. The conditions of my transfer were very different. I consider my transfer to St. Andrew's was unjust. This is a copy of the Commissioner's instruction in reference to my transfer:—

"Police Office, Timaru.—Constable Fitzgerald, St. Andrew's.—The following is a copy of the Commissioner's decision respecting you being absent without leave from your station and your application for promotion: 'Inspector Gillies,—This constable's reports are the most impertinent and disrespectful I have yet had to deal with, and cannot be overlooked if discipline in the service is to be maintained. The constable has ignored Police Regulations altogether, and, besides leaving his district without authority, has reported disrespectfully of his superior officers, for which offence he is liable to be dismissed. He will be no loss to the Department should he carry out his threat and resign. On account of his lengthened service (thirteen and a half years), I will not dismiss him on this occasion, but will not hesitate in doing so in the event of a recurrence of such conduct. It is evident he requires strict supervision, and for this reason he is fined £1, and transferred to Christchurch.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 22/7/07.' Please note this and return it, or, as informed before, the file is in my office for your perusal, and you can visit Timaru and see it.—H. GREEN, Sub-Inspector, 28/7/07." On the face of that, I did not know really what I had been fined £1 for, unless for the fact that I ought to be under strict supervision. I do not come here to say that I am better than any one else, but I say there are men who have received preferment whose defaulter-sheets are worse than mine. Anything that appears on my sheet previous to my arrival in Canterbury is quite correct, and I should like my defaulter's sheet produced; but since my arrival in this district I have never had anything in the shape of fair play or justice, and what appears on my sheet since then is neither fair nor reasonable, and I will give my reasons. I mentioned Harvey, who is a good constable, and who was made watch-house keeper. Before he left for Cheviot he was sent out in charge of relieving squads, where he was in charge of men senior to himself. It may be said that he had a clean defaulter's sheet, but Harvey must be regarded as a singularly lucky man. From the time he started he seemed to get into a good groove, and was recognised as a good man; but I do think it a rank injustice for senior constables to be put in the street under Harvey. Then, I would mention the case of Wade, who was stationed at Waimate, and who is now, I think, at Eltham. During Commissioner Tunbridge's time that man made application to get married to a certain woman. The Commissioner refused the application, but after Commissioner Tunbridge left Wade got married to this woman, and he is still in the Force. Since then Constable Leckie applied to get married to a certain woman, and his application was refused, and the constable was dismissed from the Force. Well, I would like you to call Constable Maloney, who was at Waimate at the time, also Sergeant Ferguson, now in Auckland, who was senior constable in charge at Waimate. They can tell you that this Constable Wade and his wife used to attack everybody. They wrote letters to the Inspector in Christchurch both openly and anonymously. The Inspector will be in a position to produce the correspondence if he likes. This man wrote to the Inspector in this strain: He said that a hotelkeeper doing business at Glenavy went up to Constable Findlay and said, "I am going to apply for a conditional license for the sports and races at Morven. Understand that I will not apply for this license unless you promise me to keep sober." Around the district Wade and his wife have accused Mrs. Findlay, the wife of the constable, of being no better than she ought to be, and with carrying on with the Station-master in the absence of Findlay. Mrs. Findlay is a most respectable woman. This man Wade is at the present time in the Force. I do not know that he ever said anything about me, but the first man who went there was Constable Christie, and he has left the Force; and about the next man, Constable Barrett, he wrote to the effect that Barrett was not fit for service medically, and that his hearing was bad. In fact, he attacked everybody he could attack. That man is not in charge of an important station. He was sent from Waimate to Taihape, and from there to Eltham. During the time he was at Taihape something occurred which I do not wish to refer to. That is the kind of thing more than anything else that makes the Police Force think they are not fairly treated. In dealing with the matter of promotion, I omitted to say, in regard to officers in charge of districts recommending constables for promotion, there are various reasons why certain constables are recommended. The practice is when a constable is promoted to transfer him to some other district. It has been openly said that an Inspector when he wants to get rid of a man will

recommend him for promotion simply to get him out of his district, if he does not want to do him an injury; and it is said that if the Inspector had to put up with him as sergeant in his district he would never recommend him. In regard to the influence that is supposed to exist, and which the majority of men know very well does exist, there are various reasons for saying it exists. There retired from the Force last week Constable Flewellyn, who had been for twenty-eight years in and around Christchurch, as capable a police officer as ever I knew anywhere in Canterbury. He retired as a constable; a more honourable man I never met anywhere in any walk of life, and it is a well-known fact that the reason he never got promotion was that he never used anything in the shape of influence, considering it to be beneath him to do it. It is a general impression that a man must have some influence. If he is promoted out of his turn, they want to know the source of the influence that got him his promotion; that is the first question asked. It is not a nice thing for a man to say, and any constable who says it is naturally marked down, notwithstanding the guarantee from the Minister. I will give my reasons for saying that some strong influence has been at work. I think it was in 1903 that a station sergeant who is not at present in the Force was charged in the Magistrate's Court here with being the putative father of an illegitimate child. During the hearing of the case some of the circumstances caused the presiding Magistrate to make some strong comments on the case.

5. *The Commissioner.*] You mean Detective Maddern?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie.: That was before my time.

Witness.: I am not referring to it as occurring in your time. I was stationed in Auckland at the time, but was down here on a holiday, and on my journey back to Auckland I got into the train at Palmerston North with two members of Parliament and a member of the Legislative Council. One of the members whom I knew very well was a solicitor practising in Auckland, and he told me that he was one of a deputation who had come away from interviewing the late Commissioner and the then Minister of Justice with the understanding that nothing could be done but Maddern must go. He was with seven other members of Parliament, and this was the answer they got. That is all I am going to say as illustrating influence. If there is one thing more than another the men in this district have reason to complain about it is the confidential report that exists here. I have been on several other stations, and have not known it to exist anywhere else. For instance, any constable stationed in this district might for all purposes of promotion or preferment be damned eternally to the Inspector without knowing anything about it. I cannot say there have been any confidential reports about myself—I do not know; but this I do know: In regard to a station sergeant here a short time ago, now transferred, something appeared in the paper about his former career as a constable. He suspected a constable stationed at Christchurch of giving information to the paper. He went round to make inquiries into the matter, and submitted a report to the Inspector in Christchurch, saying that the constable was seen in a hotel talking to the reporter of the local paper in which the matter appeared, and the licensee was prepared to say he heard the constable talking about matters he knew should not be mentioned outside the police office. There are two men I could name who saw that. I did not see it myself. They saw it passing between the station sergeant and the Inspector.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What was the result?—I know nothing about the result; but I do know that that constable had been reported time and again. Not only was he prosecuted, but persecuted, by that particular sergeant, and it was a subject of comment among all the men on this station that he did not get fair play. The constable's name was Brown and the sergeant's name was Barrett. As far as I am concerned, I have nothing to complain about any of the sergeants except Sergeant Brooks up to the beginning of the present year. Everybody must admit the supervision in Christchurch is as strict as anywhere, but I realised that there was special attention to be paid to me. A direct order came from the Commissioner, and I knew that, and I anticipated I would require to be extremely careful. After being transferred from St. Albans I resumed duty in the beginning of September, 1907, and up to January, 1909, nothing was said and no reports went in against me. It is said among the men in Christchurch that any man who does twelve months' duty without having to go to the Inspector's office is doing really well. Prior to being transferred there were various reports about me. Some of them contained suggestions that I was drinking, and had been drinking hard. At no period of my life have I been charged with drunkenness. There is no man either in or out of the Force who can say he has seen me drunk, or anything approaching it. I do not claim to be a temperance man, and until the beginning of the present year I have always had a drink when I felt inclined; since then I have not had a drink of anything alcoholic, and it is a most peculiar thing that since then I have been reported five or six times for trivial things. I have no reason to object to being reported for anything any more than any one else, but I have been reported for things which have been glossed over or carefully winked at in the case of other men. And I have not only been reported, but the manner in which the reports were made show a certain amount of venom and a personal element of spite, the sergeant who made the report not simply reporting it as a matter of neglect of duty. I have been treated pretty well, and have no reason to complain of my treatment by the commissioned officers or the Inspector. As a constable I have very little to do with the Inspector under ordinary circumstances. The men say that when they are reported, and have to go before the Inspector, they get anything but a fair hearing—that the Inspector would believe one sergeant in preference to all the constables. In my own case a sergeant reported something, and I had another sergeant to substantiate what I had to say and a constable, and Inspector Gillies, on the correspondence connected with the report, minuted, "Notwithstanding the reports of Sergeant So-and-so and Constable So-and-so, I still have my own opinion on the matter." That could be taken anyhow. I complain about the general treatment I have received since I came to the district. At present I am better situated than ever before in my police career, but the general treatment I have received since I have been in this district up to my going to Lyttelton has not been anything like fair or just or reasonable. During the time

the correspondence was going on in connection with my application in certain correspondence that passed between the Department and myself, I stated what I thought to be honestly true in every instance. The Commissioner placed a minute on that that I deliberately insulted my superiors. At the beginning of the present year something transpired in connection with which I was reported. A key was found in a door, and I got reported for neglect of duty. In answer to that report I made what would be called an explanation to my superior officer, Mr. Gillies. I was on night duty, on what is known as No. 1 beat. I went on at 9, being relieved at 5 in the morning. The constable who came on duty to relieve me found a key in a door. I was asked for an explanation, and I reported, and mentioned that the beat was too large for any one man to pay proper attention to. Several other constables were prepared to say the same. I was reprimanded, I think, but I made a report as to what I thought ought to be the beat. As laid down now, the beat is not fair to the men placed on it, and it is not fair to the public to have only the amount of protection one man could afford in the very centre of Christchurch. After I reported, all the sergeants did so, including the station sergeant. Some reported very fairly, others made some comments that were not called for, and among them was one who had only just come here, and who hardly knew the beat properly. In connection with my transfer from St. Andrew's to Christchurch and prior to that transfer, I might say that that station was opened by Constable Dillon, and he had the same trouble as I had there. As a matter of fact, his trouble was worse than mine, because he narrowly escaped going to gaol. Mr. Weathered had three houses and 50 acres of land, and during Dillon's time some people named Burns lived in the house next door to the station. Weathered got the house insured on the representation that Constable Dillon would burn it down, and got the insurance increased from £50 to £250. In March, 1907, the house was burned down. I furnished a report to the Sub-Inspector, but did not complete it, because I could not know the actual value Mrs. Weathered had placed on the property, nor the amount of insurance, and she was residing at Timaru. I sent the report to Sub-Inspector Green, and before I saw the amount of the insurance I mentioned it was a suspicious case, and wanted a detective to investigate the matter. But when I saw the amount of the insurance, and the way people talked about the matter—saying that when it was burned down ten or twelve years ago it was insured for £130, and this time for £250—I did not like the look of it, and inquiries were made into it. Not only that, but I went into Timaru and saw the representative of the Royal Insurance, with whom it was insured, and told them what people had been saying. I asked him what the house I was living in was insured at, and he told me £275, and the wash-house for £25. I said that was too much insurance, and the best thing he could do was to reduce the amount as soon as he could. It was suggested at the time the inquiry was made into the house I was living in, which was burned down, that it was burned down not wilfully, but while I was under the influence of liquor, and not capable of knowing what I was doing. That came out at the inquest. That was the whole of what Sub-Inspector Green wanted to find out of all the witnesses—whether they knew I was drinking, or saw me drinking. During the time this correspondence was going on the owner of the property made various allegations about me. One was that I had stolen some iron connected with the old house. This report went to the Inspector, and came back to me. I asked the Department, when Mrs. Weathered made these charges against me, to get her to lay an information against me in the usual way. I got no reply. Afterwards I made an application for permission to consult a solicitor, because Mrs. Weathered was going round slandering me, and I wanted to stop her. The Commissioner wanted me to make a specific charge. I could not do so at that time, because I wanted to consult a solicitor first as to what he would advise me to do. I was advised to let the matter drop by some person who knew better than I did. About that time, also, I arrested a deserter from His Majesty's service. There was a reward of £3 from the Imperial Government and £5 from the Colonial Government. I arrested the man on information supplied by Constable Collins, of Timaru. The matter was notified in the *Police Gazette*. The naval authorities refused to take him on board ship. I applied for the reward, and so did Constable Collins, and we never got it. They say there was no reward, because the naval authorities did not take him on board. We were both out of pocket over this man's arrest. Another thing: I think I have been unfairly treated by the Commissioner himself. After I left St. Albans I was in the Timaru Hospital for three weeks, and I attribute my sickness to the house and accommodation I had, and three of my children were sick with colds and pneumonia, and one nearly died. After I came out of the Hospital I got a certificate from Dr. Gabites recommending I be granted three months' sick leave. I stayed in Timaru for a day or two, and returned to Christchurch to be examined by the Police Surgeon. He will tell you I was suffering from a very bad cough, and was run down, and had bronchitis very severely. After I was examined by him I got fourteen days' sick leave, and I was proceeding to Wellington, and was instructed at the end of that time I could go to the Wellington Police Surgeon and get it extended. When I was all right, and going to resume duty in Christchurch, I went to the Commissioner and produced certificates from Dr. Burbank and Dr. Henry in Wellington, and told the Commissioner it would be dangerous for me to shift for five or six months from that time. He told me to go to Christchurch and resume duty there, and he would probably give me the first chance of a transfer to Wellington. On the strength of that my wife started housekeeping in Wellington, and I went on doing duty in Christchurch. I had applied for transfer, and fully expected the first vacancy in Wellington. Instead of that, another man was transferred to Wellington, and he made use of his transfer by leaving the police and going into another department. As soon as I saw that I withdrew my application at once. I got disgusted. As soon as I got a few pounds together I brought my wife and children down from Wellington, and started housekeeping here. I got no consideration from the Commissioner for having to do this. I had had to pay their fare from St. Andrew's to Wellington, which the Department would have had to pay. I got no consideration for that. I do not want to say that I am better than any other man, but I can get the evidence of officers and non-commissioned officers under whom I have served who will

say that I know my duty, and have always done it. In Christchurch for six months a junior constable was what is known as making inquiries at the police-station; he had had three years' experience, and I had had sixteen years' service before he joined the Force. I was considered capable of conducting anything in the shape of inquiries by some of the ablest officers in the Force. The present Minister of Justice came to Christchurch, and we were paraded, and he said amongst other things that seniority must always take precedence, everything else being equal. Duties change fortnightly on all big stations. I waited till the next change of duty, and I sent in the following report: "I respectfully bring facts in connection with the above matter under the Inspector's notice, as I do not think he has noticed it, otherwise he would not allow it to exist. First, Constable Scott has been on inquiries since or during the greater portion of the time Sub-Inspector Dwyer has been relieving at Napier. I see by the duty list for the ensuing two weeks that he is again down for inquiries. I wish it to be clearly understood that I do not wish in any way to interfere with Constable Scott, nor do I mean to detract him or any one else in any way, but I think I can say without egotism that I am as capable of performing those duties as he is, and considering the fact that he is years junior to me, and the clearly expressed promise of the Minister for Justice *re* the claims of seniority, I am in justice to myself compelled, although reluctantly, to bring this matter under the notice of the Inspector." This went to Acting Station Sergeant Bird, who said, "Forwarded to the station sergeant. Constable Scott has been put on inquiries again this fortnight with your full knowledge; he has performed the duties satisfactorily during the time he has been on inquiries." The station sergeant, Johnston, says in his minute, "All things being equal seniority should prevail. I consider Constable Scott the best man for position outside the watch-house keeper, therefore accept the responsibility for him doing the inquiry." The Inspector said, "The constable who is most suitable for inquiry duty is the one to be appointed; at all events, we will soon have the usual strength of sergeants, then you will have a sergeant for inquiry work." Now, Sergeant Johnston says the best man was on these duties. Before this constable ever joined the Force I could refer you to some of the best officers at present in the Force to say I was quite capable of performing inquiries years before he ever joined. In the course of my duty the other day this was sent to the sergeant of police at Lyttelton in connection with an inquiry I made. It is the first complimentary thing that has been said about our duties in connection with this work for years: "The Sergeant of Police, Lyttelton.—*Re* Ruka Weteriki: Will you kindly thank Constable Fitzgerald for his comprehensive report of the 17th instant with respect to the above-named Native? I feel quite satisfied now to recommend the Public Trustee to pay Mr. Tikao 10s. per week for his maintenance, and to make a payment of £5 for clothing for the old man.—Yours faithfully, M. C. BARNETT, District Manager." This was a surprise to me—that anything in the way of praise should come my way at all. I have been stationed in Auckland, in Wellington twice, in Christchurch twice, at Mount Cook, and three months in Lyttelton, and will refer you to any of the officers as to whether I know my duties, or ever shirked them, or whether they can say anything against me. Now, Sergeant Johnston takes on himself to say a junior constable of three years' service is more capable of performing these duties than I with sixteen years. It is not fair to say that. In regard to promotions, I do not attribute the whole of the promotions to the Commissioner; he is not responsible for all of them. I say the Inspectors in charge of districts in certain cases are as much responsible, and probably more, for influence in connection with promotions and recommendations.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Could you suggest any better system as regards promotions than the present?

The Commissioner: The witness attacks the way in which some Inspectors make recommendations, and leads me to infer you are in many instances at the mercy of the Inspectors.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Can you suggest some better system, so that the Inspectors would not be in a position to mislead me?—I do not think it is a fair question to ask me. I am not in a position to make any suggestion.

9. Do you know that you were recommended for promotion, and appear in my list?—I should be very much surprised to know that I was.

The Commissioner: By whom was he recommended?

Mr. Dinnie: From Auckland first, I believe.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your application for promotion is dated May, 1907. You say I declined to entertain it unless you passed the educational test?—The memo. that was on the application when returned to me was, "This constable's application cannot be entertained until he passes the annual examination."

11. Is not this the memo.: "Will expect this constable to pass the examination, as Constable Williams did before he was promoted"?—There was no mention of Williams, or anybody else.

12. Did you note the papers as having seen them?—Yes.

13. Is not this the minute?—To the best of my knowledge, neither Constable Williams nor any one else was mentioned.

14. Is not this your signature?—Yes.

15. Then you are wrong in saying Constable Williams's name was not mentioned?—I said I did not notice it was mentioned; but I say there are several men who have been promoted who have never passed the examination, and were not asked to pass it.

16. At this time you appear to have been next on the list for promotion, and the one senior to you had just been promoted?—There was one junior to me who had just been promoted.

17. Is not this what you say: "I notice by a report in the daily papers that the last constable promoted to sergeant is a constable one senior to me"?—Probably, and I mentioned a man much junior to me, which was what drew my attention to it first.

18. Was it not very soon after that you were reported for insubordination and other matters?—At that time I made the application I saw this thing coming, and wanted to get out of where I was. Had I been on a suitable station I should not have made application for promotion.

19. You saw it coming?—I did, and my predecessor had seen it before. It was not only me that was affected.

20. You saw you were likely to get into trouble, and you thought the best way out of it was to apply for promotion?—In order to get out of a place where I saw my officers were taking sides against me.

21. Do you not think you were not promoted owing to a report against you and the way I dealt with you?—Probably. But I am satisfied I never received justice in any matter connected with this file.

22. We may all be mistaken about you?—I will refer the file to his Worship.

The Commissioner: I shall call for the file.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You had some trouble with Mrs. Weathered in connection with the house in which you resided? It was burnt down under peculiar circumstances after your having trouble with her about certain alterations?—The alterations were taking place at the time it was burned down; they were partly completed; two rooms were papered and lined, and there was only one room and the landing to be done. The house was getting into a splendid state of repair, owing to the interference of some one who compelled the Department to act.

24. It was strange it should be burned down at such a time?—That struck me very forcibly—to my loss.

25. As regards the other men promoted who were junior to you, have you more knowledge of their qualifications than their superior officers?—I have done duty with several, and know their qualifications.

26. In your opinion, they are not such good men as you?—In my opinion, they are no better.

27. Probably that is not the opinion of their superior officers?—I can refer you to some of the best officers and non-commissioned officers in the Dominion whether I am as capable as any of those men.

28. What do you allege about Wade being transferred?—I said because he had a certain amount of political influence he could do what other men dare not do.

29. Where did the influence come in on that occasion?—He got married to a woman the Department objected to when Mr. Tunbridge was in charge, and immediately after Mr. Tunbridge left he married the woman, and is still in the Force. He must have some influence.

30. You have no proof?—No.

31. Can you tell us some other case?—I mentioned the case of the two men reported from Lyttelton.

32. What influence was brought to bear there?—I do not suggest any, but one was transferred for the same complaint that the other was left alone for; the one man was a Mason and the other was not.

33. Imagination again?—The facts are there.

34. There may have been a reason for his transfer?—I do not know of any reason, but you might have had one.

35. Will that man come forward and tell us to whom he applied for influence?—Very likely he will.

36. Will you give us the names of any of those who you say reported confidentially to the Inspector on different matters concerning constables?—I was given an instance of a confidential report that went in about Constable Brown.

37. Is it in existence at the present time?—It was.

38. How do you know?—Because it was seen by two constables, and they informed him of the fact.

39. Then, it could not have been very confidential?—He did not know anything about it at the time.

40. What was the date of that report? We might be able to trace it?—It was some time ago. The sergeant went and reported in connection with Constable Brown that there was very little doubt that he was responsible for a certain report in a newspaper.

41. You have not seen that report itself. It is merely hearsay?—No; I am giving you as nearly as possible what are the facts.

42. But you have not actually seen it yourself?—No.

43. You go so far as to say that Inspectors recommend men for promotion in order to get rid of them?—I am not the first who has said it.

44. Do you believe it?—I would not say I do believe it, but it has been said, and it did not originate with me.

45. You have not a very good opinion of your Inspectors, evidently. Knowing that you were on the list for promotion at the time you applied for it, and that it was simply owing to your getting into trouble that you were not promoted, are you not satisfied?—I am very much surprised to hear that I was recommended for promotion.

46. As you appear to be so disbelieving, I had better let you see your name on the list?—That is not my name. That is my brother's.

47. I am sorry. I made a mistake. I fully thought it was the witness, because the two brothers are from the same district. Then, you were not recommended for promotion. Why were you not recommended for promotion in Auckland?—I was not entitled to it when I left Auckland in 1902 or 1903.

48. What service had you when you left Auckland?—Nine or ten years.

49. And what is your service up to now?—It will be sixteen years in December next.

50. Then you must have had thirteen years' service when you left Auckland?—I went to Wellington after that.

51. You were not recommended from Wellington either. Did you make any application?—No; I was at the Mount Cook Station, and I had nothing to do with any of the Inspectors while I was there.

52. Do the Inspectors ever make recommendations without application?—They may, but they did not seem to think it worth while to recommend me.

53. *Inspector Gillies.*] What service had you when you came to Christchurch?—I had something over twelve years' service between Wellington and Auckland.

54. And you have served under Inspectors Cullen and Ellison?—Yes.

55. Were you ever in charge of a station before you came here?—Yes; I was in charge of a suburban station—Surrey Hills—temporarily.

56. For how long?—I could not tell you from memory.

57. Is it usual for a good active man to be kept on the beat for twelve years without getting charge of a station?—There have been instances, but it is not usual, I should think.

58. Would such a man not be placed in charge of a station in five years, as a general rule?—I could not say whether he would or not.

59. You were twelve years without having charge of a station?—I was for twelve or eighteen months in charge of a station.

60. Why were you transferred to beat duty in Wellington?—I was on beat duty in Auckland when I was transferred to Wellington.

61. What was the reason for your being transferred from charge of a station to beat duty in Auckland?—The reason was that I was reported for leaving my district without permission. That is on my defaulter's sheet.

62. That was under Inspector Cullen. You were not then under me?—No.

63. Why were you transferred from beat duty in Auckland to beat duty in Wellington?—I applied for that transfer, and I had a good deal of difficulty in obtaining it.

64. Why did you apply?—On account of my wife's ill health.

65. Have you any complaint with regard to your treatment by Inspector Cullen?—I think it was pretty fair.

66. Was it good treatment to put you on street duty?—It was probably my own fault.

67. Under what circumstances were you transferred from Wellington to my district?—I was simply transferred to Annat.

68. You have related a conversation which took place between us when you called at my office on your arrival in Christchurch. That was four years ago. You must have a good memory to be able to say clearly everything that occurred?—I have a pretty good memory.

68A. I will test your memory. Did I ask you if ever you had been mounted?—You did.

69. Did I ask you if you had ever ridden a horse?—No; you asked me if I had ever been mounted, and I said I had never been officially mounted.

70. You say you have a good memory. Did I not ask you if you had ever ridden a horse?—I do not think so, but I remember telling you I had experience of horses, and that I had no doubt I could do whatever was to be done there.

71. Did you not say that you had not been in the habit of riding horses, and had not been used to them?—No, I am perfectly certain about that.

72. Did I not say to you that under the circumstances I would try and bring a mounted man from St. Andrew's, and put you at St. Andrew's?—I distinctly say No.

73. Were you asked not to unpack until we saw whether you could be sent to St. Andrew's or not?—I had no intimation of any change until after I had my furniture unpacked and I had settled down at Annat. I then got a telegram from Sergeant Fouhey to proceed to St. Andrew's. I was nine or ten days at Annat.

74. Is not St. Andrew's a better station than Annat or Sheffield?—It is not half the station Sheffield is. There is probably more work at Sheffield, but it has not anything like the advantages or the perquisites.

75. How was your health at the time you came to see me?—It was fairly good.

76. Did you ever complain to me about going to St. Andrew's instead of Sheffield?—Unfortunately, I did not.

77. Have I not from time to time inspected at your station at St. Andrew's, and have you ever mentioned to me that you were not pleased with your station?—I think you came twice. I did not mention it to you.

78. Did you not tell me you were glad to be there because your brother was near at hand to help you in any matters, as he was then stationed at Timaru?—I never said any such thing. I never mentioned him at all.

79. With regard to a certain report which Mr. Dinnie questioned you about, you said that Williams's name had never been mentioned in it, and you insisted that you had not seen the minute on the file until you were shown your signature. Then you could not help admitting that you had seen it. Do you remember that?—Yes.

80. Is your memory just as good on that point as it is on what took place between us when you first arrived in Christchurch?—My memory is generally better than most people's.

81. Will you give me any particulars as to unfair treatment you have received since you arrived in this district?—I did not mention you in connection with it at all.

82. But the inference was that I treated you unfairly?—I did not consider putting a junior constable on to make inquiries about my case was very fair treatment, and I thought I was being treated unfairly by being shifted from Sheffield to St. Andrew's. Also, from the time I started to make complaints about the house being out of repair, I said then, and I say now, that it appeared to me that both you and Sub-Inspector Green took sides with Mrs. Weathered.

83. How long had that house been built when you went into it?—It was practically a new house, but as to its condition I do not want to say any more about it myself. I would refer you to Mr. Bradey, who is a practical farmer, living at St. Andrew's, and he can tell you more about the way that house was built than I can.

84. How long were you with me in Christchurch after your return from St. Andrew's?—From the beginning of September, 1907, to 7th March this year.

85. Can you give me any instance of unfair treatment during that time?—I have already said in my evidence that I had nothing to say as regards the treatment meted out to me by you, as a constable does not come personally into contact with the Inspector.

86. Do you know of any constable who has come before me without a sergeant?—No; because according to the regulations he cannot do so.

87. Are you satisfied that I carry out the regulations pretty closely?—I have never said anything to the contrary.

88. Did I ever ask you personally, or through anybody else, some two or three months after you were back from Lyttelton, whether you would like to go to Wellington?—No; I was waiting anxiously to go to Wellington, where my wife and family were, but when a single man was transferred to Wellington I saw I had no chance of anything.

89. Coming to your complaint about a junior man being placed in charge of a relief in the street, would I have the appointment of that man, or would I leave it to my Sub-Inspector?—You would leave it to the Sub-Inspector.

90. You know, I suppose, that I offered you Lyttelton as soon as there was a vacancy, and that you got that station, which is equally as good as any other station. You know, also, that I recommended you for bailiff work when there were three or four applications for it at the same time?—I know there were junior men down there who applied for the bailiff work, and if you had given it to one of them I would not have taken the transfer to Lyttelton.

91. But you did get both the station and the bailiff work?—Yes.

92. Are you not comfortable and fairly well off there?—I am better off than I have been for a long time.

93. You say that some sergeant made a confidential report to me about a constable at the station, but that you had not seen it yourself. You said, however, that there were two men who had seen it. I would like to know who those two men are?—I would rather not give their names.

94. Have you heard since you have been stationed here that I have been in the habit of receiving confidential reports from any member of the Force?—It is pretty common rumour here that you habitually receive reports from the sergeants that the men are not aware of. As to whether it is correct or not I cannot say, but I have heard it time and again.

95. *The Commissioner.*] Is this your defaulter's sheet?—Yes.

The Commissioner: What is the object of attaching this foolscap sheet with memoranda concerning the men upon it?

Mr. Dinnie: Only cases in which the men have been fined are entered upon the defaulter's sheet. Those on the other sheet may be reprimands or cautions, and they do not operate against the constable.

The Commissioner: Then, what is the object of attaching it?

Mr. Dinnie: It is only done in this district. I suppose it is done as a means of easy reference. I have given no instructions with regard to it.

Witness: The Inspector asked me if I had any complaint to make about his treatment of me. Well, prior to being transferred to Lyttelton I made application for a station which was about to be opened up at Islington. The man who was appointed to that station is junior to me by a good deal, and just before being appointed he had been convicted of a breach of the regulations.

96. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was any reason given to you for your not being sent to Islington?—No, it was simply noted for future reference.

97. Does not your defaulter's sheet show that you have been six times dealt with for misconduct?—I admit everything in that defaulter's sheet except that with regard to my transfer from St. Andrew's to Christchurch. That, I maintain, is wrong and unjust. There have been men promoted whose defaulters' sheets have been worse than mine.

MICHAEL LEAHY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 78.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Oxford. Was enrolled in June, 1879, and have been in charge of the station fourteen years.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make any statement?—I only wish to know why I was not promoted.

2. How old are you?—Fifty-three.

3. Have you ever applied for promotion?—No.

4. Have there been many instances of men being promoted over your head?—You can see from the numbers of the sergeants promoted. My number is 310.

5. Do you know of any reason why you have been passed over?—No.

6. You have a clean defaulter's sheet?—Yes.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If you had been promoted in accordance with your service and in accordance with the dates at which others were promoted, you would have been promoted many years ago?—Yes, I would.

8. How many years' service have you?—Thirty years.

The Commissioner: I understand he has been recommended repeatedly by his Inspector.

Mr. Dinnie: And I think he was recommended to my predecessor, but he did not appear to have formed a very good opinion of him.

Witness: In order that I might have a better chance of being considered I passed the first police examination that was held, and there is the record of it in the *Police Gazette*.

The Commissioner: I do not profess to understand it. I would ask the Inspector when he recommended this man for promotion.

Inspector Gillies: I have recommended him before he was fifty years of age, but since that time I have been debarred from recommending him.

Witness: I am quite satisfied that Inspector Gillies has been very fair to me; but there was an inducement held out to us to stand for the examination, and I passed that examination twenty years ago, but I have never got anything since. I could refer you, sir, to Inspectors under whom I have served and other officers as to my service and work.

The Commissioner: I do not want any one to speak on your behalf. I have the fact that your Inspector recommended you. Have you anything against this man, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: No.

The Commissioner: Can you offer any suggestion as to why he has been passed over without going into detail?

Mr. Dinnie: Not at present. I can only say that my predecessor said he was an average constable, fit for a quiet station only.

Witness: But I have held the position of Clerk of the Court and bailiff.

The Commissioner: Were you governed entirely by the memoranda left by your predecessor, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Not entirely. I have seen a good deal of his reports, and so on, and I judged by them to a certain extent.

The Commissioner: He is a good penman, and a man of intelligence?

Mr. Dinnie: He has got into years.

The Commissioner: He has not always been old.

Witness: I am as strong and able to-day as any man in the Force.

The Commissioner: If it were possible, with due regard to the efficiency of the Force, would you be prepared to recommend his promotion—that is, if an injustice has been done to him?

Mr. Dinnie: Well, one has to look at the other side. If an exception is made in this case, it might lead to all sorts of trouble. And I am not admitting that an injustice has been done.

Witness: Looking to the fact that I have passed the necessary examination, and that my conduct and work has been favourably reported upon, and that I have been recommended by the Inspector, I hope, sir, that you can see the justice of my claim.

The Commissioner: I think you have made out a very strong case indeed for special consideration, but, as you see, the Commissioner cannot say anything without the necessary material in front of him, and in any case, I am not the Minister; I can only make recommendations. I have, however, had the opportunity of seeing a good deal of your work, and I quite recognise that you have a strong exceptional claim for consideration, and I hope I do not see many cases such as yours. Have you anything further you wish to add?

Witness: No, sir.

THURSDAY, 29TH JULY, 1909.

FREDERICK KNIGHT HUNT, Solicitor, examined on oath. (No. 79.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] How long have you known me?—About six years, at Akaroa.
2. You have had a great deal of Court work to do with me: how did I do my work?—I think you did it very well indeed; nearly all the Court work there has been with you.
3. You were thoroughly satisfied?—Yes; I think you were very careful and painstaking, and conducted your cases very well.
4. In regard to correspondence or anything, did I give any trouble?—Not in the least; you were most obliging, and did your work very well.
5. *The Commissioner.*] As having had considerable experience, what is your opinion of this constable?—He is above the average; he is very painstaking and conscientious. Frequently, since I opened an office at Akaroa, Constable Jackson has asked me to solve legal conundrums, showing that he evidently took a great deal of interest in his work.

VICTOR GRACE DAY, Stipendiary Magistrate, examined on oath. (No. 80.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I was under you as Clerk of the Court for some time: how did I do my work?—You were under me in that capacity for three years. You did your work very well, both as constable and Clerk of the Court. You had a considerable amount of old-age pension work, in connection with which you exhibited great tact.
2. There were never any complaints against me?—Never.
3. How did I conduct cases in Court?—Above the average of the ordinary constable. I had no fault to find.
4. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion of the constable generally—purely in regard to a question of promotion? Do you think he would make an efficient sergeant?—I should think so, and he would be above the average of sergeants. I have had means while talking to residents of Akaroa of ascertaining their opinion of him as a constable, and from their sentiments as expressed to me I gathered that he was very zealous in the discharge of his duties, and did good work in Akaroa. There was a certain amount of tendency to drinking amongst the younger members of the community, and from statements made to me by prominent residents, Constable Jackson has very materially assisted in checking that tendency.

5. I should like to ask you a question or two on general matters. In regard to the employment of the police generally in connection with sly-grog selling, you have had a long experience at Ashburton—a no-license district: will you give any general views you may hold in regard to this, having regard to the efficiency of the Force?—Sly-grog selling is one of the most difficult things to detect, any person engaged in the traffic being always on his guard against surprise, and it is only natural under those circumstances that means have to be used to detect the selling of grog which would not readily be used in other matters.

6. It may possibly come before me in the course of the Commission at different parts of the Dominion, and to my mind it is more a question of ethics than anything else—the employment of the police to detect offences. You know the opinions held by some persons—I do not say I hold them myself, but they are pretty prominently before the public on occasion: have you any views on the matter?—I take it it is part of the duty of the police to detect the offence, and to use all means that may be necessary to detect and check it.

7. I am alluding more to the enticing of the offence for the purpose of detecting it?—I do not see that there is any enticing in it. If a constable has a suspicion that a certain person is a sly-grog seller he simply goes and proposes to buy some; unless he uses any inducement more than the mere asking for it, I do not think anything can be said against it.

8. You do not see any impropriety in it, but consider it simply a sort of necessary adjunct to police duty?—Provided that the constable does nothing to induce the person to sell the drink.

9. In regard to the conduct of cases, especially licensing cases, in Court?—In my opinion, the constable or sergeant who possibly receives a reward when a conviction is obtained should not be allowed to conduct the case in Court. It is highly improper that any person who is directly interested in the result of a criminal, or quasi-criminal, case should conduct the prosecution. It has been held for a long time that all such prosecutions should be conducted by the Crown Solicitor, and before any prosecution is entered upon the facts should be laid before the Crown Solicitor for his opinion. If this were done fewer cases would be brought and fewer dismissed. It would be in the interests of justice. If a conviction follows, the Crown gets the fine, and the question of the small amount of fees to the Crown Solicitor is inconsiderable. That is my opinion, as the result of experience.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Would you have Crown Solicitors employed in all licensing cases?—I do not say in technical cases, like failure to send a notice to the Clerk of the Court; but in any charge of selling I consider the Crown Solicitor should be employed.

11. That would include sly-grog selling, and any case against a publican?—Yes, I think so. I believe it is a rule that in all these licensing cases where a conviction is obtained a certain amount of reward is divided among the constables.

12. That is only in sly-grog cases?—In all cases of that kind there is a possibility of the constable or sergeant straining a case in the hope of getting the reward.

13. At the same time, you think it desirable to give rewards?—I said nothing of that.

14. Do you think it advisable?—I am hardly qualified to give an opinion.

15. But in all cases against a publican you think we ought to have the assistance of the Crown Solicitor?—I think it would be in the interests of justice to do so, because, as a rule, they are technical cases.

16. We have authority to employ the Crown Solicitor in these cases?—Only in the centres—very rarely in the country districts.

17. Do you know what the present system of detection of sly-grog selling is?—All I know is what comes before me in Court.

18. You get more sly-grog selling cases than any other Magistrate?—I think I do. From what I see, no other method could be used than the one you adopt. Formerly, I believe, men were employed who were not even probationary constables, and that led to abuse I believe. It was discontinued, and probationary constables employed. They are only carrying out their duty in detecting these cases.

19. It is better they should be employed than private individuals?—Most decidedly.

20. As regards promotion, do you not think the superior officer is best qualified to know when a constable should be promoted?—Yes.

21. Is he not in a position to know the man's qualifications better even than you?—Not altogether. You have the case of Constable Leahy living a long distance away, and not always under the sergeant's or the Inspector's eye, and he is overlooked.

22. But a constable has many other duties than those that come before you?—Yes.

23. *The Commissioner.*] Your point is that the Inspector gets little more opportunity of judging than you?—Yes, except by correspondence.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But he is in the position to recommend?—Nobody else can do so.

25. *Inspector Gillies.*] Ashburton is the principal part of your district where sly-grog selling is carried on?—Yes.

26. From your knowledge of the work done there, has it been done successfully and well?—Rumour has it that plenty of sly grog can still be obtained, but the difficulty is to obtain evidence. As far as it can be done, it has been done well.

27. You are satisfied, as far as the police are concerned in Ashburton, they have used every effort to detect it?—Yes.

28. You have had numerous cases before you?—Yes.

29. You have no fault to find with the way the cases have been got up?—No; but I say it is not desirable that where any reward is attached the case should be in the hands of the man who is to receive the reward.

30. My reason for asking this question is in justice to the sergeant in charge of the district, who is one of the best men in the service?—He is a splendid officer, and one of the few men suitable to be in the district.

MICHAEL DONNELLY, Barrister and Solicitor, examined on oath. (No. 81.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] You have known me for a number of years?—Eighteen years.
2. And have had a great deal to do with me in Court matters?—Yes.
3. Have you found me a good man?—I think you have been always very straightforward, energetic, and zealous—far above the majority of ordinary policemen. I met you first about eighteen years ago, in connection with an assault and robbery case, and we had a very hard conflict then. I have seen you in Akaroa and Christchurch since in Court and out of Court, and you have done as much as any constable to maintain the best traditions of the Police Force in New Zealand.

The Commissioner: You cannot have higher praise than that, and Mr. Donnelly is competent to judge.

CHARLES RUTLEDGE, ex-Sergeant, further examined. (No. 82.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I was a constable under you at Akaroa?—Yes, for three or four years.
2. How did I do my duty while you were there?—Remarkably well. I had no fault to find. I had every confidence in you.
3. Was there ever any delay or anything incorrect in regard to correspondence, or anything of that sort?—None at all; everything was in good form and correct.
4. I had a number of licensing and other cases which I conducted myself?—Yes.
5. *The Commissioner.*] What about Constable Jackson's suitability for promotion?—I consider him quite competent.
6. You have had a long experience as sergeant, and are competent to judge?—I have been a sergeant about thirty-three years.
7. You think he would have justified his promotion?—Most undoubtedly; he is a man in whom every confidence is to be placed.

MAURICE ROCHE, ex-Constable, examined on oath. (No. 83.)

Witness: I have had twenty-five years' experience as a constable in New Zealand, and was about seven years in New Orleans and two years in the London Metropolitan. I retired on superannuation.

1. *Constable Jackson.*] You have done duty with me, and have known me for a number of years?—Yes, I have been associated with you in important cases.
2. What is your opinion of me as a constable?—You are just the very man I would want.
3. I did my work well?—Yes; when you were associated with me you did everything that was necessary.
4. You coached me for examination: had you any fault to find?—You could answer orally any question I could see in any of the Acts mentioned in the examination. I told you if it were a literary examination it might not be so good. You cannot get an Oxford graduate for 7s. a day, although I see they have got a solicitor for that.

JAMES JOHNSTON, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 84.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] You have known me for a number of years?—Yes.
2. We have done duty together: what is your opinion of me as a constable?—You are as loyal and energetic a constable as I know. You did your work remarkably well.
3. You have trusted me with inquiries about hotels and with information?—I would trust you with any ordinary inquiry; I would prefer you to any man I know.
4. The information you gave me did not leak out?—Not that I know of.
5. You think I am a good constable?—I do not know of any better.
6. *The Commissioner.*] Having regard to the men you see promoted, do you think this constable would be a suitable man for promotion?—I do not know whether it is right for a subordinate member of the Force to answer that question. My superiors are here; it would be better to ask them.
7. I ask you, and insist on an answer. If you answer that you consider him qualified, it is no possible reflection on your superior, because it is a matter of individual judgment. If Constable Jackson had been chosen for promotion, would he have been suitable?—Undoubtedly, in every way.

ALFRED EDWARD REMER, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 85.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I was under you for about eighteen months: how did I do my work?—You were very steady and energetic, and thoroughly efficient, and absolutely trustworthy. I am satisfied if you were transferred from Akaroa to-morrow I should have great difficulty in finding a man to get through your work.
2. There is a large amount of work on that station?—There is really two men's work, and the work has been most efficiently performed.
3. *The Commissioner.*] If it had fallen to the constable's lot to be promoted, do you consider he was worthy of promotion?—Most certainly.
4. There would be nothing in the shape of disqualification?—Nothing whatever.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 86.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I have been under you for five years: have you any fault to find with me?—Not the slightest.
2. I have done my work well?—Thoroughly well.
3. Akaroa is a station where you always like to have reliable men?—Yes.

4. Have you ever recommended me for promotion?—I have.
5. I had several sly-grog selling cases and other work under you in the North Island?—Yes; I never had a more energetic constable, or one who has given me greater satisfaction in the position.
6. *The Commissioner.*] When did you first recommend him?—I think last year; but he applied before that, and I put practically the same remarks on his sheet as when recommending him.
7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What were the remarks?—I cannot say from memory.
8. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know why he was not promoted?—No.
9. You are as much concerned as the Commissioner in getting the very best quality of men in the service—it would be of assistance to the Commissioner?—When I recommend a man I consider I have done my duty.
10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You did not place him on your list previously, I suppose, because you thought you had better men?—Quite so. I am called on every year to submit names of those who I think are qualified for promotion under the age of fifty years. When making the selection I take into consideration seniority if they are qualified, not unless. I simply recommend the man I think would be most successful as a sergeant. When recommending a man I give my opinion shortly. Jackson's recommendation was this: "An energetic, active, steady man, well conducted, and I think will make a fairly good sergeant in a city."
11. *The Commissioner.*] For purposes of comparison, did you recommend the man whose name I pass to you?—I never put him on my list. He applied later, and I gave my opinion of him then. I never put him in my return.
12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Is this what you said of that man: "This is a careful, steady, well conducted constable, who has done his work satisfactorily, and I should think would make an average sergeant if not too old for promotion"?—When he made his application some time after, I had submitted my sergeants for promotion.
13. *The Commissioner.*] If you had your choice of the two men, which would you prefer?—I would prefer Jackson. There is no comparison at all. I wish to make it clear that I never put the other man on my list.
14. You have no doubt as to the qualifications of Jackson?—Not the slightest.

DAVID JACKSON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 87.)

Witness. I am stationed at Addington. I joined the service in 1892. I was stationed in various parts of Auckland. I took charge of Mahanga in 1899. After a time was transferred to Mangaweka, where, besides being constable, I was Clerk of the Court. The plaints ran about 160 a year. From there I was transferred to Akaroa, where I was also Clerk of the Court, Deputy Registrar of Old-age Pensions, Inspector of Weights and Measures, and Inspector of Factories. I have another constable under me. The pensions were about forty-seven. I did all my own Court work, prosecuting in all cases, including indictable offences and licensing cases, and I have had no trouble with any case. During the time I was in the North Island I prosecuted all my own cases, and I have gone to other stations to prosecute. I was also concerned in two sly-grog raids there, and closed up a wholesale license at Taihape. I gave evidence at various times against wholesale licenses being granted in the North Island. I applied for promotion some time ago. I was told I had not passed the police examination. I went in for the examination, and got 59 marks out of 60. A large number of juniors have been promoted over me, and it is only right, if one man has to undergo the examination, another should. No distinction should be made. I hand in a list of twenty-five men promoted over me, and also the total number of constables promoted since the issue of the circular relative to the police examination. Six have passed the examination and nineteen have not.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What reason has been given you for being passed over?—Nothing, except not having passed the examination. I am forty-nine in September. I have always been in charge of out-stations till coming to Addington. I have a large amount of work there.
2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know now your name was not placed in the recommendation list till 1908?—No.
3. So you may be the next promoted?—That is so. The men each side of me have been promoted.
4. The regulation does not say you must pass the examination; it simply says that will be a consideration?—That is so.
5. *The Commissioner.*] How long is it since you thought you were entitled to promotion?—About two years ago I began to think it over seriously.
6. When did you put in your application first?—About two years ago, through the present Inspector, and he recommended it. In regard to the statement that Masonic influence has to do with promotions, I think it only fair to say I am as old a Mason as there is in the room, and my position here shows that that has nothing to do with promotion.
7. It shows you have not used it?—No.
8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have been in stations north and south: have you ever heard anything about my placing a special man in each district to give me information?—You hear remarks, but they are like any other rumours.
9. Do you know if there is any general dissatisfaction in the service?—I think the most dissatisfaction is that some men are being promoted without passing the examination, while others have to go in for it. There is dissatisfaction there, I must say.
10. *Inspector Gillies.*] You are in touch with the men pretty well in the city and suburbs and in the country: have you ever heard from any man that I was in the habit of calling for confidential reports from sergeants about men in the district?—Never. I had occasion to make a report on a constable, and it was returned in full. There was nothing confidential about it. I never heard of it till yesterday.

11. *The Commissioner.*] Have you had inquiries to make in regard to applications for enrolment?—Yes.

12. Have you had any experience of the manner in which inquiries are made by constables?—I think constables have not been careful enough. A man came to me and wanted me to recommend him for the Force, and I said I would recommend him for Lyttelton Gaol if he did not take care.

13. Have you ever had to deal with an inquiry in a case recommended by a constable?—Yes.

14. What would you suggest in the way of making inquiries as full and careful as possible? Every constable has not the same sense of responsibility?—They should be made only by qualified men, and before the man goes to the depot there should be inquiries where the man lives. A man may be a decent man, and yet not fit for the Police Force. If inquiries are given to every constable, the chance is one may have a friend he wants to get in, or something like that.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have to place a good deal of reliance on constables in connection with other important business, have you not?—Yes, but important matters are generally handed over to responsible men.

16. Have not constables in charge of stations a responsible position?—Yes; but in many cases inquiries are made by constables who are not in charge of a station.

17. In how many cases that you know of have inquiries not been satisfactory?—I know of one—the one to which I referred.

18. What was done in that matter?—The man could not get in.

19. Was not something done to the constable who made the report?—He was dealt with.

PETER MALONEY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 88.)

Witness: I am stationed at Akaroa. I was enrolled in 1904. In November, 1905, I was sent out after two escaped prisoners, and did some rough work in company with Roche, and we arrested them at Amberley. Neither of us was recognised in the matter, while two detectives in Wellington got £5 for arresting an escaped prisoner. If it is fair for one man to get a reward it is fair for another. About March, 1908, I applied for a mounted position, and was recommended by Sub-Inspector and Inspector Gillies. A junior man by twelve months was given the position in preference. Since then several junior men to me have got similar appointments.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know the rewards have nothing to do with the police—that it is the Prisons Department that has to do with them?—I do not know.

Mr. Dinnie: I believe a recommendation was made to the Prisons Department in the matter.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Have you had any conversation with Constable Fitzgerald in regard to Constable Wade?—Not that I remember.

3. You know Wade?—Yes.

4. Do you know anything about letters that it was said he used to write to people?—There were some such remarks in the district—that he used to write anonymous letters, but I cannot say personally.

5. Letters to whom?—Different people. I never saw any of them.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What were the letters supposed to be about?—Different things. If he took a dislike to a constable, he had the name of writing an anonymous letter to his officers.

The Commissioner: I should not care to go into that in the absence of the constable; it is a very serious statement to make.

7. *Inspector Gillies.*] Who were they supposed to be written to?—I suppose, the Inspector and Sub-Inspector. It is only hearsay.

Inspector Gillies: I never received any such letters, so far as I am concerned.

PATRICK RYAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 89.)

Witness: I am stationed at Riccarton. I was enrolled in 1877, and was promoted in 1904. In regard to the pay, I think it is due to that that not more desirable candidates come forward; the service is not attractive enough.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You think an improvement in pay would improve that?—Yes.

2. How does the Force to-day compare with that of years ago?—I think the conduct of the men would compare very favourably with any time. The physique of the men is not so good. The discipline is very good.

3. Do you know anything of political influence?—No; I have heard it talked of, but I have never seen any instance of it.

4. In regard to promotion?—There is a good deal of talk about junior men getting promoted out of their turn; there is no more fertile source of discontent.

5. If there are grounds for discontent it would tend to disturb the Force?—Yes.

6. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction on that score?—I have heard a good deal of talk about it. When a constable well down in the ranks is promoted it causes a good deal of discussion.

7. In regard to the admission of candidates for enrolment, do you make inquiries yourself occasionally?—I do not know that I have made any personal inquiries; I have had some through my hands that I have passed on to constables in the sub-district.

8. Would you prefer the sergeant to make the inquiries?—There is no doubt some constables are as reliable and efficient as sergeants.

9. But there must be some you would not trust with inquiries?—Yes.

10. And you would prefer it to be done by a sergeant?—They might be more responsible.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Speaking of promotion out of turn, do you not think junior constables should be promoted if they are better qualified?—Yes; but there are instances where a sergeant has been promoted and placed in the office. Those are the ones there is the most talk about.

12. It is those special cases to which you refer?—Partly; but there are others as well.

13. You believe qualification should be considered, and not seniority alone?—Yes. There is one thing hard to understand: a man is passed over and a junior is promoted over his head, and then the man is promoted; he was as good when first passed over as afterwards.

14. But supposing he would never go further than sergeant, and the other man was better qualified to go a step higher, which of the two would you promote?—I know junior men who have been promoted, and had they not been promoted the Force would have suffered, because they are a credit to the Force.

15. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have served under me for a number of years?—Yes.

16. Have you ever had instructions from me, either by word or writing, asking you to furnish a confidential report about any man under you?—I have not.

17. Have you ever heard that such a thing was done until yesterday?—I do not think so. I would not believe it if I did.

18. You know me pretty well?—Yes, I have had a long experience of you.

19. As regards my dealing with the men, has anything ever been concealed from the men by me?—Not to my knowledge. If a report is made against a man, your custom is to send it to him for explanation.

20. And if that is not satisfactory I hold an inquiry?—Yes.

21. During the inquiry, has the constable the right of cross-examination?—Yes, to the fullest extent.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you ever heard that I had a special man appointed in different districts to get information?—Not until this Commission sat.

23. Do you believe it?—I have no reason to do so. There was a matter mentioned yesterday by Constable Fitzgerald about a man shifted from Lyttelton. He could not have known the circumstances of the case. It did not make any difference whether the man was a Mason or not. Another matter I wish to refer to is the difference between the travelling-expenses of a sergeant and a detective. I have charge of Lyttelton, where there are five men and a detective. If it so happened that the detective and I had to travel to the country on duty he would go first class and I would have to go second, and if we had to get lunch he would be allowed 2s. and I 1s. 6d. I do not say the detective gets too much, but there should be no difference.

Mr. Dinnie: The question is now under consideration, and an alteration will be made.

ALFRED EDWARD REMER, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 90.)

Witness: I am in charge of Sydenham sub-district. I joined the service in 1881, having served a few months in the Armed Constabulary. I was mounted constable in Wellington for about three years, and was at my own request transferred to Ashburton as mounted constable, where I remained two years. Transferred to Timaru as mounted constable; there I married, and was transferred to Pembroke, a lucrative station on the Otago goldfields, where I remained a little over eight years; and, at my own request, transferred to Clutha, where I was for six years; then promoted sergeant, and appointed to Christchurch. I remained there two years, and then was given charge of the Reefton sub-district. I remained there twelve months, and, at my own request, was transferred to Sydenham. The only suggestion I want to bring forward is that it would be a great improvement, and tend to truthfulness, if departmental investigations were taken on oath. I speak very feelingly on the matter.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you anything to say about the pay, having regard to the efficiency of the Force?—I think the pay is a bar to better men getting into the Force, in this way: Taking into consideration that the police are paid for seven days a week, wet or dry, it is fully equal to that of an artisan; but there is the fact of the discipline, and having to work on Sunday and holidays.

2. Some inducement is wanted to bring a better class of men to join. Do you think the standard of education is high?—I would not lower it. Education has never helped me, but I would not lower the standard. I have known men almost illiterate, who, by studying to improve themselves, have been able to write a good report. I have known men with good education to be valueless as constables.

3. What is your opinion in regard to the physique of the men? Are they as good as they were?—I think they have deteriorated considerably in that regard, and not only in physique, but in ability; they are less intellectual than they were.

4. Is there any laxity of conduct?—They have not that sense of duty they had in years gone by.

5. Are you aware of any political interference or influence being used?—I am not in a position to prove it; I have heard of it.

6. Do you think it exists?—I do.

7. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force at present as regards promotion?—There is dissatisfaction, particularly with reference to promotions of juniors over the heads of seniors, and a month or two afterwards the senior man being promoted and having the mortification of finding himself junior for the future to the man who is really his junior. In illustration, I instance the cases of Sub-Inspectors Wright and Norwood and of Sergeant Griffiths—all juniors in the service. Sergeant Fouhy, my junior, was promoted before me, and so were two other men. These three are now senior to me, and if I was fit for promotion in July I was equally fit in June, when they were promoted. One of these may be an Inspector while I am still sergeant.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You are referring to some years ago?—Before your time.

9. *The Commissioner.*] Has the same thing occurred lately?—I have noticed junior men promoted.

10. And the same remarks which apply in your case would apply in theirs?—Yes. The general opinion is—though there may be nothing in it—that when a senior man is passed over and later on promoted that he has pulled the wires, and brought influence to bear to get his rights.

11. In regard to the selection of men for enrolment, do you make inquiries from time to time?—Yes; I always make the inquiries in my own district. I agree that sergeants should make all the inquiries. Cases have come under my notice where constables have put in favourable reports which have come through my hands, and I have put an end to the application. Of course, this entails a good deal of expense, and a good deal of extra work on the sergeant.

12. Have you come into contact with any cases where the inquiries have not been sufficient from your knowledge of the men after enrolment?—I cannot say I have. Greater care is taken now in making inquiries. Most exhaustive inquiries are made; but it would be an improvement if the inquiries went further back than when a man leaves school. I think his upbringing should be gone into, and his environment, and his parentage.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You would not condemn a man because his parents had been bad characters?—No; but it would be better not to have him in the Police Force.

14. Even if he has been of the best character from childhood?—Yes. I consider if a man's father is a convicted thief, and his mother of immoral character, he should not be admitted into the Force.

15. You say you are satisfied that influence obtains: how are you satisfied?—Well, I am satisfied it does.

16. What is your reason?—Because men have been promoted over the heads of their seniors.

17. *The Commissioner.*] Men of equal merit?—Yes.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to the morality of the men, are they more immoral than they used to be?—I can point out a man who was in the Force in Christchurch who had to go on the sick list suffering from gonorrhœa.

19. I dare say you could have done that years ago?—I know of other men being dismissed for immoral acts.

20. I am talking about those in the Force at present?—I cannot point to any case.

21. Have you heard of my having a special man in each city?—Such a statement is absurd, and would not be believed by anybody.

22. *The Commissioner.*] What would you understand such a statement to mean?—That the Commissioner had some constable or other individual specially to let him know what is going on—a sort of spy.

23. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have been under me for some years in the city and Sydenham, and in charge of sub-districts?—About six years.

24. During that time, have I ever asked you for a confidential report on any man serving under me?—No. I read the statement in the paper; it is absolutely false.

25. You have been acting station sergeant on many occasions, and have been present at many inquiries I have held: when a constable is reported on, does he not get the sergeant's report for examination, and if that is not satisfactory I hold an inquiry?—Yes.

26. Has the constable the right of cross-examination in every instance to the fullest extent?—To a far greater extent than any other Inspector would allow. I have never been at an investigation where a man has a greater show than under you; he can cross-examine a witness time after time, and you will always adjourn in order to give him further opportunity.

27. Have I ever denied a constable the right of cross-examination or an adjournment?—No.

28. Have you ever heard that I have been in the habit of getting confidential reports from sergeants about the men in their district?—It is absolutely false.

29. *The Commissioner.*] What are your views with regard to the disqualification of constables for immorality—say, for instance, a man was found to be suffering from gonorrhœa?—I should call upon him to resign.

30. He would not be fit to remain in the service?—No, for it would stand to reason he must have had connection with a prostitute, and that sort of thing has to be kept in check. In my opinion, in every case of immorality—whether a case of disease or being a putative father—the man should sever his connection with the Force.

31. In regard to drunkenness, for how many offences should a man be discharged?—I should say the first time he is drunk when off duty he should be punished, and the second time called upon to resign. If drunk once while on duty he should be called upon to resign; that is, if in uniform and doing duty.

32. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are there not good officers in the Force now who, when young, have been convicted for drunkenness?—I think I know one or two who have turned out good men, but I do not think you will have a clean Police Force unless you have only men who are moral and sober.

33. I quite agree with you, but there may be men who have only once given way. Do you know the system in other countries?—No.

34. Do you know that in the case of venereal disease they are suspended and reinstated?—I do not know. I have only given you my own opinion.

35. *Inspector Gillies.*] Do you know of any cases of immorality in the Force in Christchurch during the last six years?—No. The one I have referred to is the only case that came under my notice. My remarks did not apply to Christchurch. They were general.

36. *The Commissioner.*] I have on my notes reference to a case in which the men complained that one of their comrades was suffering from venereal disease. What would you do in such a case?—I would recommend the man's dismissal.

MICHAEL DONOVAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 91.)

Witness: I am stationed at St. Albans. Was enrolled on the 28th February, 1876, and promoted to be sergeant on the 1st January, 1904. I consider the condition of the Force is better now than ever before in my experience of the past thirty-three years. When I was on the West Coast I was ordered to a place called Okarito, one of the roughest stations in New Zealand, and when I raised an objection to going it was pointed out that, as I was a first-class constable, I would have to go, but they added that after I came from that station my promotion was assured, and it would not be many years before I was relieved. Well, they kept me there for fifteen years. It was about the roughest time any man could have in the Force. In my quarterly trips to Jackson's Bay, 125 miles from my station, I had ferry rivers to cross, and others to ford as best I could. My principal duties were Clerk of the Warden's Court. I was recommended by the Warden and by the late Hon. Mr. Larnach, who came there in his capacity as Minister of Mines, for promotion to the rank of sergeant, owing to the dangerous journey I had to travel. But the answer was that my time would come. I was then transferred to Ahaura, in the Grey Valley, in 1896, and there served as Clerk of the Court. During this time I was sent temporarily to Reefton, and while there the people, recognising the injustice done to me, petitioned the Government to have me promoted. The petition was a most representative one, including the clergy of all denominations except one. I also made application through Inspector Macdonnell, reminding him of the promise made to me. And, lastly, I made application through Inspector Wilson, now of Wanganui, who recommended that I should be put in charge of a station of the strength of two to three men, stating at the same time that I did not look more than forty years of age, which was the limit for promotion at that time. Commissioner Tunbridge then asked if I would accept the rank of sergeant, and do duty in one of the principal cities, to which I answered Yes. Commissioner Tunbridge minuted the papers to the effect that he left my promotion to the favourable consideration of his successor, and on the 1st January, 1904, I was promoted and transferred to Dunedin. In 1905 a scandal arose in Dunedin, and Commissioner Dinnie came down and asked for statements from the men, and I was the only member of the Force who made a statement in the presence of the Commissioner and Inspector. Some time after that I was transferred to Christchurch, which I did not like, as it deprived me of the opportunity of cross-examining the Inspector and Sub-Inspector. Even at this stage I would ask the Commission to peruse the evidence I gave prior to the Commission which was afterwards held. I have served under many Commissioners, and I think there has been more fair play under the present Commissioner than under any other in my experience. I agree with what has been said with regard to free uniform and rise in house-allowance to married men. I do not believe in the night-duty men taking out coffeetins with them, as they would only be a laughing-stock amongst the young men, and offer an opportunity for burglary.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was your age when promoted?—Over fifty, but I am fit to do duty yet.

The Commissioner: Was this constable promoted in your time, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, there was a memorandum left by Mr. Tunbridge, as the witness has said. He was asked if he would accept a position in a city, and he said he would, and, as he had been offered the position by my predecessor, that promise was carried out by me.

Witness: As my age has been mentioned by Inspector O'Brien more than once, I should like to say that when I came up here to Christchurch it was at the extra busy time of the Exhibition, and although my work was particularly heavy, I can claim that I carried it out faithfully and well. I have no grievance whatever. The only time I was disappointed since the present Commissioner has been in office was when I was transferred to Christchurch, and that was because I felt that people would think I had been transferred in connection with the trouble in Dunedin.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was it not owing to your application that you were transferred—on account of the ill health of your wife?—No, she was anxious to go to the West Coast, but I was not.

3. But it was owing to your application that you were transferred from Dunedin?—You know best. I had made an application.

4. You think the service now is more efficient than ever it was?—The best in my experience; and discipline is well maintained.

5. You have heard of the statement which originated in Dunedin that I have a special man in each district to gather information for me?—It has not been said here. I have never heard of it. Do not believe it is true. Would not repeat it if I had heard it.

6. *Inspector Gillies.*] You heard the evidence given by Constable Fitzgerald yesterday, to the effect that the sergeants were in the habit of giving me confidential reports. Is that true so far as you are concerned?—No.

7. Whenever you had a man up before me, had not that man the right to cross-examine in every case the sergeant or any witness?—Yes; in fact, you were more lenient with the man than with the sergeant.

8. *The Commissioner.*] If you knew of a man being at the station suffering from a venereal complaint, what would you do with him?—I do not think he should be dismissed. He might be shifted to some more suitable place.

9. It would have been evident that he had been associating with prostitutes, and I wanted to find out what was your view as to the effect upon the Force?—Well, the man might have fallen in a weak moment, and might never offend again. He might afterwards turn out a first-rate man.

EDWARD BIRD, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 92.)

Witness: I am stationed in Christchurch. Was enrolled on the 21st October, 1881, and promoted to be sergeant on the 1st October, 1904. I have no general statement to make.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you think of the physique of the men of the present day as compared with what it was when you joined?—I think the men are somewhat below the size they used to be.

2. They have to pass a certain standard?—Well, they look smaller, although they may come up to the required standard.

3. To what do you attribute that?—I suppose the men are not so easily obtained now, perhaps because the Force is not attractive enough. In other lines of business the rates of wages have increased more than they have in our Department, and until quite lately better employment could be got outside. The discipline of the present day I think compares favourably with the past. I think the pay should be increased.

4. What do you think of the present system of inquiry so far as the recruits are concerned?—I think the inquiry is efficient, and I consider it is necessary that the sergeants should make the inquiries.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you heard of any general dissatisfaction existing in the service under the present control?—No.

6. Have you heard the suggestion that has been made that I have a man in each district acting as a spy?—Never, until I saw it in the paper. If I had heard it I would not have believed it.

Witness (to Inspector Gillies): I have been under you in the Christchurch district ever since you have been in charge—seven years and a half. During that time have done a good deal of station sergeant's work. When Sub-Inspector Dwyer was away I acted as station sergeant for twelve months. During that time you have never asked me for a confidential report upon any man in the city or anywhere else, to my recollection. When a constable is reported to me he is very often called upon for an explanation first, and if that explanation is not satisfactory, he is taken to your office, and an inquiry is held. Then the constable or the person charged has full opportunity of cross-examining all the witnesses that are called against him; in fact, he often gets greater latitude than the sergeant. I heard what Constable Fitzgerald said yesterday about sergeants supplying confidential reports, but I do not believe such a thing exists.

GEORGE KEEF, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 93.)

Witness: I am stationed in Christchurch. Entered the Force on the 10th October, 1891, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st July, 1908.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How does the physique of the men of the present day compare with your experience of the past?—They do not appear to be of the same stamp as they were a few years ago.

2. To what do you attribute that?—It is hard to say. The Force might not be attractive enough, on account of the pay; and many of the men consider the standard of education is a little too high. I would make it the Fourth instead of the Fifth Standard. I think that would bring forward more men, even without an increase in pay.

3. Have you heard of any dissatisfaction as regards promotion?—You hear complaints from pretty well every one who has been passed over. I have myself been passed over by nineteen. I do not know why. I think I was as well qualified as I am now.

4. What, principally, do you object to in the matter?—There are some men in the Commissioner's office who have only ten years' service, and I do not see why a man who has served sixteen years and odd should be passed over by them.

5. You do not think there were any circumstances to justify it?—They may have been especially good scholars, but I do not think that should give a man the privilege of earlier promotion than his seniors. Sergeant Muggeridge, who is my junior in the service, is now my senior as a sergeant.

6. Do you know of any special qualifications which would entitle him to promotion before you?—No.

7. Do you think that was a cause of dissatisfaction?—I do. Then, take the case of Sergeant Hodgson: his number is 621, and the man before him was 719. I do not think the man promoted before him was any better qualified for sergeant than he was.

8. Those are the kind of things you have got to accept, but cannot account for?—Yes. The men lately have been complaining about a junior being placed in charge of the watch-house while the permanent man was away for a while. The man who was put in had only seven weeks' service, and there were men with four or five years' service available. They should have the same system as in Auckland.

9. It is a responsible position for the time being?—Yes. The men have complained to me, and I believe they have reported it.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There may be a reason why you were not promoted in your turn?—There may be, but I do not know of it. My defaulter's sheet is as good as the others.

11. Who recommended you for promotion?—Inspector Cullen told me he recommended me for promotion two years before.

12. You have been up North. Have you ever heard it said that I had a special man as a spy in each district?—I had never heard a word about it.

13. And yet it is said to be rumoured from the north to the south. Is there any general dissatisfaction under the present control?—The only thing I know of is in regard to the watch-house keeper.

14. You say a young man of seven weeks' service was placed there: when did that occur?—Last Saturday night, and he has been in for three nights.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not know about it. I presume it is a temporary arrangement.

The Commissioner: It is an unsatisfactory one, at any rate.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you consider the efficiency of the Force is as good as it was years ago?—As regards efficiency, it is all right, but the physique is not quite so good.

16. Is that within the last year or two?—Within perhaps the last five years.

17. How is discipline maintained now?—Both here and in the North it is well maintained.

18. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have served as sergeant under me for some time. During that time have I ever asked you for a confidential report concerning any man under you, either by word of mouth or correspondence?—No; nor have I ever heard of such a thing being done.

19. You say that a young man was put in as watch-house keeper last Saturday night while another man was away: do you know what his qualifications are?—He might be a good scholar, but I do not think he would know enough about police duty for that position.

20. I do not know the circumstances, but there was a change of watch-house keepers on Friday night last, was there not?—Yes.

21. The Sub-Inspector will be able to speak as to that. I will make a note of it, and hand in the papers to the Commission. So far as you have seen, have I dealt fairly with the men since you have been sergeant here?—Yes.

RICHARD THOMAS HODGSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 94.)

Witness: I am stationed at Christchurch. Was enrolled in March, 1892, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st of the present month. I am just recently from Wellington.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make before I put any questions to you?—No.

2. It has been represented to me that you have some knowledge of recruits, and so on, in Wellington, or have you any opinions concerning those recruits?—I have not been at the same station with them, but there are various opinions about them. I was in charge at Manners Street.

3. What do you know about them?—I was never with the recruits at Mount Cook, but it seems to me that they have deteriorated.

4. You have evidently been talking to somebody about them, otherwise this communication would not have come to me?—I have had a good deal of talk, and I think they have deteriorated a good deal lately.

5. Morally or physically?—Both.

6. Can you suggest any reason why that is so?—No, I cannot; but I think the discipline in the depot could be improved. The instructor is a married man, and not resident at the Mount Cook depot; he resides at home. They are not really in charge of anybody. The beat-duty sergeants have to look after their sections, and the sergeant at Mount Cook is also a married man, and living away from the station, and the recruits, in my opinion, can do what they like at night. I think if there had been strict military discipline a number of the men who have been dismissed of late would never have joined the Force. They would have been hounded out of the depot without joining. I have myself seen a good deal of hoodlumism. There was one man who has been dispensed with lately who I think should never have been allowed to join the Force, and I have heard a good deal about the others.

7. The wonder to you is that he was enrolled?—I think, if there was strict discipline, and a man were put in charge of the recruits at the training depot, sufficient would be seen of them to prevent some of them from being enrolled at all. I am not blaming anybody, but I think there should be some one in charge to see in what state these recruits come in at night, and so on. The sectional sergeant visits the men at 11 o'clock at night, but the sectional sergeants are away on other duty before that.

8. How long were you in Wellington?—Fifteen months. I came from Auckland.

9. What do you say as regards the discipline and general efficiency in Auckland?—I think it was good.

10. Was there any dissatisfaction there in your time?—I dare say there was a good deal.

11. What was it based on?—I dare say promotions had something to do with it—juniors overstepping seniors. I have heard other people complain.

12. Were you dissatisfied yourself?—Yes; I was passed over myself.

13. Do you know the reason? Were you less fit in those days?—I do not think so. Twenty-five or twenty-six were passed over me. I did not know the reason.

14. Was there any dissatisfaction as regards the promotion of the men doing special work in the office in Wellington?—I do not think any one junior to me was promoted over me in Wellington.

15. Where were you when Sergeant Muggeridge was promoted?—I was in Auckland.

16. Were there any reasons apart from his connection with the office which would have justified his promotion?—I have heard a good deal of dissatisfaction about his promotion in the office.

17. Do you know anything about the duties he was performing?—No; but I have heard other men say that his duties were looking after the police stores.

18. Not strictly police duties?—Except as being attached to the Police Commissioner.

19. Were you dissatisfied yourself in connection with that appointment?—I cannot say I was dissatisfied.

20. But he is still senior to you as a police sergeant?—Undoubtedly. There is one thing I want to say about the uniform. We are allowed now a pair of trousers every nine months and a jumper every eighteen months. I think two pairs of trousers should be issued with the jumper, then the colour would probably wear the same. As it is now I am wearing a black pair of trousers and a blue jumper, and it makes the uniform look odd. Then, there is another thing. The single men are provided with barracks, light, and fuel, and I think the married men are justly entitled to the same treatment.

21. What house-allowance do you get?—10s. 6d. a week. I am paying 13s. as rent. The house has not all the conveniences I have been used to, but I have to take it.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You make some serious allegations about the recruits, although you have not seen them. Do you mean to say that Sergeant Dart's supervision is not strict?—I do not blame Sergeant Dart; I blame the system. He is a married man, not resident at the station.

23. What was your duty if you found these men misconducting themselves?—I was not at the station, and did not see this thing. I said I was at Manners Street.

24. This is only what you have heard?—Yes, I have said so all along. I was not at the training depot when these fellows were going there.

25. Do you know that the barracks are practically new?—Yes.

26. Do you know there is a police-station close to the barracks, and that there is a sergeant there?—I believe so.

27. Do you know that the men are under Sergeant Dart the whole day, and that at night there is a sergeant at the station next to them supervising them?—That is so. My remarks referred to Mount Cook.

28. Well, a sergeant is in charge of the station there?—No; the sergeant resides half a mile away.

29. *The Commissioner.*] How many men were there?—I could not say.

30. You think the men would get on the "loose" when the sergeant's back was turned?—I do not know anything personally. I only speak from what I have heard.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know whether you were recommended for promotion whilst in Auckland?—I could not say.

32. Was there not some trouble?—Yes, there was some little trouble.

33. That was perhaps the occasion for your transfer?—I applied for it.

34. You know the cause of it?—The Inspector recommended it, and I applied for it as well.

35. Have you heard any suggestion that I had a man specially appointed in each district as a spy?—I never heard of it until I saw it in the paper the other day.

36. Do you believe there is any truth in it?—I do not think so.

37. As regards the discipline of the Force, is it not as good now as it has been for years past?—I think the general discipline is as good now; but it is the class of recruits that are now coming into the Force that are bringing such disgrace upon the service.

38. What is the reason for it? Is it pay?—I certainly think pay would be one of the causes.

39. Are not the investigations made in respect to candidates carried out more strictly than in previous years?—Yes, I think so; but there are a good many men coming into the service that we cannot make much inquiry about. They come from other countries, and you have to go on what they carry with them.

40. You know we write to the other countries and get them certified to?—Yes, I suppose so.

FRIDAY, 30TH JULY, 1909.

GEORGE WARREN RUSSELL, Member of Parliament, examined on oath. (No. 95.)

Witness: I am a member of Parliament, representing Avon, and I have been for several years Chairman of the Board of Governors of Canterbury College. I wish to say at the outset that, speaking for myself, as a man who has been identified with public affairs for a great many years, I have never under any circumstances endeavoured to influence either the Minister or the administrative head of the Department with regard to any person who has misconducted himself as a police officer. My object in coming before the Commission, however, is to give vent to the opinions I hold, and which I can support with facts, regarding the educational status of the Police Force, and what can be done to improve it. The educational standard which is set up as the minimum is the Fifth Standard, although applicants for admission to the Force are preferred who have passed the Sixth. As I presume the age of men who join the service will probably be somewhere between twenty-two and thirty years, it will be found that these men will have passed the educational examination on which they produce their standard certificates quite a number of years before they apply for admission to the police; and we all know there are very few men who carry for any number of years the education they have possessed for a specific examination. My opinion is, seeing the majority of the police are drawn from what may be called the agricultural-labourer classes, if these men, when applying, were set to pass the Fifth Standard of the public schools, a very small minority would be able to do so. Consequently it must follow that the standard of education of the members of the Force must be below what should be expected of men who have to undertake the responsible duties that are frequently cast on the police. My opinion is that the Police Force does not present sufficient attractions as an occupation to draw men of a higher class of education. There are in the Force altogether about eight hundred constables, and only nine Inspectorships and six Sub-Inspectorships, and somewhere about ninety sergeants; the result being that out of eight hundred men the chance of promotion, carrying with it higher pay, is so small as not to make the occupation of the police one that is likely to attract men having a higher standard of education than the class from which they have been hitherto drawn. I have been connected with education in every one of its aspects in New Zealand for a number of years, and I have come to the conclusion that if the general standard of the Police Force is to be raised there will have to be provided some means by which there will be more chance of

promotion and increment in salary than the Police Force itself is able to offer. My opinion, therefore, is that in order to encourage the entrance into the Force of the better and more highly educated class of men who probably would be available if the conditions were more favourable, an arrangement should be made by the Government under which the Police Force might be regarded as a recruiting-ground for other branches of the public service. For example, if the Factory Inspectors, of whom there are a considerable number, were drawn from the Police Force, and if the Landing and Tide Waiters employed in connection with the Customs Department at all the ports of the Dominion were drawn from the police, it would open up other avenues to which the police would be the leading door; and men would understand that when they join the police they were not going to have a twenty-five-to-one chance of finishing up as policemen, but that there would be other avenues open to which they would be able to pass from the police. If this method were established, an arrangement might also be made by which the municipalities would draw their inspectors also from the same body. But it should be an integral part of the proposal that those men drawn from the Police Force for other occupations, either in the Civil Service or municipalities, should still continue to be members of the Force, and be liable to be called on in the event of any panic or inter-State trouble, or anything of that kind, for actual service within the Force. They would, in fact, constitute a kind of reserve, which could be drawn upon if the occasion arose. I am quite aware the objection might be raised to this proposal that probably a lot of the best men would be drawn from the Force. But the answer to that would be that under the proposal I venture to lay before you there would always be a fresh group of men coming on the whole time, and the whole standard raised, so that ten or twenty or fifty might be drawn from the police and there would still be another body equally capable of taking their places. I think, also, one most important operation in connection with the rank and *personnel* of the service would be the encouragement of the men, after they join the service, in connection with raising the standard of education for themselves. I do not know whether there are school-classes in connection with the different barracks in the cities or not; I am not aware how far they go; but I do think that if in connection with such classes certificates of knowledge of law, which would represent actual fitness for the higher class of police work, were established there would be encouragement to the men, and you would soon mark the men who by diligence and aptitude in their studies stamped themselves as persons specially qualified for promotion. If this plan were adopted the old idea of a man who had been twenty years in the service being necessarily the best for promotion would speedily disappear. Men of a higher standard of education and better training would so completely mark their position in the service that it would be almost impossible for men who were comparatively unfit for higher positions to be put there simply on a question of seniority. I am getting on in years, and I do not wish to depreciate the value of age, but at any time as between the comparatively young man who is trained up to date and the elderly man who has had merely experience I should be disposed to say the educated and trained mind is the one best to be relied upon under ordinary circumstances. Then the university colleges might well be asked to take a part in connection with raising the standard. Speaking as Chairman of the Canterbury College, we have an extremely valuable law department in connection with it, and in Wellington the Victoria College specialises in connection with law. My opinion is that there should be prepared, if it has not been done already, by some thoroughly competent barrister, a small and simple compendium of law relating to criminal work. This should contain a clear synopsis of the law of evidence, and a clear definition of the different crimes and offences, and such full explanation as may be deemed desirable in order that the average man of intelligence may be able to pass an examination in these things. In my younger days, when living in smaller places than Christchurch, I have seen absolutely ludicrous instances of policemen endeavouring to conduct cases in the Courts before Justices of the Peace—I may say I have been one for thirty years—and being turned absolutely inside out by the smart type of lawyer who considered he had on the bench Justices who did not know when he was wrong and when he was taking advantage of them. The policeman, not being acquainted with the law, was scored off every time by the lawyer; and in many cases I believe mistakes are made in the administration of the law in this way. If the university colleges were to arrange that their law lecturers should have a course of lectures specially adapted for the police, taking in all the matters that come in the ordinary course of police work, you would find that not only would the average policeman be glad to attend them, but that even Inspectors and other officers would be quite willing to go and learn the principles, and the application of the principles, of the laws in which they take so important a part. Speaking for my own college, I can say that our Board would be prepared immediately to endeavour to set up such a course as I have suggested on conditions that would entail very small cost indeed. We have already established a course of engineering for the purpose of instructing the engineering Volunteer corps in the City of Christchurch, and the Board is desirous of in every way using its endowments and the position it occupies for the benefit of the country as a whole. I can conceive nothing better than this if the suggestion I make were carried out. Another thing is this: as settlement goes on in the back-blocks any one must see the enormous advantage it would be to the distant country settler if he had located in his midst a police officer who had some general training in the law. I need not amplify this point, but, from a thorough knowledge of the back-blocks, I am able to speak with confidence in saying that if the police were acquainted with some general principles of law their services would be largely availed of. Then, if you had these trained men in connection with the Force, they would be the men naturally to receive promotion in the way of filling country stations where the men have to act as Clerks of Court and in other capacities where some legal training would be of great advantage. There is one matter I should like to refer to before closing my evidence, and that is this: I think the detective branch of the service should be so arranged as to attract to itself men who intend specially to follow that branch of police work. At present the ordinary practice, I understand, is that from the ranks of the main body of the police

a man who shows himself industrious and reliable is selected first of all as a plain-clothes officer, and is subsequently promoted to the rank of detective. No doubt in many cases this acts correctly, but I have myself stumbled across detectives in this country—I will not say in Christchurch—that were too slow to catch worms. They absolutely had no training in regard to the general development of the intellect, and where it came to refinement of crime they were absolutely paralysed, and could do nothing but sit on the back-door step and see if the criminal came out of the window. My idea is this: To have a first-class detective service you must catch your detective from the jump; start him on that line; and there should be men specially trained who would instruct the younger men on the lines of the profession. I would not suggest that they should be put through a course of Sherlock Holmes, although perhaps they might get some tips from the author of those celebrated books. If the plan I suggest were given effect to the detective force might study under a university teacher works on criminology and scientific works on such matters, and even if it did not bear very directly on the lines of crime there would be the stimulus of the intellect and the training given by these men being specially prepared for this branch of police work. We should then catch the man adapted for detective work, and let him make a study of it under proper scientific conditions. I do not think I have anything more to say except that if the proposal I have made should be considered favourably by the Department, I am prepared to bring immediately before the Board of Governors proposals necessary to give effect to what I have suggested as possible.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You suggest this course should be followed by practical experience, with the ultimate issue of a diploma?—Yes.

2. The men would then carry a sort of hall-mark?—They would have a diploma that they possess qualifications for this branch after going through a certain course. Another thing is this: The men I suggest would naturally confine their studies in the first place to their own particular branch of the law. Now, in order to qualify, supposing a police officer wishes to become a lawyer, he has to undertake so much study of general law which will have no direct bearing on his duties that it is almost impossible for any man to pass a legal examination. But if they were studying only criminal law and evidence probably a number of them would make the attempt.

3. The essential thing would be the preparation of certain suitable text-books, because the present ones are quite valueless for the average man?—That is so.

The Commissioner: I am very much obliged to you for your valuable and interesting remarks; they open up a new line altogether.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you know we have in the probation classes a sergeant who has passed as a solicitor?—I was not aware of it; the fact does him great credit.

5. He instructs the whole of the candidates both in legal matters and police duty before they are appointed. We also have classes in each city for similar purposes?—I was not aware of it. I would not mind putting one of our people on to examine for you.

Mr. Dinnie: We would be very pleased to have him. It may come to that. We have an annual examination in police and legal matters.

The Commissioner: Mr. Russell wants to make it a part of the educational system of the Dominion.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think that practical knowledge of police duty is the best education they can have?—No, I do not. A man may go and make a blunder; he gets practical knowledge, and finds he has made a mistake, and will not do it again; but he has made a mistake, whereas if he had been trained beforehand he would have been able to avoid doing so.

7. It is not always the best-educated man who makes the best constable?—I am prepared to admit that may be the case.

8. A man must have some natural acumen to make a good detective?—Yes; my suggestion is to find the man with the acumen at the start.

9. You know men are selected and tried before they are appointed to see what they are made of: is not that a good system?—I think under your present system you have got the best plan you could have.

10. You wish to go beyond it?—Yes; I want to offer inducements, which appears to me the most practical aspect of the matter. The more inducements you can offer the better men will come into the Force—putting the educational standard on one side altogether.

Mr. Dinnie: It is rather a gigantic scheme.

The Commissioner: There is nothing unfeasible in it; it only wants working out.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What about those who cannot pass the examination physically?—I do not suggest that any physical test should be set aside for one moment. I want, instead of drawing the police from one class, to offer inducements so that men coming to me and asking for my influence to enable them to get into other departments of the Civil Service will say, "I would like to join the police."

CHARLES RUTLEDGE, ex-Sergeant, further examined. (No. 96.)

Witness: The only grievance I have is that a few months before I left the Force I got a doctor's certificate for three months' sick leave: it was returned to me with a memo. from the Commissioner that the three months' sick leave would count as my three months' leave of absence to which I was entitled after leaving the Force. I have never heard of such a thing before, and I thought it very unfair.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did the doctor recommend three months' sick leave?—Yes, for change of air. I was pretty well done up at the time.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I forget the exact details of this case, but the sergeant was treated very fairly indeed. You got leave, did you not?—I got sick leave on the doctor's certificate, and you granted

me three months' leave on full pay, arranging that it should be with the three months' sick leave. After a lot of correspondence, which I was really too ill to attend to, you extended the leave one month, so I had four months. There are now two months owing to me. Both you and the Inspector said there was nothing against my character.

The Commissioner: I will go into the papers.

JAMES O'CONNOR, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 97.)

Witness: I am stationed at Christchurch. I was enrolled in 1907, and have been in Christchurch ever since. I should like to bring under notice a little incident that occurred yesterday of a report in connection with a junior constable being given watch-house duty while senior men were available. He had only six weeks' service, and I, with a number of other senior men, felt the position very much, and it caused a lot of dissatisfaction and discontent. I consider I was quite justified in putting on paper what I did. Yesterday I got the report back, after it had been criticized by the Sub-Inspector, and a note from the Inspector, severely cautioning me and reprimanding me for what I had done. There was a minute from the station sergeant, "Constable O'Connor.—For your information. Please note." I took the correspondence away, and read it, and having other matters to attend to, put it in my pocket. Shortly after the inquiry finished yesterday I met Sergeant Keep, and he said, "I brought this matter up at the Commission today." "Oh," I said, "did you? See what they have done to me," drawing the report out of my pocket and showing it to him. Sergeant Keep was returning it when the Accountant came out of the office and wanted to know if I had noted the report. I said I had not and did not intend to. Sergeant Johnston, who was standing by, said, "Sergeant Keep, give up that report"; and, turning to me, said, "You have no right to let other people see the report." The Accountant turned to Sergeant Johnston, and said, "Sergeant, you had no right at all to allow this correspondence out of your office." I have reason to believe that since the matter was mentioned at the Commission yesterday something has gone astray with the reprimand, on account of Sergeant Keep bringing the evidence out at the inquiry. I wish the correspondence to be produced.

The Commissioner: Where are the papers?

Inspector Gillies: In my office. After what you said, I went into the matter, and will place the facts before you. I may say it appears a young man was placed for three nights in the watch-house by Sub-Inspector McGrath. He has seven weeks' service in New Zealand. He is very well educated, and had twelve months' service as mounted constable at the Cape. During the absence of the proper watch-house keeper, who was dispensed with, and pending another one being appointed, it appears the Sub-Inspector put this young man in the office. I will show you the whole of the correspondence.

The Commissioner: Would you approve of it under ordinary circumstances?

Inspector Gillies: I do certainly, and I think when you see the report you will agree that there was palpable impertinence on the part of both constables in their reports. There was a proper way of laying the matter before the Sub-Inspector, and he would deal with it. I dealt with it as a very impertinent action on their part, and I think you will probably agree with the action of the Sub-Inspector and myself.

The Commissioner: I cannot express any opinion at present.

Inspector Gillies: But it shows the insubordinate action of the constable; and then their coming forward here without notifying me about it.

The Commissioner: Of course, inquiries of this sort must necessarily disturb the discipline of the Force for the time being. I can only trust to the good sense of the members generally not to abuse in any way the opportunities they have. This matter was brought up by Sergeant Keep yesterday in such a way as to make it *prima facie* the object of inquiry, and men labouring under a sense of injury may not act with the same discretion as they would in calmer moments. The constable has a perfect right to come here and bring the matter up. I will go into the matter.

Witness: I would like to know, since this severe caution and reprimand was sent out, why it was withdrawn.

Inspector Gillies: I withdrew it till I knew the facts. I drew up a memorandum, unsigned, as to what I was going to do with the constable, and in my absence from the office the clerk took it off my table, and wrote it out, and apparently sent it out, appending my signature. After hearing what I did yesterday I sent for it, and brought it, with the idea of going further into the matter. I had not approved it.

CLIFFORD SIMEON THOMPSON, Manager for Turnbull and Jones, examined on oath. (No. 98.)

This witness produced a sample of an electric-flash lamp, the cost of which was 11s., the cost of refills, taken in quantity, being 2s. 3d. It would burn four hours continuously, and supply 960 flashes of a quarter minute duration.

Mr. Dinnie said he had experimented with a similar lamp, and found the flashes to get weaker the longer the lamp was in use.

WILLIAM MILLER, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 99.)

Witness: I joined the Force in 1895, and was promoted sergeant this year. Since then I have been in Christchurch. I joined in Napier, was transferred to the Thames; was promoted first class, and transferred to Devonport, where I had three men under me during the Auckland Exhibition of 1898-99; then I was promoted to a country station where there was a district constable. I reported unfavourably on him, and his services were dispensed with. I recommended another young man, who was appointed at £30, and since then, owing, I claim, to my training, his salary was raised to £100.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How do you find the physique of the Force to-day as compared with formerly?—It is not so good.

2. To what do you attribute this?—The pay is not sufficient to encourage qualified youths from the rural districts to join the Force. This is within my knowledge.

3. In the district you used to be in, would men discuss it with you?—Yes; when Mr. Dinnie sent out a circular to the effect that constables should talk the matter over with men they thought fit to join I spoke to different farmers' sons who were all fit for the position, and when they heard the wages they pooh-poohed the idea, saying they could get £3 or £3 10s. in the bush, or as much as £5 digging gum. As to Sergeant Remer's statement as regards selection of recruits from parents who are absolutely good, and so forth, I do not see how it would be workable in New Zealand, because at present, through the natives of rural districts in New Zealand not joining, the majority joining lately have been Australians and arrivals from the Old Country, and you could not find out their parentage.

4. What I understood him to say was that sons of known ill-behaved parents should not be taken on. Is there any reason you know of why New-Zealanders cannot be induced to join?—None except that the rate of pay should be raised. There is another little thing: Since the uniform branch and the detective branch have been brought into competition as regards promotion, I think the position of station sergeant should be put on a more equal footing with that of Chief Detective in standing in the Force, and in pay. If a Sub-Inspectorship becomes vacant, I think the Chief Detective is the more likely to get it. The Chief Detective receives 16s. a day, and the sergeant only 13s.

5. As far as promotion is concerned, it does not appear to me to be a factor at all. Sub-Inspector Hendry was a station sergeant, and so was Sub-Inspector Phair and Sub-Inspector Norwood. I think you are taking a wrong view of it: the matter of pay has nothing to do with it. If a station sergeant happens to be fit and competent, probably he would be given promotion over the head of a Chief Detective who is not so competent. Have you any views in regard to promotion? You have been fairly dealt with?—Yes.

6. Have you heard any talk amongst the sergeants or others about juniors being appointed over the heads of their seniors?—I have heard talk about it.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know something about the inquiries now made in respect of candidates for enrolment in the service: are they more strict than they have been?—They certainly are much more strict in every way.

8. You have had inquiries to make yourself?—I think I did in Devonport.

9. Are you aware of any general dissatisfaction owing to the present control of the service?—No.

10. What do you think of the discipline as compared with some years ago?—It compares favourably.

11. Have there not been some reforms since I have had charge, such as revision of the *Police Gazette*, system of classes, compulsory attendance, system of drill, and the finger-print system?—Yes.

12. Do you think all this is for the benefit of the service?—Undoubtedly.

13. In dealing with defaulters for drunkenness, do you not think it is a very important matter, and one in which the greatest care should be exercised?—Yes.

14. There are many occasions on which a man may be reported for drunkenness. A man may be under the influence of liquor on one occasion, but if retained in the service he may get to the top of the tree by good conduct?—Yes.

15. *The Commissioner.*] You would draw a distinction between being drunk on duty and drunk when off duty?—Yes.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards influence, do the Force generally believe that influence obtains?—I have heard them talking about it.

17. Have you known any case in which it has been used?—No; you hear the men talking about it, but they will not give you anything to go on. It is a hard question to answer. I never applied for promotion.

18. You have not been much in the centres?—No.

19. You have no fault to find with the system of selection for promotion?—No; I have nothing to complain of myself.

20. Have you ever heard of the suggestion made in Dunedin, that I have a man stationed in each district as a spy?—Not until I saw it in the newspaper.

21. You would have heard of it had it been rumoured from north to south?—I think so.

JOHN BURROWS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 100.)

Witness: I am stationed at Christchurch. I was enrolled in 1885, and promoted in 1906, at Waikouaiti. I have been here ever since.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion in regard to the efficiency of the Force?—It is just as efficient as it was years ago.

2. In regard to the physique of the men?—I do not think it is quite as good as it was. We have a good many fine young fellows, but a few are not up to the standard.

3. The conduct generally?—I think it is as good as it was years ago.

4. Is there any dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion, &c.?—You hear that sort of thing.

5. Is it affecting the efficiency of the Force?—I do not think so.

6. To what do you attribute the falling-off in men coming forward for enrolment?—I can hardly explain it. When I joined twenty-five years ago I did probationary duty at 5s. a day, and

I think the conditions of the Force to-day are more in advance of what they were then. I might further say up to 1898 there was a stagnation of promotion in the Force for thirteen or fourteen years, there being practically none.

7. What do you deduce from that?—The Superannuation Fund was organized, and the older men went out; before that they stayed in till they died.

8. But that does not account for the fact that it is not so easy to get good men now as it used to be?—Probably it is the pay. I cannot form any opinion.

9. It must be traceable to some cause?—Speaking to young fellows about the town, they seem to think they can do better outside. I think it is the discipline; they do not like to knuckle down to discipline. There is no question the discipline of to-day is better than it was years ago.

10. You consider, generally, the Force has improved?—I do.

11. If there is a lack of attraction it is due to the conditions?—Yes.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know in all large bodies of men there is always a certain amount of dissatisfaction?—That is so; there is nothing more in this Force than any other.

13. Have you heard anything about this "special man"?—Not till I read about it.

14. Do you believe it?—No.

15. *Inspector Gillies.*] How long have you been in Christchurch?—Over three years.

16. During that time have ever I called on you for a confidential report about the men serving under you?—Never.

17. What do you think about the discipline in Christchurch?—I think it is well maintained.

THOMAS GIBSON, Acting-Detective, examined on oath. (No. 101.)

Witness: I have been acting-detective since 1906. I was enrolled in the Force in 1902. I wish to put on record that a junior man was promoted to the rank of detective before me, and will now be senior to me for all time. I allude to Detective Quartermain.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is there any special cause why he was given promotion?—None whatever, except being in the Commissioner's office.

2. It has been a subject of comment among plain-clothes men?—Yes.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you capable of filling Quartermain's place?—If I got the chance. I never had the opportunity.

4. You have not had the experience?—No.

5. The mere fact of his being promoted does not affect your advancement?—I should like to know that.

6. He has not filled an outside place?—He is placed on the seniority list as detective.

7. He will not retard your advancement?—In years to come he may.

8. At present he does not?—But I am looking forward.

9. If kept at Headquarters always he will not interfere with you?—What assurance have I that he will be?

10. *The Commissioner.*] You are anticipating he may be sent out?—Certainly.

THOMAS ALFRED EVENDEN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 102.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1893. I had two years in Wellington, five years at Port Chalmers, and nine years at Rangiora, where I am now stationed. I have never been offered a station, and I want to know why I have been passed over.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your defaulter sheet like?—There is a fine of 2s. 6d. and one of 5s.

2. That was when you were a young constable?—Yes. Twenty-one men have been appointed over my head.

3. Have you ever applied for a station?—No. I consider the Rangiora Station far superior to the ordinary one-man station. I have been in charge there for thirteen days at a time, and repeatedly for from five to ten days during the time the sergeant has been away, and I have also relieved nearly all the stations in the sub-district. On the North Canterbury stations now all the constables in the sub-districts are junior to me. The man in charge at Kaiapoi was not in the Force when I went to Rangiora. Three men have been sent to Cheviot, two to Kaikoura, one to Culverden, and one to Amberley—all junior to me. In regard to travelling in boats on transfer, I think better accommodation ought to be provided. One time I came from Wellington I had to travel in the steerage with Chinamen. I think the house-allowance ought to be increased. The house I live in is not much of a house, and you cannot get one under 15s. I am living in free quarters, such as they are. The rate of pay for constables of sixteen years' service is too low; it should be at least 10s. An ordinary ganger on the railway gets 10s. for eight hours' work, whereas a constable has to be called on at all hours of the night. I work an average of ten hours a day.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There may be some reason why you were not appointed to a station?—Not that I know of. I never asked for any favour.

5. Are you fitted for Clerk of Court?—I could take it on right enough, but I do not want it.

6. *Inspector Gillies.*] Do you know why you have not been appointed?—I do not. I was recommended for a suburban station.

The Commissioner: On the face of it, it would appear peculiar that he has not been advanced.

Inspector Gillies: He was put on my list for a suburban station, but nothing further.

The Commissioner: What is the average service a man puts in before he gets charge of a station?

Inspector Gillies: Five or six years.

The Commissioner: He has sixteen years. Do you know the reason he was not appointed?

Inspector Gillies: He never asked for it. The only reason I know is I do not think he is fit for anything more than a suburban station. He has the same privileges where he is.

The Commissioner: What do you call suburban stations?

Inspector Gillies: Islington, Belfast, New Brighton, and Sumner.

The Commissioner: Do you wait for a man to apply for a station before you recommend him?

Inspector Gillies: Certainly not. My recommendation is before the Commissioner that he is fit for a suburban station.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not want to bring out specially what I know against this constable, but there is something. I shall make inquiries very soon, and it may be he will have to be transferred very soon.

Witness: I know of no reason whatever why I have not been appointed. I was five years under Sergeant Johnston at Rangiora, and I have known Constable Roche for seven years.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Why have you not applied for a station?—Because my family are living in Rangiora, where they have improved in health. My children are now grown up, and I was not particular whether I was moved or not.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You told me that when I saw you once?—Yes.

9. *The Commissioner.*] I presume, from the fact of your coming before me, you suffer under a sense of injustice?—Not particularly; but as other men are making complaints, I thought I might as well make mine.

10. You come because you feel that you are suffering under injustice, and complain that after sixteen years' service you never had the offer of a station. There is either a reason or no reason for this. If there is no reason, you appear to have been exceptionally treated; if there is a reason, you should say so?—There is no reason I know of.

11. What has your conduct been?—Good, so far as I know.

12. There have been no complaints about you?—Not as far as I know. I notice some constables are making complaints about influence and Masonry, and so on. I have been a Mason for years, and I never used any influence.

13. *Inspector Gillies.*] You are in just the same position at Rangiora as if you were in charge of a suburban station? You have the same privileges, but are more a free agent?—Yes; but when the sergeant is away most of the work falls on my hands, and there is more work at Rangiora than an ordinary out-station.

14. You do not want a station?—Not particularly.

FRANK JOSEPH BISHOP, Chief Detective, examined on oath. (No. 103.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1892, and was appointed to the plain-clothes branch three months afterwards, not at my own request. I have been doing plain-clothes duty ever since. I was sent to Palmerston North as acting-detective, and from there to Wanganui. I have no complaint whatever. I have received my just dues.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views in regard to the promotion of men in the plain-clothes branch to higher office?—I cannot understand why there should be such an objection to it. When a detective's turn comes for promotion, I can see no reason why his claim should not be considered. In the first place, the Inspector picks out the best man available to go into the detective office; he must be intelligent and persevering, and if he proves a success as acting-detective he is promoted when his turn comes. So you fill up the office with the most intelligent men in the service; and why, because he is placed in the detective office, he should be considered done with so far as promotion is concerned is a thing I cannot understand at all.

2. The objection in the minds of some is that the plain-clothes men will be out of touch with uniform work, and there may be laxity of discipline?—So far as I know, the Chief Detectives in the colony are all disciplined men, who have gone through severe tests of discipline which the younger constables now joining have no idea of. They go through practically no discipline compared with those I am referring to. I was a member of the Permanent Artillery for two or three years, and I can tell you the discipline there was—well, once you learn you do not forget it.

3. You are aware that for some time no promotions were made of detectives till the promotion of Chief Detective McGrath?—That is so.

4. You agree the very best man must be taken?—Yes.

5. It does not follow that because a man is Chief Detective he is the best?—No; but I say when his turn comes he should be considered with others. I think the Chief Detective's position should be made equal to that of Sub-Inspector. The ranks should be on all-fours; they have to deal with all the serious crimes.

6. What would you call the Chief Detective?—Sub-Inspector of Detectives.

7. Is there any other matter you wish to mention?—I consider 8s. a day as travelling-allowance for detectives is not enough.

8. What about the 6s. a day for the constable?—I do not object to his getting an increase; but I want to point out that when a detective is away on service conducting investigations into serious crime, the first thing he has to do is to get lodgings, and that costs him 6s. a day at the very least; then he has to spend a certain amount of money in making inquiries, and, from my experience, I should say he is usually 1s. to 2s. a day out of pocket.

9. Does he not get a refund of any reasonable expenditure of that sort?—Yes, if he brings it under the notice of the Department, but he cannot remember every shilling here and there. In Melbourne they have a system of unauthorised expenditure, and they get their receipts as they pay any one for information, or for anything that is done for them. If that were in vogue here, I think it would be a good thing; but if 10s. a day were allowed when travelling it would about meet the case. When I was travelling in the Taranaki and Wanganui district I was always out of pocket to some extent.

10. Has the promotion of Detective Quartermain caused any dissatisfaction among the plain-clothes branch?—Gibson and Ward thought they should have been promoted before him, as they were his seniors.

11. They are exceptionally good men?—Yes; I have no doubt about that.

12. *Mr. Dinnie:* So is Quartermain?—I do not know anything about him, as he was in a different branch altogether. In reference to travelling-allowance, in every other branch of the Government service, from the cadet upwards, they get 10s. a day, and they are not called upon to spend money as the detective is. The detective must spend money if he wants to be a success.

13. *The Commissioner.*] It seems to me that that should not be spent under the guise of travelling-allowance, as it might open the door to a great deal of abuse throughout the service. I should infinitely prefer a special fund?—Well, the detective would prefer that too; but 10s. a day would about clear it.

14. There has been so much dissatisfaction about travelling-allowances throughout New Zealand that I do not think they are likely to be raised again?—The detective must be a good man. When he has an investigation to make he very often gets very little sleep at night. He has to find all his own clothes, which cost him about £20 a year for wear-and-tear and one thing and another. As the constable has his uniform he has to spend very little upon plain clothes.

15. In your official relations, do you deal direct with the Inspector or through the Sub-Inspector?—Direct with the Inspector.

16. Do you know anything about the finger-print business?—Yes, I understand it fairly.

17. Do you think it would be any advantage to take a promising man occasionally from a district and give him instruction in the finger-print branch?—Not as the office is situated—in Wellington. It is a splendid branch of the service. When a shop is broken into, for instance, we take the finger-prints, and send them on to Wellington, where they are immediately enlarged, and very promptly we get word down to say who the offender is. With regard to steamer-fares, from the Chief Detective downwards we have all to travel steerage, and, as many of the detectives and sergeants have large families, they cannot afford the extra fare charged for saloon passages. It often happens that telegraph boys and railway porters are travelling by the same steamer in the saloon, their fares being paid by the Government, while the members of the Force have to travel steerage. I think we should receive saloon fares. Then, the allowance of 2s. a week is not sufficient as a bicycle allowance to enable us to keep our own bicycles in repair. We have worked it out, and we think 3s. a week would about meet the case. That would come to about £8 a year. The allowance is made in this district only.

18. What about the prime cost of the bicycle?—From £20 to £22, as we have to get as good a machine as we can. You can get them from £5 upwards, but I would not ride some of those. Since I have used a bicycle it has cost me £46, and my second bicycle is pretty well done now. But we do not complain about that. It is the cost of the upkeep that we think we should have a larger allowance to meet. I need not point out to you, sir, I think, how greatly the use of the bicycle adds to the efficiency of the detective branch. I only wish to add that the detectives here have all been satisfied since Mr. Dinnie has been in charge, and they have no complaint to make. They consider the Force has never been in a better position. As regards the office here, the pay, and everything else, there is no complaint to make.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards travelling-allowance, would a regulation of this description satisfy you: "Officers, Chief Detectives, and detectives will travel first-class by boat or rail; non-commissioned officers will travel saloon by boat and second class by rail. Constables will travel steerage by boat and second class by rail"?—I think that would be reasonable.

20. You were appointed to plain clothes after about three months' service: did that give great dissatisfaction to the members of the Force?—Well, in those days you could not get men to take the position, and when any man showed himself worthy of it Mr. Pender at once jumped at him, and tried to get him into the office.

21. *The Commissioner.*] Why was the duty not so sought after in those days? Had the pay anything to do with it?—I only received 7s. a day as acting-detective for five years.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] With regard to the finger-print department, do you not think it would be a dangerous thing if we allowed the finger-prints to be taken and classified in the different districts—I mean, as regards tendency to mistakes?—I would not interfere with the present system. It is quite satisfactory.

23. You know that at Headquarters we have a complete system of registration of offences and criminals, and an easy reference to the photographs?—Yes, it is a pleasure to see the system in vogue there.

24. Do you know anything about the inquiries that are made into the antecedents of candidates for enrolment in the Force?—Yes; I think the present system is very efficient, and it is more strict now than it has ever been.

25. Are you aware of any general dissatisfaction in the service?—So far as Christchurch is concerned, every one appears to be satisfied. One hears of political influence here and influence there, but I have heard that kind of thing ever since I have been in the Force. I know when my time came for promotion to Chief Detective I was told I would be passed over for a certain man, but I said I thought I would receive justice from the Commissioner when my turn came. And as it turned out, the rumour was without foundation.

26. Since I took charge do you think there have been improvements in the *Police Gazette*, and as regards the introduction of the education classes and the finger-print system?—I do, certainly.

27. Do you know of any case where political influence has been effective?—No.

28. You know nothing of this spy I am said to have in each district?—The first I heard of it was through Mr. O'Brien's evidence in Dunedin, as published in the papers. It astonished me, because I had never heard of such a thing.

29. If you had heard it, would you have repeated it in Court?—No; nor would I have believed it.

JAMES JOHNSTON, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 104.)

Witness: I am station sergeant, at Christchurch. I joined the Force on the 27th October, 1876, and was appointed sergeant on the 1st August, 1898. Was promoted to be station sergeant on the 1st May, 1907. Since then I have been in Christchurch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You did not do town duty from the time you were appointed sergeant until you were made station sergeant?—No.

2. Since then there has been a rule that sergeants promoted should go into the cities. You admit, I suppose, it is a good rule?—Yes; but in that year there were a large number promoted to be sergeants, and there were more than the cities required, and I believe a few of those, apart from myself, got stations without going to a city. I agree it is good for the Force that they should go into a city.

3. How does the physique of the Force now compare with what it was a few years ago?—As I have been out of the city for some time I am not in a position to say, but I do not think it is anything like it was when I joined.

4. To what do you attribute that?—I could not say, but I know that fine young eligible farmers' sons would not think of joining the police. From what I have heard, they do not like the discipline.

5. Of course, we must have discipline. As a set-off against that, do you think there is anything that would make the Force more attractive?—I think if you made the pay sufficiently high you would have the men tumbling over one another to join, more especially if the men were allowed half their time off duty.

6. I want you to view the position from a practical standpoint?—Well, I do not think the pay is high enough, because men have said to me that they can do better outside, and have more Sundays off. In speaking about pay, I would like to say that I do not think the station sergeant receives sufficient pay in proportion for the duties he has to perform. He starts with 12s. 6d., and rises in two years to 13s. 6d.

7. And as to house-allowance?—I could not tell you anything about that.

Mr. Dinnie: It depends.

8. *The Commissioner.*] What is your position?—I have a house rent-free and 13s. 6d. a day as pay. Were it not for the hope of reward in the shape of a pension I would not keep the position as against that of sergeant. Looking to the work and the responsibilities of station sergeant, I do not think he is paid sufficiently in comparison with sergeants, although I do not like to make comparisons with others. I think Station Sergeant King told you it was the most irritating position in the service. The maximum pay for sergeants is 12s.

9. How does the pay compare with that of detectives and Chief Detectives?—A Chief Detective gets 16s. 6d. and a detective 15s.

10. What would you consider a fair amount as a maximum for a station sergeant?—If I had another shilling a day I should be perfectly satisfied.

11. Do you consider the discipline is well maintained?—Yes, it is good, but not so severe as when I joined the service.

12. Are you aware of any general dissatisfaction existing in the Force?—The only thing I hear criticized is the method of appointing sergeants from constables.

13. You mean placing men over the heads of seniors, and afterwards promoting the seniors?—Yes.

14. Do you consider that is a real grievance?—It seems to be from the way it is talked about.

15. Knowing the men, and going through the list, would you be unable to account for some of the promotions?—The men cannot account for it.

16. Have you any personal grievance?—I have been treated exceptionally well since I have been in the service, although there have been junior men who have been placed over me. But Mr. Dinnie has nothing to do with that. It has been in existence ever since I have been in the Force.

17. But there are certain instances that you, as a reasonable man, cannot account for in your mind?—That is exactly the position.

18. Do you see any reason why a Chief Detective, if as competent or more competent than the next station sergeant, should not receive promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector?—This is the attitude I take up: Suppose, for example, that Chief Detective Bishop and I are equally qualified for the position, and although I may be the senior man he may be the smarter; if he is appointed Sub-Inspector and I am subsequently appointed Sub-Inspector I am then made junior to him, when I consider I should be the senior. I do not object at all, however, to the promotion of detectives to the plain-clothes branch if they have the qualifications and the ability. But I would point out that a detective, as a rule, would not have the knowledge of the police routine that the uniform man would have.

19. You know that for a long time no such appointments were made?—Inspector O'Brien is the one man who has been appointed from the detective branch, and I think, if a man has the ability, there is no reason why he should not be promoted in that way.

20. You know the then Minister stated that before a man in the detective branch could be promoted he would have to go into the uniform branch and work his way up?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: That is the system adopted in the Metropolitan Police in London.

The Commissioner: I understand you do not agree with that system?

Mr. Dinnie: At one time it was an open question with me.

Witness: But the other side of the question has not been touched. I do not see why, if a sergeant is considered capable, he should not be promoted to the detective branch. There might be some men of exceptional ability in the service who might like to join the detective branch.

21. *The Commissioner.*] Do you really think it would tend to the efficiency of the detective branch that a sergeant should suddenly be transferred to that branch?—I have no feeling in the matter. I merely throw it out as a suggestion.

22. With regard to alleged political influence, can you put your finger on any case in which it has proved effective?—No, I cannot. I noticed that an ex-constable named Walker gave evidence in Dunedin to the effect that no man could get above the rank of constable without some influence. I can only say that since I have been in the service I have never asked for nor sought promotion, and I should certainly be amazed if any one has written to the Commissioner or any one else to recommend me.

23. I strongly recommended you myself for the rank of sergeant years ago. I spoke to Commissioner Tunbridge of your case?—I never spoke to you about it, sir.

24. You did not know until I told you?—I think, with all respect, that Inspector Broham strongly recommended me.

25. I spoke to Inspector Broham about you at the time; but that is not the kind of influence that is objectionable: I refer to influence of a kind that is against the interests of the service. Do you know of any case where such influence has been used with effect?—No, I do not; and it should not be tolerated. I have heard, of course, that such influence is used, but I do not know of any case.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards promotion, you said there was a certain amount of dissatisfaction in the Force, and you said that there were some constables who were fitted for promotion who had been overlooked: would you leave them in the position of constable to the end under such circumstances?—Certainly not, but the men should not have been overlooked in the first place.

27. Suppose some constable had been overlooked before my time, and was still qualified for promotion, would it be fair that he should still be overlooked by me?—No, I suppose not.

28. *The Commissioner.*] At what age would you cease to promote men to the rank of sergeant?—I think after a man gets to fifty years of age it would be a hardship to him to have to go and do the block. If a man is worth anything at all, and shows adaptability, he will be made a sergeant well before that age.

29. You are aware there are a great number of men who would be fit for sergeants but not for any higher rank?—Yes.

30. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You will recognise that there are men who are not particularly active as sergeants, and having an active sergeant or two amongst them will make a difference to their general efficiency?—Yes, influence of that sort is a very good thing.

31. Are the inquiries made into the antecedents of candidates for enrolment not more strict now that they have been for years past?—I do not see how you could have any more strict inquiry than at the present time. I know that sometimes certificates have not been accepted until I have gone and verified the signatures, although I knew those signatures to be genuine, and that takes up a good deal of a sergeant's time.

32. You know that in the House it was alleged that no inquiry was made in some cases?—That must have been said without any knowledge of what goes on, if my experience goes for anything.

33. With the exception of the promotion question, do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the Force?—No.

34. Is the discipline well maintained?—Yes; but I do not think it is as rigid as when I joined the service. At that time a man could not go out of the station without leave.

35. As regards the rule that the men must be in at 11 o'clock at night, do you not think that hour is quite late enough?—I think so.

36. It was mentioned in the House that the men even had to be in at 11 o'clock at night: does that not show ignorance of what discipline means?—Yes, because a man can get special leave when he wants it.

37. Do you think the system of education classes is a good one?—Yes.

38. And there has been a revision of the *Police Gazette*?—Yes, there have been improvements all round. The only thing that could be improved is the pay.

39. I suppose you have not heard of this spy I am supposed to have at all the stations?—We have heard a lot of wild rumours, but I did not hear that until I saw it in the papers recently.

40. Did you believe it?—No. If he is about here he is lying very low.

41. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have served under me altogether about seven years and a half: have you ever known me to communicate with you or with any other sergeant confidentially about any of the men serving under you?—No. No report is made reflecting upon any man without that man subsequently sees it.

42. When a constable is reported, is the system in Christchurch not this: that the report—unless it is for something very serious—is sent back to the constable for explanation? Then, if the explanation is not satisfactory, the constable comes before me, and the evidence is taken, and the constable charged has the fullest opportunity of cross-examining each witness that comes forward?—Yes, that is so.

43. Amongst other things, Constable Fitzgerald stated, in effect, that the men had no fair play at such an inquiry?—That is contrary to fact.

44. You have been at most of the inquiries held in my office during the past two years and a half?—Yes, a good many of them.

45. What do you think of the proceedings before me?—I think you are very forbearing, and give the men every opportunity of placing their side of the case before you, and of calling or cross-examining any witnesses they please.

46. As to these alleged confidential reports, had you ever heard such a thing talked about until it was mentioned in evidence here?—Never.

47. *The Commissioner.*] With regard to the case of Constable Leahy, of Oxford, do you know of anything that would have disqualified him from holding the rank of sergeant?—No.

48. He has been about thirty years in the service, and has a clean defaulter's sheet?—As for the defaulter's sheet business, there are some of the best men in the service who have not clean defaulters' sheets.

49. Is it not unusual for a man of long service, with an absolutely clean sheet, to remain a constable?—I think not.

50. Has Constable Leahy, in your opinion, the attributes which would go to make a successful sergeant?—Yes, I feel sure he has. To show that he has some backbone, he is the only man who when he was in charge of men in Christchurch here got a man fined £1.

51. But he is past the age for promotion?—It has often been a wonder to me why Leahy has not been promoted. He was under me for several years when I was in charge at North Canterbury; and whenever I went to Oxford he was always in uniform, and clean and tidy, and the station books were exemplary. The stable was always whitewashed, and, in fact, everything was as it should be. I have often wondered why he was never promoted.

52. As a matter of discipline, have you any opinion as to what action should be taken where a constable was drunk or under the influence of liquor when on duty?—I do not think there is any excuse for a man under those circumstances.

53. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Of course, you know that young men joining the Force are subject to greater temptation as regards drinking than they would be in their private capacity?—Yes, much more, because people will ask you to have a drink if you are a policeman.

54. And there is more likelihood of their getting into trouble?—Well, if a man is not strong enough to resist there should be trouble.

55. Is it not mostly the young constables who fall into this trouble?—Yes; when they are not hardened to people who want them to drink.

56. Do you not often find that the men with the most marks on their defaulters' sheet are the men who do the most work?—Very often.

57. It is not always the man with the clean sheet who is the most suitable for promotion?—No, because very often a man in trying to do his duty gets into trouble. I have been the victim of it myself.

58. The slow constable has often the cleanest sheet?—Yes. With regard to promotions, I want to say there seems to be an impression that it is necessary to make application before a man can get promotion.

59. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not know recommendations are made every year?—I do not know what the system is.

The Commissioner: I notice the question has been frequently asked of a witness, "Did you apply?" I strongly object to it myself.

Mr. Dinnie: I keep a list of applications, as well as a list of recommendations.

ALFRED EDWARD REMER, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 105.)

Witness: I have been informed that in giving evidence yesterday as to the moral conduct of two constables I said the occurrence did not take place within the Christchurch District. If I did say so, that is an error. What I intended to say was within the City of Christchurch. Since then I have remembered another instance of gross immorality that took place in Christchurch.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Is that in respect to a case where the man was dismissed?—Yes. I was asked if I knew any specific cases. I want to further explain that when I used the word "immorality" I did so in the broadest sense of the term. I did not mean dismissed for having actually had illicit intercourse; but if illicit intercourse has not been proved, it had been proved that the intention was to have it. If, on the other hand, an indecent act had not been proved, it was actually proved that the intention was to commit it. In my examination I said the service had deteriorated morally, physically, and intellectually. Mr. Dinnie asked me, in cross-examination, to give specific instances, and there they are.

2. *The Commissioner.*] All these men have been dealt with?—I believe they were promptly dismissed. At present I do not know of any immoral men in Christchurch.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As soon as it was found out these men were acting immorally they were immediately dealt with?—Yes.

THOMAS FREDERICK HAMMOND, Constable, further examined. (No. 106.)

The witness appeared and, through his solicitor, Mr. O. T. Y. Alpers, explained in detail the circumstances in connection with the service of the summons which formed the subject of part of Constable Gillespie's evidence, and produced evidence to show the esteem in which he was held after the occurrence by responsible police officers and by prominent residents in the Temuka district; and that after the occurrence on the occasion of his transfer from that district he was presented with a testimonial, and his wife with a purse of sovereigns, the testimonial being signed by three hundred persons, including five Justices of the Peace, the clergy of various denominations, and all persons of responsible position, fifty of whom were personally known to Mr. Alpers.

The Commissioner said he had specifically discouraged the bringing-up of this matter, but it having been brought up he was bound to inquire into it. He now said that he did not intend to allow the matter to be referred to again, and he did not intend to mention it in his report, nor would he allow it to be used to the constable's prejudice.

Mr. Alpers said the constable had ample reason to be satisfied.

ROBERT McCLELLAND, District Clerk, examined on oath. (No. 107.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1879. A month after I was transferred to Christchurch; and thence to Lyttelton; thence after three years back to Christchurch. In 1887 was appointed assistant in the district office, and in 1899 was appointed district clerk, and in 1901 was appointed sergeant. I have been here ever since. I have two clerks in the office. A third man is very seldom required.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you generally get suitable men sent you?—Yes, I am very fortunate; the two I have now are excellent men, of very good education. There is a great quantity of work, and it requires experienced men to deal with it. The man of experience has the advantage over the man without.

2. An inferior man with large experience is worth more than a better man without?—Yes.

3. How long does it take a man, on the average, to become a fairly good assistant to you?—He should pick up his work in a few months if he takes an interest in the work, and intends to remain in the office; but a man with twelve months' experience is of some value, because all the work of the stations in the district comes through the district office, and has to be supervised by the Inspector and his staff, and the Inspector necessarily expects me to take a share, and I expect my assistants to take a share.

4. Something has been said in other places about making use of the assistant clerks for relieving work on Sundays, &c.: have you any views on that?—I should be very sorry to see the clerks deprived of their Sundays off.

5. One case was before me where a man said he had not had a Sunday off for three years?—I can scarcely credit that. Some do not care for leave. I have never asked for my annual leave. I do not think I have had three months in twenty years. The reason I have never asked for leave is because we get our Sundays off, and the assistants do not ask for leave on that account.

6. Would it affect the efficiency of the staff to occasionally utilise their time in the direction I have indicated?—I think it would.

7. You would not be in favour of it?—I certainly would not. We have never closed our office on Saturday for the last ten years; if we did, we should have to come back and work on Sunday.

8. It has been represented to me that the clerks work, on an average, five days and a half a week?—Here it is not so.

9. Then, if they had to be on beat on Sunday, there would not be sufficient recreation for them?—No. I think they are fairly entitled to their Sundays off; it is a little encouragement for them to remain in the office.

10. You are able adequately to cope with the work you have to do?—Yes; if we wanted assistance we would get it.

11. Do the men take kindly to the work?—They would work twelve hours a day if they were asked.

12. Do you consider the position attractive to suitable young constables?—All that is attractive is that they have no night duty, and their hours are regular. It is a kind of work some are adapted to; others would not care about it.

13. When a man gets into the office he does not care about leaving it?—We encourage them to remain, and make everything as pleasant as possible for them to induce them to remain. In regard to pay, I think, to get the right class of men into the Force, it would have to be raised, because an ordinary tradesman earns from 7s. 6d. to 10s. a day, and a constable has to serve four years before he gets a rise, which is too long. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction about promotion. It seems everybody wants promotion, and we cannot all be Sub-Inspectors. For my own part, I do not grudge any man whatever promotion he may get. I have never seen a man promoted yet who was not well able to fill the position.

14. The question is whether there are other men equally good who have a better claim?—It is impossible for the Commissioner to satisfy everybody in making appointments. It would be impossible to stop grumbling.

15. Does the dissatisfaction exist to such an extent as to impair the efficiency of the Force?—I can safely say it has not done so in the Christchurch District. In my opinion, the standard of efficiency in the Christchurch District is higher than eight or ten years ago.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know the clerks are liable to be called on for documents at any moment?—Yes.

17. If they were out on street duty there would be a difficulty in getting them?—They would not be there to be called on.

18. Do you think many would apply for the position if they were to be called on for uniform duty?—I do not think they would.

19. You want special men as assistant clerks?—Some men are better adapted for the work than others; I have had men who were glad to go out again, and whom I was glad to get rid of.

20. You do not want your work sent back for correction?—No.

21. Are the inquiries into candidates for enrolment more strict than in years gone by?—Very much more strict.

22. You have no fault to find with that?—No.

23. If anything comes in wrong it is sent back to you?—Yes.

24. In regard to discipline as compared with former years?—On the whole, it is very good. Some of the younger men do not take kindly to it at first.

25. *The Commissioner.*] Would you be in favour of a period of probation before a man is finally enrolled?—Yes—say, for six months.

26. Do you think, owing to the strict discipline, some men leave?—I do not know of any instance where a man has actually left on that account. In former times men have left, as they used to say, in disgust.

27. Do you think the discipline maintained now is any reason why men do not join the service?—I really do not know why they do not join. I think it is on account of the pay not being sufficient.

28. Have you heard of a "special" man being employed in each district to get information?—No; the first I saw of it was in the Dunedin papers.

29. You have no reason to believe it?—None whatever.

30. *Inspector Gillies.*] Have you known instances where the clerks have to come and work on Sunday?—Yes, and after hours as well.

31. Are you ever able to leave your office till after 5, except on Saturday?—No.

32. And one of the clerks and sometimes two remain on Saturday also?—Yes.

33. And even after that they have sometimes to come back with a mail between 7 and 8?—Yes, frequently.

34. Have you known instances where I have had one of the clerks up till 9 and 10 to work?—Yes; we do not think anything of that.

35. Do your clerks have a spare moment from the time they come in the morning, one at 8 and one at half past, to the time they leave at a quarter past 5?—No; they have to work very hard indeed.

36. And the whole of the work is very exacting?—It is all important work. A young man without police experience would be no good whatever; he requires to have police experience, because the work from the out-stations has to be supervised.

JOSEPH ALBERT MCGRATH, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 108.)

Witness: I am stationed in Christchurch. I joined the Force in 1878. I left it in May, 1882, and rejoined in December, 1882. My former service was allowed. I was appointed detective in 1885, Chief Detective in 1899, and was promoted Sub-Inspector in 1909.

1. *The Commissioner.*] In regard to promotions from the plain-clothes branch to commission rank, have you any views? Do you know of any reason why any difference should be made?—I think the best man should be appointed, I do not care in which branch of the service he is found, selecting, of course, from the higher ranks. I think it would be grossly unjust to debar a man from the higher ranks because he has chosen to take up detective work. I regard the detective branch as the right arm of the service.

2. What is your opinion on the apparent unwillingness of the Department to promote detectives before your promotion took place?—The detectives were very much dissatisfied, and I venture to think it would be the means of keeping good men from joining the detective branch. Personally, I have no complaint to make. I was not at all sweet on taking the appointment, and I think Mr. Dinnie will admit I took some time to consider the matter.

3. Have you any views in regard to dealing with the detectives under a different heading from the police? Taking the Victorian Force as a basis: we have the various grades of the Force, and then at the end of the list the Chief Detectives and detectives, making it appear that you have to look in a different part of the roll for their seniority?—I think that is a mistake. I would not advocate the Victorian system in its entirety; I think it would work very well in a city with a population as great as that of the Dominion, but I do not think it is practicable in New Zealand.

4. Would you have grades of detectives? I want a suggestion in regard to the inclusion of detectives in their proper seniority on the roll as it stands?—I think it would be a very good system.

5. How would you place them?—You would have to make some alteration. I believe it would be well to have the rank of constable detective, detective sergeant, and instead of Chief Detective I would have a Chief Detective at each centre ranked as Sub-Inspector, and let him take his proper place as such, and when a vacancy occurred he would be as well entitled to it as the Sub-Inspector in the uniform branch. I would have in each centre two Sub-Inspectors, one in charge of the detective branch and the other of the uniform branch.

6. Would that lead to dual control or friction?—None whatever; one could be responsible for the detective branch, the other for the uniform branch. I do not see why that should not work very well.

7. How does the pay of Chief Detective compare with that of Sub-Inspector?—The maximum pay of a Chief Detective is about £40 more than the minimum of a Sub-Inspector. The result in my case, with house-allowance, meant a loss to me of about £20 a year. I suggest that should not be; and that when a man is appointed to a higher rank he should not draw less salary than his subordinate.

8. Do you find it any detriment to your work as Sub-Inspector that you have been out of touch with the uniform branch?—I think it has been of great assistance; I gained knowledge that is invaluable in my present position. I have had previous experience in the uniform branch myself.

9. You come from Wellington: how did you find the discipline there as compared with here?—I have not had the same opportunity of judging in Wellington, but I have no fault to find with the discipline here. I think it is very good. I do not at all agree with what has been said about the young men who are joining now. I think they are a fine lot of young fellows, and very promising constables. Both physically and morally I see nothing to take exception to. You must have seen that yourself on parade, sir.

10. I did not understand that there was any direct detrimental remark made about the men joining at the present time, but in comparing them with the men of the past there was a somewhat

sharp contrast drawn?—Well, some of us who are old in the service are inclined to think there were giants existing in the early days. I dissent from that view entirely. I think, with a very few exceptions, they are a fine lot of well-conducted young men in the service to-day.

11. You know there has been a great deal said about political influence?—Yes; I have heard that for years.

12. Do you think it has been such as to in any way affect the efficiency of the Force?—I should be very sorry to think that any member of Parliament would interfere in such a way as to prejudicially affect the discipline of the service. For myself, I have never received any advancement in the service for which I was not strongly recommended by my superior officer, and the only influence I ever brought to bear on him was hard work and strict attention to duty.

13. As regards promotion, has there been any dissatisfaction of such a nature as to affect the Force generally?—There has been a good deal of grumbling about juniors being placed over seniors, and then the seniors being afterwards promoted and losing their seniority; in fact, that has occurred to myself, and, of course, I naturally felt sore, but I might have been quite wrong. Of course, there may be a good deal in the point advanced by Mr. Dinnie this morning, that in promoting junior men he may be promoting the best men, and then going back to the man who was passed over as being the next best.

14. Does that dissatisfaction exist to a considerable extent?—I think I may say it does, but I have always heard the same complaint. It has always existed.

15. You have heard the opinions expressed with regard to the promotion of Detective Quartermain: did that create any dissatisfaction amongst the detectives and plain-clothes men?—I have heard it did; but I had left the branch at that time, and I know nothing of it personally. It has been said this morning by some one that only one sergeant had joined the detective branch—namely, Sergeant Siddels. I have been acquainted with six—namely, Neil, Walker, Eccles, Hughes, Geerin, and Siddels.

16. Why was Siddels particularly mentioned?—Probably because he is the only one in the service at the present time.

17. It has been claimed that if detectives can be promoted to the uniform branch the men in the uniform branch should have the same right of promotion to the detective branch?—That seems to me quite absurd. A man requires special qualifications and training for detective work.

18. What have you to say about the general conduct of the men?—I should say it is very good.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There is no rule to prevent uniform men from getting into the detective branch any more than there is no rule to prevent detectives from getting into the uniform branch. The same opportunity is given to each?—Yes.

20. *Chief Detective Bishop.*] From your experience as Chief Detective, and the experience you have had now as Sub-Inspector, do you find any trouble about coping with the uniform branch?—No. I think a man who is capable of successfully carrying out the duties of Chief Detective is quite fit to carry out the duties of Sub-Inspector.

21. *Station Sergeant Johnston.*] You heard what I said with regard to the pay and the duties of station sergeants: do you agree with that?—I do. I know what the station sergeant has to do, and I know he has very hard and wearing work, and long hours. I think he should get at least 1s. a day more.

THOMAS FREDERICK HAMMOND, Constable, further examined. (No. 109.)

Witness. I am stationed at Bingsland. I wish to make a statement on general matters. As regards uniform, I would suggest that the uniform supplied to members of the Force be made free of cost. I do not see why an exception should be made in the Police Department when the other departments of the service have their uniforms free. It has been mentioned that the helmet would be more suitable for wearing than the shako, and I would suggest that before the Commission recommended anything on that point a vote of the men should be taken.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that a vote of the men was taken, and that a huge majority voted in favour of the shako?—I did not hear that. As to the proposed concession on the railways, I would point out that the railways is a public place within the meaning of the Act, and that when a constable goes into a train his mere presence there brings about a better state of affairs than would otherwise exist, and, apart from that, a constable is liable to be called upon at any moment, whether on leave or otherwise, and there have been cases where he has been of great service to the guard in relieving him of awkward work. I could mention many instances which have occurred when a constable travelling has been called upon for duty. Considering, therefore, the relations existing between the Railway and the Police Departments, I think it is only reasonable that some concession should be offered to constables when travelling on leave. I think the present system of enrolment of candidates is a very good system. I have on several occasions had inquiries to make in this respect, and there is only one thing I would suggest, and that is, that any candidate for the Force should first submit himself personally to the Inspector of the District, because, although he might be passed by the surgeon as medically fit, the Inspector would even be in a better position, through looking him up and down, to say whether he would be a suitable man or not for the Force. Then, provided, of course, that he could pass the necessary examinations, let him be enrolled. Then I think that the inquiries that are made into a man's previous character, and so on, should be put into the hands of a man, whether constable or sergeant, who is picked out by the Inspector as being specially fitted for the work.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Do you mean a man specially appointed for that purpose?—Yes; I mean an officer for each district and sub-district.

3. That is tantamount to saying that the average man in charge of a district is not dependable?—I do not think in all cases he is.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 110.)

Witness: I am Inspector of Police, in charge of the Christchurch District. I joined the Royal Irish Constabulary on the 6th June, 1870, and resigned from that Force in August, 1874. I joined the New Zealand Armed Constabulary on the 14th January, 1875, and was transferred to the Auckland Police in April of the same year. I was afterwards stationed in various parts of the colony. I was promoted to be sergeant in 1883, I think, and from sergeant I was promoted direct to Inspector, there being no Sub-Inspectors in those days. I came into office as Inspector as from the 1st January, 1899. The present is the authorised strength of the Christchurch District: One Inspector, two Sub-Inspectors, one station sergeant, thirteen sergeants, 113 constables, seven detectives, and three acting-detectives; the total strength being 140. There are forty-seven stations, including Hampden on the south and Kaikoura on the north. To show the efficiency of the Christchurch Force to a certain extent, I would quote some figures. I took charge of Christchurch in 1902. For the year 1903 the percentage of detected crimes of the offences reported was 96; in 1904 it was 95; in 1905 it was 95 and a fraction; in 1906 it was 93; in 1907 it was 95 and a fraction; in 1908 it was 95. I might go further and say that the small percentage of undetected crime was due mostly to the property not being identifiable, or something of that sort. As regards the men who have been appointed to the service for some considerable time past, I do not agree with some of those who have given evidence. I admit that the physique of the majority of the men is not as good as it was in the early days, but I consider that at present we have a very fine lot of young men in Christchurch, and a large number of them will make splendid officers. So far as the morality of the Department is concerned, I think it has never been higher than it is at the present time in this district. I cannot, of course, speak for other districts. It is quite true that we are not getting the same number of applicants for the Force as we did formerly, and I certainly attribute that to the pay to a great extent. The ordinary labourer can make his 8s. a day, and I consider that the responsibility of a constable, and the work he has to perform, should place him on a higher footing than a labouring man as regards pay. The constables, although they are supplied with uniforms, have to pay for the making-up, and the average cost is £2 5s. I understand that the gaol warders get their uniforms free, and other perquisites. That also applies to the Postal and Railway Departments. I certainly think that sergeants, when travelling, should have a larger allowance. At present they get the same as the constables. There is a distinction made between sergeants and detectives; I do not say that the detectives have enough now, but I think the sergeants should be on the same footing with the detectives when travelling as regards allowance, and also as regards having a first-class fare. I agree that men joining the Force should be placed on at least six months' probation before being finally appointed constables. That has been my opinion for years. I think it would give an opportunity of testing both the character, the habits, and fitness generally of a man during that time, and before he was finally appointed.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Of course, we have heard a lot about political influence: can you say that anything of the kind exists?—So far as I am concerned, I never used any influence in my life. Whatever I have got has been through my superior officers; but, rightly or wrongly, there is a strong feeling amongst the men that political influence is used, and men who do not make any effort to use it feel aggrieved because they think they ought to get what is due to them without political influence. They are under the impression that others who are not deserving sometimes get before them through political influence. I cannot give any proof of that; I am only giving you the feeling that exists, and it is a feeling that must affect discipline. There is a regulation against seeking political influence, and I think if it were enforced it would go a long way towards putting a stop to it.

2. But if members of Parliament will try and influence the powers that be, is it not very difficult to put a stop to it?—Yes. Then the regulation should be wiped off the regulation book, to my mind. While the regulation is there it should be enforced.

3. We know that members of the Force do seek influence, but as to whether it is effective or not is another matter?—I think there are only two members of the service who can say as to that—the Minister of Justice and the Commissioner.

4. What is the object of attaching the sheet of foolscap to the defaulter's list?—Early in 1906 there was a conference held in Wellington of the four city Inspectors and the Commissioner, and it was then agreed, with the approval of the Commissioner, that nothing was to appear on the defaulter's sheet except in the case of fines. Reprimands and cautions would not appear. That has been strictly adhered to ever since. There are instances where men have been reprimanded or cautioned several times, and, as the file sometimes is very large, I have adopted this plan of putting the reprimand or caution on a separate sheet, so as to save my clerks half an hour's work looking up the papers when a man comes before me. It is only for my own information. When the constable is transferred from this district that sheet is detached and put in the fire. If I find a constable comes up four or five times for a reprimand I might possibly take that into consideration and say it is time he was fined.

5. In the other districts I have visited the defaulters' sheets came before me without this sheet of foolscap attached. You did not think it advisable to detach this sheet when handing in these defaulters' sheets to the Commission?—No, I did not feel that I was at liberty to detach anything when the papers were called for by the Commission.

6. I understand you do not deal with cases of drunkenness?—No; I have no power to do so. They are dealt with by the Commissioner.

7. I think you have already said you are in favour of sending on a man's defaulter's sheet when the man is transferred to another district?—I think it should be sent to a commissioned officer, as in the case of Sub-Inspector Green, for instance, who raised the question.

8. In the case of district clerks in the office, how are they placed there?—They have all been sent to me except, I think, two. When I have wanted a man in the office, and I considered there was a qualified man available, I have recommended him, as in the case of Sergeant Hogan, who was then a constable. He remained in the office until he was promoted to be sergeant. I also took on a man named McGlone when we were short of clerks, but, unfortunately, he was not a success.

9. The appointments are made by the Commissioner on your recommendation?—Yes, unless I have no one I think I can recommend; then I apply for a man.

10. If there were a promising young man in your district, and there was no vacancy in your office, would you recommend him in that capacity generally?—Yes; in fact, we are asked to do so on our returns.

11. How do you recommend constables for promotion to the rank of sergeant?—Each year I forward a list of men under fifty years of age in my district suitable for promotion.

12. To what extent have your recommendations been carried out?—They have been fairly carried out in my district, with the exception of two or three. Of course, some may be recommended who have not come to their time yet.

13. And some past their time?—There was only one, I think. You had the case before you yesterday.

14. Take a case such as that of Constable Leahy: would you consider it consistent with your duty, or the relations existing between yourself and the Commissioner, if you thought the man over fifty had been overlooked, to draw the Commissioner's notice to it?—Well, we are under military rules, and, of course, I was brought up in a very strict school, and I never like to approach my superior officer in that way.

15. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction on the score of promotion?—I have heard it talked of from time to time, but I am not able to say whether it is well founded or not.

16. But you occasionally see instances where perhaps a little explanation may be needed?—That is so. There may, of course, be a reasonable explanation.

17. Have you recommended all the men who have been promoted in your district?—There was one, I think, I did not put on my annual list, but my remarks were favourable to him. All the others were on my list.

18. And in the course of time they gradually come to their turn?—Yes, with the exception of one, or perhaps two.

19. Are many of your decisions overruled on appeal?—I think there have been two or three.

20. Is there generally a rehearing?—The Commissioner asks for an explanation, or some further report from the constable concerned as a rule, and on his report he has certainly overruled me in two or three cases.

21. Are you particularly exhaustive in your inquiries?—Yes; but, of course, it is a matter of opinion.

22. Do you see the supplementary report of the constable before it goes in?—Yes.

23. Do you offer any supplementary remarks upon it?—It depends on the circumstances. In some cases I think I have done so.

24. If there is a supplementary report asked for, the inference would be that your first inquiry was not sufficient?—It would be so.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards inquiry into character of candidates prior to joining, do you think it is more strict now than it has been in years past?—A great deal more.

26. If full inquiry is not made, the files are returned to you?—Yes, although I have been very careful over the files; I have had them sent down to me until the thing is complete.

27. As regards alleged dissatisfaction in the service, what do you say?—I have not seen any so far as this district is concerned. Dissatisfaction as regards promotions, of course, has existed ever since I have been in the Department.

28. And in all large branches of any service that sort of thing must exist?—Well, particularly in our own Department. One hears the same thing outside with regard to other Departments.

29. What do you say as regards the condition of the Force generally?—I consider I have a very efficient Force in my district, and the percentage of detected crimes will show that clearly, and I consider I have a large number of promising young men.

30. And discipline is well maintained?—I consider it is very good here.

31. Since I have had charge of the Department there have been several improvements introduced, have there not—such as the system of education classes and the revision of the *Police Gazette*?—As regards the education classes, I think I was the first Inspector to introduce that prior to the last Commission. It is compulsory now.

32. We have now the finger-print branch?—I have no hesitation in saying that is a most important branch. I admit I had very little faith in it until I thoroughly understood it, but I can now see the great value of it.

33. As regards the promotion of constables to the rank of sergeant?—I consider my own selections have been good.

34. What do you think of mine?—Those I have seen, I have no fault to find with.

35. Do you consider that the return of detected crimes in proportion to reported offences throughout the Dominion shows to a great extent the efficiency of the Force?—Yes.

36. Since my time here seven men in your district have been convicted once for being under the influence of drink?—That is so.

37. Altogether eleven men since 1883?—Yes.

38. Have there been any men dealt with for that since this Commission has been set up?—There has been a case, but it has not been finally dealt with. There is an appeal to the Minister. I could not therefore put it on my return.

The Commissioner: Does the Minister review your decision with the papers before him in the same way as you review the Inspector's, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

39. As regards Sergeant Donovan, he was transferred on application to Dunedin, and Ramsay was transferred to Dunedin in his place?—I understand that is so.

40. During the time Ramsay was here, had you any fault to find with him?—None whatever. He was only here two or three months.

41. Is this the circular that is issued with regard to police instruction classes (Circular No. 14, of 1906)?—Yes, that is so.

Mr. Dinnie: I will hand it in to the Commission.

42. You think it would be well to put men on six months' probation before being permanently appointed. You know that according to the terms of their appointment there is no reason why they should not be dismissed after they have been appointed, if they are found to be unsuitable or are defaulters?—Well, you must have a very clear case before you can deal with a man after he has been appointed. That is my experience. In the case of a probationer, you would not have to give the same reason for dispensing with him. In my opinion, it would be much easier to get rid of a probationer than a full-fledged constable, even if there is a contract in their appointment.

43. Do you think it is wise that the men should be allowed out after 11 o'clock at night without leave?—I say that a man who is out after 11 at night is not fit for his work at 5 o'clock in the morning; but I have never refused a man leave if I considered it was a genuine case. It depends a good deal on your men.

44. I suppose you have never heard of this "special" man of mine in each district?—Never, until I read it in the newspaper reports from Dunedin.

SATURDAY, 31ST JULY, 1909.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 111.)

1. *Dr. Symes:* Is it not the case that a certain number of men are placed on the sick list on account of catarrh and pleurisy, and complaints of that nature?—I suppose so; I always get your certificate.

2. Do not 10 per cent. of the constables appear more repeatedly on the list than the other 90 per cent.?—I cannot say. I leave that matter entirely in your hands.

3. Seeing that if six months' probation were adopted it might not include the winter weather, would not twelve months be better?—Yes, but that would mean rather a large order, and the result might be that, seeing they might be dispensed with at the end of the twelve months, we might not get any applicants at all. No reasonable man could object to six months.

4. Is there not a small proportion of men—say, 10 per cent.—who are not fit for night exposure although they are perfectly sound healthy men?—I think those men should be rejected.

Dr. Symes: It is impossible at the preliminary medical examination to eliminate these men.

The Commissioner: I am inclined to agree with the Inspector—that a twelve months' period of probation, with the possibility of final refusal, would certainly detract from the attractions of the Force.

Witness: I might say that when we find a man with a weak constitution, or with a susceptibility to catching cold, we cannot discharge him on that account.

The Commissioner: Are there any indications of that in your preliminary examination, or is there no doubt in your mind as to his fitness?

Dr. Symes: The man may be perfectly sound and healthy, and yet, from heredity causes, be very susceptible to catching cold.

5. There is another matter: would not time be saved if the Inspector could grant a man a few days' sick leave to enable him to go home without the necessity of applying to Wellington?—It would not save much time; but such an application has never been refused to my knowledge. If a man sent an application to me for sick leave on your recommendation, I should grant it till approved by the Commissioner, and in an urgent case I should wire to the Commissioner and take the responsibility on myself of granting him leave to go home till I got a reply. I am sure it would never be refused.

6. *Mr. Dinnie:* In regard to probation, do you not think that even six months is a pretty long time?—I think six months is a reasonable time, and I do not think it would prevent the proper kind of men from coming forward. If there were anything wrong about them they might be afraid of it being discovered during the six months.

7. But would it not have this tendency: that a man might be cautious about joining if he knew that he might not be appointed after the six months?—I do not think that would affect the good men, as they would have nothing to fear. It would only affect the doubtful men.

8. What do you consider the main reasons which prevent applicants from coming forward for enrolment?—I certainly think that the rate of pay is one—the principal one—and the discipline is another. The younger men do not like the discipline.

9. *The Commissioner:* But they do not know much about it till they join?—It is talked about; and I believe a third reason is that the Police Force of the Dominion is held up from time to time unfavourably. That would deter some from joining.

10. Such exposure as the present, you mean?—I do not wish to speak of the Commission at all, but I think your Worship will agree with me that the Commission affects the discipline of the Force considerably, and that it is some years before it gets back to its proper place. I go further, now that the subject has been raised: the self-respecting men of the service feel keenly how they are being held up to the public. If there are a few in the service who deserve punishment—and I say there are—these men should be dealt with, but the self-respecting men who are the bone and sinew of the Department should not be held up before the public in the way that is done from time to time. I have spent my whole life in the service—thirty-nine years—which I joined as a boy, and I have taken the greatest possible interest in it. I have always liked the work, and I have never been tired of it no matter how long my day was, so much was I interested in the work. But I feel so keenly the way we are held up to the public—undeservedly I consider—that I should be glad to-morrow if I had reached the age for retirement, though I have always loved the service.

11. How are you going to stop it? The trouble is that the few cases are distorted in the public mind as being typical of the whole?—That is exactly where we are suffering.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think you will agree with me that the whole cause for this Commission arises entirely from a few malcontents in the service, and a few who have left?—There is not the slightest doubt about that in my mind, and I could name a good many if I wished.

13. There has been some misunderstanding in respect to promotion. Supposing we have a man fourteen years in the service specially qualified for promotion, and another man with forty-five or fifty years' service who would make an ordinary sergeant, which would go up first?—The man with fourteen years' service I should consider, in the interests both of the service and the public.

14. On the other hand, supposing the senior man was equally qualified with the junior, which of the two would be promoted?—I should promote the senior; but I say if you want a good service you want to pick out the best men, whether they be senior or junior.

15. That is an explanation of what is going on?—Yes.

16. And this may not be understood by the men, and may be the reason for the dissatisfaction?—That may be so.

17. A great deal was said by Inspector O'Brien in regard to Sergeant Burrows—that he did not recommend him: is he carrying out his duties in a satisfactory manner?—I have no fault to find with his work. He is giving me every satisfaction.

18. Do you think he was qualified for promotion to the rank of sergeant?—I certainly do; he has done nothing to make me think otherwise.

19. Inspector O'Brien complains of receiving defaulters in his district?—We all receive defaulters from other parts.

20. You have had some from Dunedin?—Yes; I have had them from every district. We all get them, and we all send them away sometimes. I do not think it always desirable that when a man is punished he should remain where he is, and I therefore have him transferred.

21. *The Commissioner.*] You have not got a very bad lot, at any rate?—No.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] For five or six years you have reported favourably as regards the conduct of your men?—I could not do otherwise.

23. Have you anything to say about your clerical staff doing street duty?—I say at once that I think it would disorganize the office if they were sent out on street duty on Sundays.

24. *The Commissioner.*] The evidence that has been given here puts quite a different light on this question?—I have no hesitation in saying that the clerks under me are the hardest-worked men in the Department, and the least they can have is their Sunday off, and they do not always have that.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you ever heard of such a suggestion as that they should go out on street duty?—I cannot understand such a suggestion being made by any one who knows what the office work is, and I have never heard of it being done in any other Police Force.

26. *Chief Detective Bishop.*] Are you satisfied with your present Sub-Inspector?—Thoroughly. I would not ask for a more competent man. The point has been raised about men being promoted from the detective rank: I say without hesitation, from experience, that a Chief Detective, if he has the same qualifications as a station sergeant for advancement, is entitled to it in the same way; and I say further, that the four Chief Detectives in the Dominion should have the same rank as Sub-Inspectors.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Would not that mean recasting the grades, although I do not know that there would be any particular difficulty?—I have no wish to change the present title of Chief Detective, but he should hold the same rank and get the same pay as a Sub-Inspector. He is intrusted with the most delicate portion of the duties in the way of inquiry and getting up the most important cases. I do not consider station sergeants are sufficiently paid for the work they have to do.

28. Have the duties of station sergeant been defined?—It is a very open question. They have charge of the station and all the duties connected therewith, and I leave that pretty well to the Sub-Inspector, because one cannot define everything a station sergeant has to do. I think it therefore wise to leave it to the Sub-Inspector.

29. I think, speaking from memory, a complaint was made by one of the station sergeants that his duties had never been defined?—We have never had any trouble at this station. The station sergeants and Sub-Inspectors have all worked well together. They have been able to arrange matters so as to have a Sunday off in turn, and so on; and I have thought it better to leave such arrangements entirely to themselves. If there had been any friction, of course, I would have stepped in, but I am glad to say none has existed under me.

FRANK JOSEPH BISHOP, Chief Detective, further examined. (No. 111A.)

Mr. Dinnie: I would like to ask Chief Detective Bishop if he remembers the Papakaio murder case?

Chief Detective Bishop: I do.

Mr. Dinnie: You will have noticed that Chief Detective Herbert, in Dunedin, commented strongly on the fact that he was not allowed to conduct the inquiries in that case: do you think he had any grounds for complaint?

Chief Detective Bishop: None whatever.

Mr. Dinnie: What is the system that has always been adopted in the investigation of such cases?

Chief Detective Bishop: The cases are always investigated by the officers in whose district the offence is reported to have been committed. No officer from another district attends to them at all.

Mr. Dinnie: You know that certain investigations were made in Dunedin by the local police, and that we afterwards sent an officer from this district who obtained information which they failed to obtain there. I suppose that is the reason for Detective Herbert's complaint?

Chief Detective Bishop: Evidently so.

JOSEPH ALBERT McGRATH, Sub-Inspector, further examined. (No. 112.)

1. *Chief Detective Bishop.*] Will you state your opinion with regard to travelling-allowance made to detectives?—I have always found 8s. a day quite insufficient when travelling on duty. I think a detective should be allowed at least 10s. a day. In the case of a sergeant it is different, as he, as a rule, has no inquiries to make, while a detective has frequently to go to a hotel and use a room for a whole evening, taking statements, and so on, and the hotelkeeper would look upon him as a rather "dry-hash" sort of fellow if he did not spend a few shillings.

2. *The Commissioner.*] We have it in evidence that there are occasions when a sergeant has to travel around with a detective making inquiries, when they both stay in the same house and spend the same money?—Such cases may occasionally occur, but while the sergeant might have to go once in twelve months the detective has to go frequently, and if his allowance is too small he will lose a considerable amount of money when travelling.

Mr. Dinnie: I have had considerable experience myself, and I know I have been a good deal out of pocket owing to incidental expenses. There is no comparison between the expenses of a sergeant and a detective. Detectives are always making inquiries.

Inspector Gillies: A little matter came before the Commission yesterday with reference to appointing a certain man to the watch-house. It has been made public, and I think the papers are before you, sir. I wish now to say that I adhere to that memorandum which you have seen signed by me, but had I known the whole of the facts I should have punished more severely the constables concerned. But as it stands I leave it at that.

Sub-Inspector McGrath: I selected the man I considered the most competent for the duty. It was merely a temporary arrangement for three or four nights only.

The Commissioner: I think it is to be regretted that a question of that sort has assumed any importance at all.

This concluded the Christchurch evidence.

GREYMOUTH, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

MALACHY O'GRADY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 114.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1902. I appear as delegate for the police in this district. The men are of opinion that the pay is insufficient, and consider it should commence when joining at 8s., with increments of 1s. every four years, until eight years' service enables them to reach 10s. It should then remain till promotion to a higher rank.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You mean to the charge of a station?—No.

2. There are other emoluments attached to a station which the ordinary constable does not receive?—Yes, house-allowance. We consider we should get free uniforms. At present the cost of making up averages £2 10s. We should also be allowed at least two pairs of boots a year. We consider that constables on leave should get free passes on the railway, because they are never really free from duty, and on occasion arising are always called upon to act. I have several times been so called upon when on holiday leave. Another thing is that we cannot get our holidays when it suits us, but when it suits the Department, and we never get them while cheap fares are on. Then, the men here have a grievance in regard to Sundays off. For the last twelve months the men have only got four Sundays off, and we think a constable should get at least one Sunday a month off. We are short-handed on this station, and that could only be done by increasing the strength of the Force.

3. Is this generally regarded as a hardship by the men?—Yes.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You suggest a rise in pay till a constable gets 10s., in the course of eight years; by that time he would most likely be in a free house if he behaved himself?—Yes.

5. Do you know the time it takes a man to get charge of a station, if he behaves himself, and is fitted for it?—Between five and six years.

6. Then, if, in addition, he got 10s. a day he would be pretty well paid?—I do not think it would be very high pay. The ordinary labouring man on the Coast can get from 11s. to 14s. a day.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Do you mean casual labour?—Yes; the average pay of the men in the State Coal-mine was 14s. 10d. for the year.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What is the rent of a suitable five-roomed house here?—From 14s. to 18s.

9. Then, if you add 14s. to the 10s. a day, would not that be more than the labouring man gets? In regard to Sunday leave, I suppose you get a day off when you apply occasionally?—Not always; when we can be spared we do.

10. *The Commissioner.*] What is the average cost of living to a single man here?—I have paid for my board since I have been here from 16s. to 17s. 6d. a week, in a boardinghouse. I live in barracks. Living is very dear on the Coast. You pay 1s. here to get your hair cut.

DAVID JAMES WHITE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 115.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1899, and served ten years. I am now in the State collieries. As regards applications for enrolment, I think New-Zealanders should be given the preference. Good men from the country can be obtained.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Under present conditions?—Yes; and all applicants should have resided at least twelve months in the colony. More physical drill should be encouraged in the training depot, such as club-swinging, dumb-bells, and single-stick. I do not agree with probationers being employed to detect sly-grog selling; experienced constables should be told off for that duty.

2. They would have to be brought from other parts?—Yes; and any expenses they incur should be refunded to them. White gloves should be abolished, and also collars. The tunic should be made similar to those worn by the Permanent Militia, as a man wants his freedom. Constables should be supplied with one pair of boots a year, and should be allowed 9s. for the making up of trousers and £1 10s. for the tunic. They should be supplied with trousers every nine months, and tunic every twelve months. Better lamps should be provided, as at present they are clumsy, and the oil escapes, and destroys the uniform. The hours for night duty in cities should be from 10 p.m. till 6 a.m. A duty roster should be drawn up, so that a man could take his turn on every beat; and a man should not be on the same beat always, or twice in succession. Every man should have a turn at making inquiries, and so forth, in the centres. It would be a good idea once a year to have practice shooting with revolvers; few of the men have ever fired out of their revolvers, or know how to shoot at all. The statutes should be kept in the watch-house, so as to be at the disposal of the constables. The last place I was at they were kept in the sergeant's room. Country sub-stations likely to become vacant should appear in the *Gazette*, so as to give every man an opportunity to apply. On all stations there should be rubber gloves for use when handling dead bodies, to guard against blood-poisoning. I think the men in the Force should have the opportunity of balloting for the Police Surgeons in the centres; they are not satisfied with all those in the centres.

3. You would give the constables practically the right to appoint the surgeons?—Yes. In country stations, where there is no medical man, constables should be allowed £5 a year in case of sickness; anything more they can pay for themselves. Constables in charge of country stations should be supplied with kerosene; at present they have to find their own kerosene for the office or police cells. Constables should have some experience in relieving duty before being appointed to country stations. On country stations constables should be allowed to collect the dog-tax, and be allowed 1s. a head, as they used to be, and as they do now with regard to the agricultural statistics. Constables on transfer should be allowed for damage to their furniture. When on holiday leave they should be allowed a free pass on the railways, or at least privilege tickets at quarter-fare for their wives and families. And their wives and children under fourteen years should travel saloon when on transfer; the steerage is not fit for women, especially if delicate. No man should remain on a station longer than ten years, as he is liable to become too intimate, and to shirk duty. Watch-house keepers should be appointed from old servants who are unfit for street duty. Where a policeman is likely to give way to drink he should be removed to a prohibition district. Bicycle-allowance should be increased from 2s. 6d. to 3s. a week. All policemen before being appointed to office-work should do two years' street duty. Apart from that, preference should be given to old servants who are too old for street duty. The pay is insufficient; it should commence at 8s., and increase by 6d. every two years up to six years. House-allowance is too small at present. Inspectors and Chief Detectives should receive 15s., sergeants 12s., and constables and detectives 10s. Men should be allowed to keep poultry on country stations.

4. Is that prohibited by regulation?—Yes; there was a circular to that effect.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There is a reason for that, is there not—because it was found that the horse-feed was used?—Yes; but a certain amount of horse-feed could be supplied, and let that do for a month.

6. They can get permission when they apply occasionally?—I do not know of any case.

7. As regards to training depots, do you know what is done there now?—No; I went through some years ago.

8. As regards the employment of experienced constables in cases of sly-grog selling, do you not think they would be known?—Bring them from other places.

9. Do you know that has been tried, and failed?—I could not say.

10. Do you not think it requires a strange person?—I think detectives could do the work in some places where they are not known.

11. As regards every man being employed on inquiry shift: perhaps some are not capable of carrying out that duty?—In Port Chalmers every man got a turn.

12. But do you not think the best men ought to be employed for that duty?—I understand a man must be a good man before he is admitted into the Force.

13. But are there not good and inefficient men?—Yes.

14. And should not the best man be selected?—Any man with common sense could have undertaken the inquiries I went through.

15. You must admit the best man ought to be selected for making important inquiries?—Yes, I suppose so, but they keep them to one man in the centres.

16. If one man makes the inquiries do you not think he gets accustomed to the system?—Yes; but others do not get a show to get any experience.

17. You think vacant stations should be gazetted: do you not know there would often not be time for that?—Surely there would be time when men are going out on pension.

18. What difference does it make? You know the Inspector recommends men for stations: it does not require any application?—I know when a station is known to be likely to become vacant, men apply for it.

19. You say men should be removed every ten years: do you know that very few remain ten years?—I know one who has been at a station thirty years.

20. But the majority are moved?—I believe so.

21. You suggest a man who has been dealt with for being under the influence of drink should be sent to a prohibition district: do you think he would be any good there?

The Commissioner: That scarcely needs answering; it is the very worst place you could send him.

Witness: I think dummy inquests should be held at the depot. I had a case in Otago Central where the Coroner had never held one before, and I had no experience, and had simply to go by the book.

22. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware if there is any general dissatisfaction in the Force over any of the matters you have touched on? How long is it since you were in a centre of population?—Six years since I left Wellington. Things went on very smoothly there, and, so far as I know, it is so still.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If it is said that dissatisfaction has been existing in Wellington for years past, it is not true?—There have been a few dissatisfied men there.

24. When you were there, six years ago?—Yes.

25. In all large bodies of men there are always a few dissatisfied?—Yes, in every department.

26. Men get dismissed for misconduct, and have for years past?—Yes.

ALFRED HASTINGS JONES, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 116.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1897. In regard to the pay, since I have been in the service it has taken me all my time to pay my way with the pay I have received. I have had to deny myself things a constable should be entitled to have. At present I receive 8s. 6d., but I think, considering the cost of living on the Coast, I should have at least 10s.; I think I am worth it. In the district I am in—Stafford—I could not get any young men to join the Force because all the working-men are making 10s., and therefore would not think of joining at the present rate of pay. If the pay began with 8s., and gradually rose by 6d. every two or three years, it would be an inducement to better men to join than do at present. I think, considering the nature of the duty, and that a constable has to be exemplary in his conduct, and withstand exceptional temptations in the way of drink and being dishonest, the pay should be higher. I also think that when constables are being transferred from one station to another, they, with their wives and families, should be allowed saloon passages by steamer. I am quite satisfied with second-class accommodation on the railway, but I think it is somewhat degrading to a constable to have to travel with the class of passengers that are often found in the steerage of our coastal boats. In many cases constables pay the extra fare charged for saloon out of their own pockets, and a constable is always put to a certain amount of loss when on transfer, more especially as he has to dispose of some of the things he cannot take with him for a good deal less than their value, and buy new things at his new station. Then, I think the plain-clothes members of the Force should remain in their own branch. Then men who have borne the heat and burden of the day in uniform, in my opinion, should be entitled to the higher ranks of the service, provided they have the necessary ability. The detective and the uniform branches should be kept quite distinct from start to finish. As regards recruits, I consider the young men from the country turn out the best constables, as a rule, as many of the young fellows brought up in the town acquire habits which are not conducive to discipline. If the pay was raised it would, I feel sure, induce a better class of men to join. I think all promotions to the rank of sergeant should be made on the recommendation of the Inspector, who has a better knowledge of the merits and qualifications of the men in his district than any one else can possibly have. If a man did not turn out a good sergeant it would certainly recoil on the officer who recommended him for promotion. And I do not think those men who have passed the police examination should take preference of men who are known to have practical experience.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are not promotions now carried out on the recommendation of the Inspector?—I think the police examination has a good deal to do with it. I am not speaking as a disappointed man, as I have not asked for promotion; nor do I think I would take it in preference to a country station.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you do not know that the Inspectors every year are asked to recommend a certain number of constables for promotion to the rank of sergeant?—I understood that was so, but I have heard of men applying for promotion, and of their being told to pass the examination.

3. May that not have been because they had not been recommended?—I do not know.
4. You have been only twelve years in the service, and would not therefore be entitled to promotion yet?—There have been several junior to me promoted.
5. That would be for special positions. I mean for street duty?—I could not say. I do not know where the men go when they are promoted.
6. *The Commissioner.*] Just name some of those who have been promoted over you?—There is a man named Dart, and there is another man whose name is in the *Gazette*.
7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Those are for special positions. For street duty a constable must have seen at least fourteen years' service before being promoted. You are getting 8s. 6d. a day yourself and a free house, are you not?—Yes.
8. A free house makes a difference to you?—Yes, but only 5s. a week in my district.
9. *The Commissioner.*] Are you Clerk of the Court?—Yes; I get £15 a year as Clerk of the Warden's Court, and £15 as Clerk of the Magistrate's Court, but I have a lot of work to do for that.
10. From the fact that you have time to discharge those duties, I assume your duties as a constable would not be heavy?—I am out every night until after 11 o'clock.
11. You say it is the young constables that are most tempted to drink?—Yes; drink is held out to them as a bribe. The young constables give the most trouble. I do not think, myself, that a man should be taken into the service until he is twenty-five years of age.
12. That would affect the pension?—Yes, probably it would.
13. You think detectives should not compete with the uniform men as regards promotion. Suppose there is a station sergeant and a Chief Detective both fitted for the position of Sub-Inspector, but the Chief Detective is in every way the superior man as regards qualifications?—If he is superior, by all means give him the position; but at the same time, I think it should be a recognised thing that no plain-clothes man should compete with us for promotion. Each man, having selected the branch he is going into, should remain there.
14. Do you think the educational standard is too high as regards candidates?—No, I think an educated policeman is better than an ignorant one.
15. Do you know if there is any general dissatisfaction in the service owing to the present control?—No; but there is one thing I would indorse, and that is, that the police should be allowed a free pass on the railways when on leave.
16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that I have applied to the Railway Department for that concession, and have explained the reasons for so applying, and that the Railway Department did not see their way to grant the concession?—I did not know that. The principal complaint, so far as I have heard, amongst the members of the Force is with regard to the pay.

JAMES ARTHUR CRUICKSHANK, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 117.)

Witness: I am in charge of the station at Ross. I joined the Force on the 21st June, 1898. Was stationed at Dunedin for two years, and at the Bluff for seven years. For the past two years I have been at Ross. I think the pay of men joining the Force should be raised to 8s. a day, and that it should be raised to at least 10s. a day in the ten years. The cost of living has gone up by at least 30 per cent. in the last six or seven years. I feel sure a better class of men would be induced to join the service if the pay was raised. Suitable men have spoken to me on the question of joining the Force, but when I have mentioned the pay to them they would not look at it. They said they could do much better outside. I also think constables should be allowed 10s. a week in town, instead of 7s., as house-allowance. A constable is compelled by orders to live in close touch with the station, and rents in central localities like that are high. The rent of a four or five roomed house in Invercargill or Dunedin would be 12s. or 13s. a week. Then, I think assistant clerks in the district offices should do some relief work on Sundays or in the watch-house occasionally. I understand they are better paid than the ordinary constables, and they have every Sunday off, and have no night duty practically. I agree that a constable on transfer should be allowed saloon passages by boat for himself, his wife, and family; and, further, I think when travelling with his wife and family a constable should be allowed to travel in plain clothes. There is a regulation now that he must travel in uniform, and he has practically to treat his wife as a prisoner. I think more efficiency would be maintained in the Force if some of the older members were punished for glaring breaches of the regulations, instead of being allowed to go scot-free.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you refer to cases that are reported to the Inspector?—I am not blaming the Inspector. I blame the Department as a whole.
2. Do you know of any instances in which breaches of the regulations have been overlooked after having been reported to the Inspector?—I know of the case of one constable who was mixed up in horse-racing at one of the stations, and that is, I understand, a breach of the regulations.
3. Was the Inspector aware of it?—Yes. The facts came out in the course of a Supreme Court case, and the constable was transferred to a better or quite as good a station.
4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was that down South?—Yes.
5. *The Commissioner.*] Will you write down the name of the constable?—Yes. [Name written down, and handed in.]
6. Do you know of any other cases?—No; I simply refer to this particular one. I also notice that men are chosen for plain-clothes work after very little service. I fail to see why an Inspector should choose a man after a few months' service on the street for the position when he has done nothing to merit it, and there are older and more experienced men applying for the position.
7. What about the man's merits?—Well, he had done nothing at all.
8. He would have been recommended by the Inspector, surely?—That may be.

9. Then, you are setting your own judgment against that of the Inspector, practically. Somebody must be responsible for the selection of these men?—I think the Inspector, if he is worthy of his position, ought to see that the men are qualified before going into plain-clothes duty. There is one more matter I would mention. I feel satisfied that in some districts constables are in the habit of writing to the Inspectors privately about other constables, and those letters never come to light.

10. What ground have you for making that assertion?—One constable made that statement at the last Dunedin Commission, and it was admitted, and there is a feeling amongst the members now that that sort of thing is being done.

11. What was done?—So far as I know, nothing.

12. What resulted from the letter?—No action was taken.

The Commissioner: An isolated case might occur, but it would not be fair because of that to assume it was a system. This question arose in Christchurch the other day—that the Inspector was in the habit of receiving confidential reports from his sergeants. Now, every sergeant upon oath stated that he had never furnished such a confidential report concerning the men under him, and that he had never been asked to do so; and the Inspector also stated he had never received such a confidential report.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you in a city before you were in charge of a station?—Two years.

14. Had you a free house?—Yes; that saved me 10s. a week.

15. You did very well then?—You had to do three years' service before you got 1s. a day at that time.

16. You referred to older members of the Force committing breaches of regulations, and not being punished, and referred to a case in the south: do you know the man was not punished?—He was transferred.

17. Was not a fine inflicted?—I cannot say for a certainty, but it was not heard of by the members of the Force.

18. He was dealt with: where is he now?—I cannot say, but I know he was transferred from a good station to another good station.

19. The emoluments are not so good at Geraldine?—No; but it is a very important station.

20. What was proved against him as regards horse-racing?—I cannot give the details, but I know there was a case in the Supreme Court.

21. Do you know the Inspectors recommend every year those men they think fit for plain-clothes duty?—I cannot say.

22. It is on their recommendation the men are appointed?—I understand so.

23. Are they not in the best position to recommend the right man?—This is the way I look at it: If a man has four or five years and a good record, is he not better than a young man who has only been a few months on the street?

24. As regards letters being sent to Inspectors, you can only mention one case?—I merely mention this: that I hope the matter will be severely dealt with if it is allowed to go on. I only know of one instance. I am satisfied in my own mind it is going on, and there is more than I in the service who thinks so. I should like to make it clear that I referred to the Southland district only. In any dealings I have had with the Inspectors under whom I have served I have found them very good.

25. Do you include Southland?—Well, leave Southland out of it.

THOMAS BARRETT, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 118.)

Witness: I am in charge of the Hokitika sub-district. I entered the Force in 1890, and was promoted in 1896. I know of no general dissatisfaction in the service. I know the conditions obtaining in the Force at present are better than formerly. Of course, the man entering now may not be in a position to appreciate that fact. There is a certain amount of discontent and grumbling, but to what it is due it is difficult to say. So far as political influence is concerned, I cannot state a case, because it never affected me. I have only heard it spoken of. I think quite a number of us do not give those in authority credit for understanding the exigencies of the service. A good deal of consideration is shown to the men—far more than formerly—in the way of leave and time off. The physique of the Force has fallen away a little. It is difficult to say to what it is attributable. I would urge an extra 1s. a day; that might have something to do with counteracting it. From my experience as a beat sergeant, and from close association with recruits, I think there is a strong desire on the part of 90 per cent. to get into the plain-clothes branch. Beat duty is heavy and monotonous, and some find it physically hard.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you find the average constable entering the Force good intellectually?—Yes, better to-day than formerly, and the moral standard and sobriety of the Force is good; it is quite a rare thing to see a man under the influence of drink.

2. What was your experience in Christchurch in regard to sobriety?—Very good; I know of old hands there who were fond of drink, but the sobriety in Christchurch is very good, and with two exceptions it will hold its own with any district in the Dominion.

3. Have those men to be carefully supervised?—I believe so, and have been reported: they have improved—taken a pull on themselves.

4. But those sort of men have to constantly be under watch?—Yes; men like that make a bad impression on the others.

5. Would you retain men like that in the Force?—I would give them an opportunity.

6. They have large consideration shown them?—Yes; they have perhaps got more opportunities than they should have.

7. You say it is really the pay that would form the attraction to the Force?—Yes; Is. a day rise would attract a better class of men.

8. Have you anything to say about promotion?—No; I have no fault to find with the system. There is some comment on the clerical division being promoted, but I do not think it affects us very much. I think the idea is that when a man goes as a clerk he should remain one for all time.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you do not know of any general dissatisfaction in the service owing to the present control?—No.

10. Do you know whether there is any reason for the public being uneasy as regards the Police Department?—No. I am afraid there is too much talk and breaking of confidence: the private work of the service is divulged.

11. Do you think it is owing to a few dissatisfied men, who have divulged matters connected with the Force?—I do; and I think too many get to the ears of politicians. That is a sign of the times, and the labour leagues.

12. And owing to letters appearing in the Press occasionally?—Yes.

13. You mentioned two men who are addicted to drink in Christchurch: do you know how often they have been reported for being under the influence of drink?—Once during my period there of two years—each of them once.

14. Would you dismiss a man for being reported once?—No; I think they should be entitled to one chance.

15. You know that young men in the service have been dealt with for being under the influence, and who have subsequently turned out well?—Yes, first-class men. The temptations are many, and it would be hard to dismiss a man for the first instance. It is a case of degree; if it occurred when a man is on duty in uniform it is more serious. I have never seen a case so bad as that.

16. Do you consider the Force is as efficient as it has been for some years?—Yes.

17. Are the men strictly dealt with for misconduct?—Yes; but they get a fair show, and opportunity for a fair trial.

18. Are they treated as well as they used to be?—Yes, and far better; the old hands can appreciate that better than the new ones.

19. While you were at Christchurch did you ever hear of this “special” man Mr. O’Brien mentioned?—I never heard the faintest suspicion of the existence of such a person. I believe it is purely imagination.

20. You have heard no rumour to that effect?—Never.

21. Would you have been likely to hear it?—Yes.

EUGENE EGAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 119.)

Witness: I entered the Force in 1879, and was promoted in 1902. I have been stationed in Greymouth for four years and a half.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How does the efficiency of the Force to-day compare with formerly?—In my experience it is as good, and the quality of the men is fairly up to average. In regard to transfers, I think tenders should not be called for packing and removing men’s luggage, as it gets badly knocked about; other departments get it done by the Express Company, who are responsible for breakages.

2. When on transfer, do you pay the expenses or the Department?—The Department; but I had a lot of luggage destroyed. In regard to the pay of the Force, I think it should be increased, in order to keep up with the times in all grades, especially the lower grades.

PATRICK BLACK, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 120.)

Witness: I am in charge of the Grey district. There are twenty stations in my district, thirty-one constables, five sergeants, and one detective. The sergeants are at Hokitika, Reefton, Westport, and two at Greymouth, one being district clerk. There are two men in the district office. I entered the Force in 1878, in Wellington; was transferred to Dunedin, where I did duty for seven years and a half, and, after doing duty as acting-sergeant for a year, was promoted and transferred to Wellington, where I remained for seven years; was transferred to Dargaville for two years; transferred to Auckland for two years; from there to Gisborne for three years; transferred to Napier, and promoted Sub-Inspector; transferred to Christchurch for two years; to Auckland for three years and a half; from there to Dunedin for thirteen months; promoted Inspector, and sent here, two years ago.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinions in regard to the promotion of the plain-clothes branch?—My opinion is that every man should have the opportunity of rising as high as possible, according to his qualifications.

2. Making merit the essential test?—It should take preference over seniority, which, however, should count if the qualifications are equal. Seniority should not be the sole cause of promotion.

3. Is there much difficulty here in giving men Sunday off?—In a small place like this, with the present number of men, it is impossible to give them the Sunday as suggested; it could not be done. The men get all the Sunday leave I can possibly give them.

4. It could only be dealt with by increasing the Force?—Yes; we are not always full-handed, owing to different reasons.

5. Are you sufficiently policed here?—I have suggested that two more stations should be opened—one at Cobden and another at Blackwater. At the latter place there are about three hundred miners, where a goldfield has been opened. The constable at Ahaura visits there, but cannot remain there.

6. That would not help in regard to the Sundays off?—No.

7. That could only be done by increasing the number of men in Greymouth?—At present we have the full number we are supposed to have, but, owing to sickness and leave, &c., we are always one man short.

8. Is it desirable to give men a Sunday off?—I think they should get as much Sunday leave as they can be given.

9. One Sunday a month is not very much?—It is not too much. I think they should have at least that. I think it is a little overdrawing the matter to say they only get one Sunday in three months here. I think the Sunday leave would average about one in every six Sundays.

10. Would you advocate having power to take evidence on oath at your inquiries into breaches of discipline, &c.?—I think it would be better to do so, as a good many men might be tempted to make a false statement if not sworn.

11. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Dinnie: At one time all the Inspectors were appointed Justices of the Peace, but the practice has not been continued. All those in the large centres, however, are Justices of the Peace, and one or two of the others, I think.

The Commissioner: Do you think they should all be Justices of the Peace?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, I think so.

12. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinion as to the period a man should have to serve before being enrolled in the Force?—I think those in charge at the depot should be able to come to a definite conclusion at the end of six months.

13. We have it in evidence that the best class of men are not coming forward for enrolment in the Force at the present day: to what is that due, in your opinion?—I think insufficiency of pay is one reason, but I think another reason is that a good many men object to being policemen at all, and wearing the uniform, because it is not looked upon as a very honourable calling.

14. Why?—I could not say; but I believe there has been that feeling ever since I have been in the Force. There are not many fathers who would encourage their sons to join the Police Force. If you take any man in the Force earning, say, £200 a year, his social status is not equal to that of a man earning the same salary in any other service, Government or otherwise.

15. Which of a policeman's duties do you think operate principally to create that impression?—Well, their duties are regarded as something that gives offence to a certain extent.

16. The Attorney-General the other day, in a public address, referred to the police as being the right hand of the law?—I consider the Police Department is one of the most important departments under the Government, but, as I have said, there is a lack of social status, and, as every one knows, the Police Force has always been the butt of a good deal of ridicule.

The Commissioner: But that would only apply to a very irresponsible portion of the community.

Mr. Dinnie: I am able to bear out what the Inspector has said. I know I did not let my parents know that I intended to join the Force, because I knew they would have objected.

Witness: I do not mean to say that the better class of the community look down on the police, but, at the same time, they do not want to have anything to do with the police unless they require the services of a policeman. Every policeman knows that.

17. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views on the subject of promotion?—I think promotion should be open to every one qualified for it, from the highest to the lowest, either in uniform or plain clothes. As to pay, my opinion is that a constable when he joins should be paid at the rate of 8s. a day, and should go on to 10s. It would take that to place him on a level with the ordinary labouring man, and any man who is fit to be a policeman should be as well paid as the man working on the wharf or in private employ, and a policeman's duties are far more responsible than those of the man in private employ; besides which a policeman is expected to live in a respectable locality, and to dress decently. With regard to the length of time a constable should remain at any one station, I have already expressed the opinion at the last Commission that every man in the service under the Commissioner should be transferred every five years. I am of that opinion still—that there should be a hard-and-fast rule to that effect. If the Department want to kill political influence, such a rule would go a long way in the direction of killing it. A man living for a long period at any one station is bound to make many friends, and a policeman, being human, does not care to do anything that is likely to injure one of his own friends. And as to cost of transfers, it is not necessary that a man should be transferred from Auckland to the Bluff. The same effect would be brought about by a transfer to a much nearer station.

18. Is it an advantage to have a district clerk a sergeant?—Yes. As a rule he is a superior man to the ordinary beat-duty constable.

19. Have you more than one clerk here?—No; one clerk does the whole of the work.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] With regard to your suggestion that men should be transferred every fifth year, do you not think it would be rather a hardship on a constable having a large family if you move him away from a place where he is finding employment for his family?—I am looking at it from the point of view of the service. I think it would be beneficial to the service. Even at present there are some men who are transferred as often as every five years, but there are others who are left ten or more years.

21. You know men are transferred when it is found necessary to transfer them?—Yes; I dare say that is correct.

22. You know that it takes some considerable time for a constable to know all the people in a district?—Yes, it takes time; but a constable in charge of a station ought to pretty well know the run of the district in twelve months, and my experience is that when a man is transferred to a new district he is more energetic than he has been in the district where he has been located for five or six years. He has no friends there, and there is nothing to prevent him from doing his duty thoroughly.

23. You have been all over New Zealand: have you heard anything of this "special" man Inspector O'Brien has mentioned as having been placed in each district by me?—I never heard a whisper of it until I saw it in the report of the proceedings down south; and I was three months in Dunedin before I came here.

24. You do not believe it?—I do not.

25. If you had believed it, would you have repeated it in public?—I do not think I would.

26. Is there any general dissatisfaction in the service as regards the present control?—Not that I am aware of.

27. You know that in any Force there are a certain number of men who are dissatisfied?—Yes; I have found that wherever I have been.

28. Do you not think those are the men who cause all the trouble?—Yes, I think there are agitators who cause a good deal of it.

29. As regards influence, political or otherwise, you do not know of any case where influence has obtained?—I am satisfied, from what I have heard, that there is such a thing as political influence in the Police Force, ever since it has been a Force, more or less.

30. You know constables do run to influential people?—Yes; but I cannot put my finger upon any particular case. Speaking for myself, I have never, directly or indirectly, applied for anything except a transfer.

31. As regards men who have been dealt with for being under the influence of liquor, you know there are men who have been fined, and who are in the service now, and doing well?—Yes; I know of some men who have been under the influence more than once, and have turned out to be among the best men in the service. I may say that, as a rule, it is not the duffers who get the worse for liquor. The men who indulge a little occasionally are, as a rule, smarter men than those who never touch liquor. I know there are some men, also, who have a good many marks on their defaulter's sheet, and they are to-day occupying high positions in the service. In my opinion, if a man makes the mistake of taking too much liquor, or commits some other offence that is not altogether intentional, he should be given an opportunity of recovering his position; but if after having had his opportunity he still persists in doing those things, he should be dispensed with.

32. If we were to dismiss all the men who have been under the influence of liquor we would have a difficulty in obtaining candidates to fill their places?—Well, I have known some of the best men in the service who have had a little too much liquor more than once. It is the man who is constantly nipping who should not be in the Force at all.

33. As regards the alleged unrest in the public mind in respect to the Police Department, is that not caused by a few malcontents circulating rumours, writing to the Press, and perhaps by the Commissions continually arising?—I think a great deal of whatever discontent there is at present has been given rise to by a few malcontents in Wellington and Dunedin. I have no doubt at all that the members of Parliament who have made statements in reference to the Police Force received their information from members of the Force who have had access to some of the records.

34. One member went so far as to say he received that information from a man who had been dismissed from the service?—That might be so.

THOMAS OLIVER, Sergeant and District Clerk, examined on oath. (No. 121.)

Witness: I am district clerk in the office at Greymouth, and have been in that position since April, 1900. I did not apply for the position, but was sent here. I was in Wellington in charge of a station for a time, and Inspector Pender sent for me, and asked if I would come here. I was promoted to be sergeant in 1906. I was employed as second clerk in Wellington before I came here.

1. *The Commissioner.* You have a good knowledge of your duties?—I had six years' street and wharf experience in Wellington.

2. You do the whole of the work of the office in this district yourself?—Yes.

3. Can you do it with ease?—I have quite sufficient to keep me going.

4. When you acted as second clerk in Wellington, had you an assistant under you?—No; I was the only assistant clerk there at the time, but that is a good while ago now, and I believe the staff has been increased.

5. How long would it take a fairly educated constable to become pretty proficient in the work of the office?—Anybody could do the work of assistant clerk in Wellington; but before he would be of much use he would require from six to twelve months' experience.

6. Have you any general opinion to offer with regard to the administration of the Force generally?—I do not think so.

7. You are satisfied with your position?—Yes, I have no complaints to make.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 122.)

Witness: I am stationed at Greymouth, where I have been for six years. I entered the Force in 1879 as constable, and eighteen months later was transferred to the detective branch. In 1884 I was promoted detective, and served in Wellington under Inspectors James, Shearman, Thomson, and Pender. I was promoted Chief Detective in 1899, and transferred to Dunedin in place of Chief Detective O'Brien, promoted. My family not being strong, I applied for transfer to a northern town. Commissioner Tunbridge said I could exchange with another Chief Detective if I could arrange with any of the others to do so. In lieu of that he offered me Timaru, but I pointed out that, having been Chief Detective for twelve years, I would be looked upon as being disgraced if I took Timaru. He said I could still retain the rank. I refused to go to Timaru. When leaving the service Mr. Tunbridge wired offering me Greymouth, with the same seniority as when I joined as Chief Detective. I accepted that, and have been here ever since. Shortly after my arrival here I discovered that Chief Detectives were made a separate class, and got 1s. a

day rise in salary. I reported on the matter to the present Commissioner, pointing out that I was entitled to it, and received a courteous answer saying he regretted he could not grant it. Since then the Chief Detectives have got another 1s., and they get 2s. a day more than I do. Two of the present Chief Detectives have only half my service, and served under me. I have thirty years' service. I am not finding fault with those men getting promotion, but I think I should have got promotion at the same time. I am only allowed 10s. 6d. for house-rent, and the Chief Detectives are allowed 14s. I refer to any Inspector I have served under as to my ability or work, and the records will show that I have done more work as detective than any detective in the service at the present time. I may say that since I came to Greymouth I am drawing 6d. a day more than when I was Chief Detective, but there has been a general rise all round. I pay £1 a week rent.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know Chief Detectives are promoted now by merit, and not seniority?—Yes.

2. When you were made Chief Detective you were promoted by seniority simply?—By seniority and merit as well.

3. You did not assume that you were to be transferred here as Chief Detective?—I did not, but had I known my transfer here would be a bar to further promotion I should not have come here.

4. It is not said to have been a bar—not that alone?—It has been in this way: that six other men have been promoted over my head with better pay. Mr. McGrath served under me; I do not say he is not entitled to all the promotion he has got.

The Commissioner: Were there departmental reasons, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Oh, yes, undoubtedly.

Witness: As regards my conduct, I have a clean record. If there has been any report against my character it has never been brought under my notice.

Mr. Dinnie: There is not a word against your character.

Witness: Or my ability.

The Commissioner: That must be a matter of departmental judgment.

Witness: In regard to the work I have done, I can refer to the officers I have served under as to whether I gave satisfaction.

5. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think you ought to be appointed Chief Detective, and sent to a centre?—It is a matter of indifference to me where I am placed. I would be quite willing to go back to a centre.

6. Do you want to know why you were not offered the opportunity?—Yes, certainly.

Mr. Dinnie: Not only do I not consider him qualified, but my predecessor held the same opinion.

Witness: Well, he did not say so. My record speaks for itself. I think I have not been justly dealt with.

REEFTON, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

JAMES BLACK, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 123.)

Witness: I am sergeant of police, stationed at Reefton. I was enrolled in 1890, and promoted to be sergeant in 1906. I have been in Reefton since 1st March last. Previously I was in Invercargill for about two years and seven months, doing street duty. I have no complaints to make.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you noticed any falling-off in the physique or mental capacity of the men in recent years?—I cannot say I have. I have read all the evidence that has been given before the Commission down south.

2. Do men ever speak to you about joining the police?—Well, I have heard men say that they would not take on the job at the present pay the constables are getting.

3. You think the young men are not coming forward as they used to?—I do not think they are. A man can get work at 10s. a day elsewhere.

4. You get free quarters?—Yes. There is one thing I cannot understand, and that is why a detective gets 15s. a day as pay, while a sergeant who is responsible for the district, and who has his nose kept to the grindstone, receives only 12s. a day. I have given the maximum amounts, and that does not include Chief Detectives. I think 7s. 6d. a day is too low a rate for a constable to start at at the present time.

5. Have you good men in your district?—Yes; I have not the slightest trouble with them.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have been in Auckland, Invercargill, Marton, and here: do you know of any general dissatisfaction amongst the men in respect of the control of the Force?—I have never heard of any.

7. You know, of course, that men are dismissed from year to year for misconduct, and so on?—Yes; one was dismissed at my instigation in Invercargill.

8. Have you heard anything of the rumour that Inspector O'Brien mentioned as to my having a "special" man at each station?—I never heard of such a thing before I read his evidence. I only laughed at it when I read it. I have heard of a good deal, but I never heard of that.

9. You have not noticed any falling-off in the physique of the men?—I have been reading up the evidence about the physique of the men, but I consider you do not merely want size in the Force. If you get a man with a little tact and brains, he is probably worth three men of 6 ft. 6 in. or 6 ft. 4 in. I could name some of the best men in the service, so far as police work goes, who are only 5 ft. 7 in.

THOMAS KEENAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 124.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Westport. I was enrolled in Auckland on the 11th February, 1897. I have been at Westport for nearly two years. I have been a strong healthy man all my life, and the only time I had medical attendance up to the time of the occurrence which I am bringing before the Commission was when I had a touch of rheumatics in Christchurch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] I understand you had to deal with Conolly, who is now undergoing sentence for manslaughter?—Yes.

2. How long were you in charge of him?—On the 31st May, 1907, two men named Halinan and Andersen were committed for trial for the wilful murder of John Burke, of Westport. Conolly was the principal witness in the case. He was bound over to appear at the Supreme Court against Andersen. During the time the proceedings in the lower Court were going on he was under the supervision of Sergeant Cullen in the sergeant's own house. In consequence of some remarks made by Mr. Rawson, S.M., in committing the two men for trial, Conolly was turned out of Sergeant Cullen's house. Inspector Black said that Conolly would have to be looked after, and, although I objected, I was ordered to look after him in a room in the police-station, and beds were put in the room for Conolly and myself. As I knew the Inspector very well, I did not make much demur. I had instructions to walk out with Conolly for two hours every afternoon and forenoon, but those instructions were not given in writing. I carried out the instructions to the best of my ability. The witness was very troublesome all the time, and was a source of great annoyance to me. So bad was he that one morning I struck him and knocked him down. He endeavoured to strike me with a shovel, and a constable came to my assistance. Well, I took him to Nelson, and he gave evidence there at the trial. After that trial I arrested him on a charge of perjury on a private information, and took him back to Westport. While at Nelson Dr. Simpson, jun., pointed out to me that my hair was coming out, and that I had alopecia areata. As I knew that Dr. Conlon had been successful in treating complaints of that nature I consulted him, and after a course of treatment at his hands I was ultimately cured.

3. Are you absolutely cured now?—With the exception of two or three spots. When I was at my worst there were bald patches all over my head.

4. What did this treatment cost you?—I should think, roughly speaking, about £20.

5. I understand that what you ask is that the Department should take into consideration the actual loss incurred by you in connection with the treatment for the trouble which you consider is traceable directly to the execution of the particular duty of which you have spoken?—Yes.

6. Do you say your illness was caused by anxiety when looking after this man Conolly?—Yes, I consider that has been the cause of it. I knew the man had been brought up at a reformatory, and that he was a convicted thief, also that he was a dangerous man.

7. You are not a very young constable. I presume you have had considerable experience?—Yes; but the night the murder was committed, this man had a knife on him, and I had my strong suspicions that he had used it. I thought twenty-four hours in each day was too long for me to be with him.

8. Why did you not speak to your Inspector about it?—I was told by the Inspector to look after the man, and to produce him at the trial, and I did not think the results would be so serious to me as they have been.

9. Did you feel that you were losing in health all the time?—I felt a giddiness in the head.

10. Did you sleep at night?—I had some sleep, but I kept the gas burning all night. I was afraid he might use a knife on me.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you so engaged?—Five weeks.

12. You say you were afraid he might use a knife. Was there a knife in the room?—I had two sometimes in my pocket, but I used to take them out and put them under my pillow at night.

13. How long after this was it that your hair began to come out?—It began during that time.

14. How often have you been on the sick list before?—Sixteen days in twelve years.

15. You never suffered in this way before?—Never.

16. *Inspector Black.*] I suppose you will admit it was necessary that the witness Conolly should be carefully guarded?—Yes.

17. You were the only single constable at the station?—Yes.

18. While you were looking after Conolly, had you any other duty to perform?—No, that was all I had to do.

19. Did you think it was a very hard job for a man like you?—He was not a pleasant companion. I would much rather have been doing street duty.

20. You say that on one occasion you knocked Conolly down. Why did you not report that, so that I might have known of it?—Well, I did not report it. I do not know why. He said he would report me himself. I was sitting by the fire at the time with my boots off, and he made some remarks about the smell of my socks, and I just gave him a knock on the side of the head. I did him no harm. But he had worried the life out of me before that.

21. Did you ever, during the five weeks you had charge of Conolly, complain of having too much to do, or of being worried?—I told the sergeant, and the sergeant said if he did not conduct himself better he would have him taken to Ross or Hokitika. He made himself as great a nuisance to me as he could. He would scratch on the walls, and he would burn every police document he could get his hand on.

WILLIAM ALOYSIUS CONLON, Medical Practitioner, examined on oath. (No. 125.)

Witness: I am a duly qualified registered medical practitioner, practising in Reefton.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you know Keenan before he consulted you for this trouble?—Yes, I knew him, but I had never seen him as a patient.

2. When did he first consult you?—In October, 1908.

3. What did you find?—He was suffering from a disease of the scalp called alopecia areata. As you will have noticed, Keenan is a man of extremely nervous temperament, and at that time he was suffering more markedly than he is at present from nervous disorder.

4. Is this scalp trouble traceable to nervous causes?—Yes, it is purely of nervous origin. Of course, there are numbers of neurotic people who do not get this trouble, but people who go through what seems to them cruel or hard experiences sometimes do. His condition now is far better than it was. He is quite fit for duty now. I came to-night at Keenan's request to say, apart from other treatment, I ordered him plenty of nourishing diet, which must have cost him something.

5. Has he paid you your fees?—Yes.

6. *Constable Keenan.*] You have heard about this man Conolly. Do you think it would be good for me to have to sleep in the same room with him for nineteen nights?—I think it would be better to sleep in a separate apartment, if that were allowed by the Police Regulations. Of course, it would be horrible to sleep with a man you knew to be a criminal, and to have him with you at all times.

WESTPORT, THURSDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1909.

LEONARD JOHN COCKERY, ex-Constable, examined on oath. (No. 126.)

Witness: I am licensee of the Royal Hotel, Westport. I was at one time in the Force. I joined in 1898, and resigned in 1907. I desire to make a few remarks in regard to a thing I consider causes dissatisfaction in the Police Force. A man on retiring under ten years' service is at present not entitled to a refund of any contribution from the Provident Fund. I was paying into the fund for some time. If a man is dismissed he gets a refund of his contributions, and if he resigns he gets none. If I had made a blackguard of myself in any way and had been dismissed I should have had a refund, but on resigning with a good character I got no refund, because I had not been ten years in the Force. It has been asked why men do not apply for enrolment in the Force. I think the reason is this: a man must be intelligent, and be fit to pass a Fifth Standard examination, and you offer him 7s. 6d. a day, deducting 6d. for the Provident Fund; while a man with physical energy can earn on the wharf from 11s. to 14s. a day, and he has not to live in a respectable part of the city, nor wear a good suit of clothes. I think the house-allowance for a constable should be the same as that of a sergeant; I fail to see why there should be any difference. Then, constables' travelling-allowance is not sufficient. A constable has to travel with his Inspector sometimes, as I have done, and to put up at the same hotel, and while the Inspector draws 12s. 6d. the constable only gets 6s. travelling-allowance, which is not fair, especially on the West Coast. A night-duty coat should be served to every man in New Zealand, and specially on country stations, where on many a night the constable is called out on duty where he never would be on other stations. When on leave the men should be supplied with a free railway-pass, as is done on other public bodies. I should like to say, in reference to letters that have appeared in the Press in connection with the Conolly case, that the constables on the West Coast are as good a body of men as in any part of the Dominion. In regard to myself, I have the biggest reward ever given to a constable in the Dominion. I left the Force because Mr. Dinnie did not treat me as he should have done. Mr. Tunbridge, when leaving the colony, told me if I would open the Blackball Station he would leave me there two years, and told me he would leave a letter for his successor. When I interviewed Mr. Dinnie in Wellington I applied for Marton, as I wished to leave the West Coast, for the sake of my wife's and children's health. He told me it was filled. I said I heard Seddonville was vacant, and he said, "You can go to Seddonville, or stay where you are."

1. *The Commissioner.*] You asked for Seddonville?—Yes, in the presence of Mr. Wright. Mr. Dinnie did not fill Marton for a month after I asked for it. There is no getting away from the fact that I had the biggest reward ever given to a constable—6d. a day, twelve months' seniority, and being asked to open a station.

2. You declined to accept Seddonville?—I did not. The conditions of life at Blackball when I went there were such that the pay was inadequate. I have been there for a week, and never had a letter or a paper, through floods in the river. I was promised a shift after two years, which was never granted.

3. How long after did you leave the Force?—I took Seddonville, and sixteen months later resigned.

4. What was the primary cause of your resigning?—I recognised I had not been fairly treated.

5. Up to that time did you intend to remain?—I did.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You seem to have a grievance against me for not letting you have Marton?—Yes; you told me an absolute untruth—that you had filled Marton, and a month later it was filled.

7. How do you know arrangements had not been made when you applied?—I know it from some of your own officers.

8. The papers will show?—Oh, no; it was altogether wrong; I had it from your head officers. It was not filled; I know it from a letter from Constable Black, whom you appointed three weeks after I spoke to you.

9. Where was Black transferred from?—I could not tell you.

10. A transfer from here to Marton would be very expensive, would it not?—Nonsense; no such thing.

11. You say Mr. Tunbridge left a letter about you: will you believe me when I say he never left a letter about any one in the service?—I would not believe it. I never knew him to break his word.

12. Would you believe me if I state it on oath?—Yes, I would take your oath.

13. Well, I say now that I did not receive any letter from him?—My merit sheet shows what my record has been. There is another thing. Every man on resigning from the Force has an absolute right to ask for a copy of his merit sheet to be attached to his discharge. This is refused under the present system.

14. *The Commissioner.*] Have you ever applied for yours?—It is no use applying.

Mr. Dinnie: We have never been asked for such records: they are kept for the information of the head of the Department.

Witness: They are testimonials of character, and I want to know whether there is any departmental reason why a man should not get it.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not think so; it is not the practice; I do not know any substantial reason for refusing it.

15. *The Commissioner.*] Can you give me any reason why it should be refused? You have assumed that it would be?—I know others have asked, and have been refused.

Mr. Dinnie: Well, you apply to me, and see if it will be refused. As regards the Provident Fund, that matter is under consideration at the present time, and I believe an alteration will be made next session; and the regulations in regard to travelling-allowance will be altered.

JAMES STEVENSON REID, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 127.)

Witness: I am stationed at Seddonville. I entered the Force in 1900, and was given charge of a station two years ago. I appear as delegate on behalf of the police in this district. The constables consider the pay is inadequate; they think they should receive 8s. on joining, with increments of 6d. every two years up to 10s. House-allowance is inadequate for constables, who should be on the same footing as sergeants. I have paid as high as £1 1s. in Wellington. Uniform should be issued free, with an extra pair of trousers every twelve months. The average cost of making up at present is from £2 5s. to £2 10s. Two pairs of boots should be provided annually. Rain-proof coats should be provided once a year; at present they are issued every two years. The men on country stations should get night-duty coats. A greatcoat should be provided every three years. The 6s. travelling-allowance is inadequate, and free passes on the train should be provided for men on leave, as men on leave are liable to be called on for duty. The men think, after serving two years on the Coast, they should be transferred to a more favourable climate; the cost of living being also higher here than any other part of the Dominion. We consider a Board of Appeal should be established to deal with grievances, or that appeal should be granted from the decision of the Commissioner to a Stipendiary Magistrate. We think that rewards are not fairly distributed.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Can you give an instance?—Yes; in regard to a sly-grog case at the Thames, myself and Constable Butler were told off to make a raid, which was successful, and the man was fined £50. We were travelling four or five days in the bush getting the liquor out. Butler and I got £2 each, while the sergeant who gave us the information got £4 or £5.

2. The man who did next to nothing got double?—Yes. In regard to promotions, the men here consider they have not given satisfaction, in many instances men having been promoted over the heads of their seniors, though both had the same ability. The men also consider that the men in the Commissioner's office should rank as Civil servants, and not as members of the Force.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Why do you come to that conclusion?—There seems to be so much dissatisfaction about their being promoted over the heads of the others; they seem to get their opportunity before the man on the street.

4. *The Commissioner.*] You think they have the ear of the authorities?—Yes.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know the men are selected from the whole Force because of their qualifications?—Yes. I refer to the case of Muggeridge, who joined in 1906, and was promoted in 1909 to sergeant.

6. You admit that the clerks in the office are specially selected?—Yes.

7. Are you of opinion that men ought to be advanced by merit?—They should be promoted in their turn.

8. Do you think a man should be promoted by merit or seniority?—Both. We think men are getting promoted at present who should not. I think only about three men have been promoted who have passed the examination.

9. The circular does not say they must pass the examination?—No; it is not compulsory.

10. It is simply with a view of getting the men to study the law pertaining to their duties?—Yes; but those who pass ought to be given consideration.

11. So they are?—I do not see it lately.

12. Do you not think men ought to be promoted according to merit?—Yes, and seniority.

13. Do you know the qualifications of the last junior man promoted?—I do not see why Cummings should have the right to promotion.

14. But referring to ordinary promotions to street duty, leaving out special cases?—I consider the men on street duty have every right to be promoted before the men in the office, as they have greater experience and a better knowledge of street duty.

15. Did you not say the complaint is that junior men are promoted over their seniors as regards street duty?—No; I am alluding to the whole lot.

16. You think the men in the office are promoted before their time?—They should not be.

17. You do not know anything about the qualifications of those who have been promoted?—No; but I have never seen their names as having passed the examination.

18. Do you know the best men are selected for the office?—Probably.
19. Should not their special qualifications entitle them to promotion before others?—Not if they have not passed the examination.
20. But they are capable of passing any time?—Then, they ought to be made to pass it.
21. In regard to the sly-grog case in which you say you did not get a sufficient reward, how many persons were prosecuted?—Two.
22. Do you know that £5 is the highest amount of reward that can be made in each case?—I consider it should be equally divided.
23. You admit the sergeant got the information?—I think so.
24. It appears to me that the amount was equally divided. The sergeant got £5 and you got £2 10s. each?—I am not sure.
25. You think night-duty coats should be given to those at out-stations: have they ever been applied for?—I could not say. Personally I have not applied.
26. Do you not think the proper thing would have been to make application to your superior officers?—Probably it might.
27. Do you not think, if any of the men are aggrieved as regards promotions or anything else, their proper course would be to make representations to me?—I do not think the men should meet together for the purpose of making representations.
28. Could you not do it yourself?—We should be pulled up for breach of discipline. Personally, I have no grievance. I have always been treated very fairly.
29. You know that the regulations do not require that the men must keep their grievances to themselves?—Yes, the regulations tell them what to do.

SAMUEL JOSEPH DEW, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 128.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Westport. I joined the Force in June, 1883, and was promoted to be sergeant in February, 1903. I have under me three constables in town for street duty and one gaoler; and there are five constables in outside parts of the sub-district. When there are no prisoners in the gaol the gaoler does reserve duty in the watch-house.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are his duties light?—Yes.
2. Have you anything to say as regards the physique and intellectual capacity of the men in your sub-district?—In that respect the men here are equal, I think, to any in the Dominion. I have no complaint to make with regard to that.
3. You know that there is a difficulty now in getting suitable recruits for the service?—Yes, and I think the reason for it is that as regards pay a man can do better in private life. That applies more especially on the West Coast. If the pay were increased it would, I think, tend to induce a better class of men to come forward.
4. Have you any views with regard to promotion?—I am under the impression that there is a certain amount of political influence, and I think there has been a certain amount of undue favouritism in regard to certain promotions to the rank of sergeant. I have known of junior men being promoted over the heads of their seniors.
5. Have you known the men?—I have known some men who have had fifty or sixty passed over them. I have not been able to account for those promotions.
6. With regard to admission of men to the Force, are you in favour of a period of probation before a man is finally enrolled?—Yes. I think before a man is passed on to the street duty he should go under a strict course of discipline of, say, six months.
7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think that if candidates knew they had to undergo a six-months probation and training they would be so anxious to join the Force?—Well, I have been in the Imperial service, where the men have to undergo from twelve to eighteen months' strict military training, and they get plenty of recruits there.
8. But you do not compare the Police Department with the military?—No; but I do not think men, as a rule, would hesitate to join the police if they knew they had to undergo proper training.
9. *The Commissioner.*] You think the advantages of probation would more than counter-balance the drawbacks?—Yes, I think so.
10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] With regard to promotions, suppose you had in the service a man of about forty-five years of age, of fifteen or twenty years' service, and who was fit to be an ordinary sergeant, and suppose you had another man of, say, fourteen years' service who was more efficient and capable, which would you promote?—I should go over the list carefully, and see if there was any man among the senior men who was capable of filling the position, and, if not, I should promote the junior man. I should be careful that no capable man was passed over, as has been done in some instances.
11. Do you believe in the present system, under which the Inspectors send in a list of names of men recommended for promotion each year?—I think in some instances that might be objectionable, because Inspectors are bound to have favourites. I think the Inspectors should make recommendations, but I should not rely entirely on their recommendations.
12. But they are in a better position to know the qualifications of the men than I am?—I think it would be more satisfactory to the Force if there was a Board set up to make the promotions.
13. What knowledge would a Board have of the men?—They would have in front of them a list of the men, and the remarks of the Inspector, and they could find out the qualifications of the men.
14. They would not have practical knowledge of the men?—They would have the knowledge of the Inspector.
15. Then, you come back to the Inspector again?—Well, there is a feeling on the part of some of the men that favouritism is shown.

16. *The Commissioner.*] Then, I understand it is not the system you are attacking, because you have not given us a sufficient reason for altering the system. Have you been passed over?—No.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction existing beyond that?—I have heard it stated over and over again that before a man can get along he must have some political "pull."

18. The Commission has been trying to find a case where such influence has been successfully brought to bear?—I do not think, by the time the Commission finishes up in Auckland, they will have been able to find a single case, and I do not suppose the men who have been pushed along could tell the Commission how they got there.

19. The files will show pretty well how the men came to be promoted?—Well, I know of one instance in which it would take a lot to satisfy me there has not been some influence used. I refer to the appointment of Sergeant Dart as instructor at the training depot.

20. Do you know his qualifications?—In my opinion, if he was the only man in the Force capable of filling the position there was not a sergeant in the Force who was fit to carry the stripes of a sergeant.

21. What I said was that he was the most fitted to fill the position. Do you not think he was specially qualified, seeing that he had passed the solicitor's examination?—I do not see why a constable requires such a tremendous knowledge of the law for police duty. I consider that any member of the Force carrying the stripes of a sergeant is fit to teach recruits their duties.

22. I think his Inspector recommended him strongly for the position. Do you know his qualifications?—Yes, I was in Auckland at the time. I look upon the position as a sort of training-ground for a Sub-Inspectorship, as the last Sub-Inspector appointed was taken from that office.

23. Do you not think Sub-Inspector Gordon was qualified for promotion to that position?—Yes; I think he was thoroughly entitled to the position, but I am speaking of the principle. I should like to mention one other point. I think that a man having once entered the detective branch should stick to that branch, and should never go back again to the uniform branch. I have no objection to a detective getting promotion, even to the rank of Inspector, in his own branch; but if they are to compete with the men in the uniform branch, I am satisfied there is not much chance of getting past them for the position of Sub-Inspector. What chance has a station sergeant against a Chief Detective in a big centre for the position of Sub-Inspector?

The Commissioner. I should say he has a very good chance. I do not know of any Chief Detective who would be likely to get the position now.

Witness. Well, I do not know of any station sergeant in New Zealand who would be likely to get ahead of him.

The Commissioner. I do. That is where you and I differ. A good many of the best sergeants have admitted that, other things being equal, a Chief Detective is as much entitled to promotion as a sergeant.

Witness. I admit that; but I say, let him have promotion in his own branch.

NELSON, MONDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1909.

JAMES CAMERON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 129.)

Witness. I am stationed at Richmond, where I am in charge of the station. I was enrolled in the Force in 1888, being transferred from the Permanent Militia. I have been twelve years in charge of a station. I consider that after passing out of the training depot constables should receive not less than 8s., increasing by 6d. every three years till a maximum of 11s. is reached, at the end of eighteen years. A good many good men are leaving the Force now through the smallness of the pay, whereas if there was something to look forward to they would devote their whole time to it, instead of looking out for something else. Seven shillings is not enough for house-allowance. For eight years I paid rent before house-allowance was granted, and I found it very hard to make both ends meet. I think 10s. house-allowance would not be too much to allow, especially in the big towns. I think the Department should pay for the making-up of uniforms, and provide two pairs of boots a year; and the issue of uniforms should be on a more liberal scale, especially during the first year of service, so that a recruit should always have a good suit for day duty and an ordinary one for night. Saloon passages should be provided for the wives and families of constables on transfer. I have had to pay the difference out of my own pocket. Annual leave should be increased from twelve days to sixteen, and be allowed to accumulate for three years. Free railway-passes should be given to constables on leave. I think the Department pays too much attention to anonymous and other letters.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is the procedure in regard to them?—The letter is sent to the sergeant, who calls upon you for an explanation. This causes unnecessary annoyance.

2. You think no notice should be taken of them?—No. A letter has been sent to the Minister of Justice about me—signed by the writer—and the worst he could say about me was that I acted as instructor to a brass band, and also took part in operas. I have been put to considerable worry over it.

3. You would advocate that such a letter should be put in the waste-paper basket?—Not a letter with a name to it, as this one had; but a person can presume on acquaintance with a Minister or member of Parliament to annoy a public officer.

4. How are you going to stop that?—The proper course would be to write to the officer immediately superior who knows the local circumstances.

5. What would be the difference between writing to him and to the head of the Department?—If it was a frivolous complaint such as this, the sergeant would know how to deal with it.

6. Do you not think it is better for you to know about it?—Yes, I court full inquiry. But there is annoyance caused. Constables have certain duties to perform, and any communications from Headquarters have to be completely answered, and it takes time—more time than the matter deserves. In regard to promotion, I have served twenty-one years in the Force, and have a clean defaulter's sheet, and have also a fair record of merit. I have also passed the annual examination—in 1907. Three constables who passed at the same time are junior to me, and have been promoted to the rank of sergeant. Their names are Willis, Kelly, and Hardy.

7. Have you ever had an offer of promotion?—No.

8. Do you know whether you have been recommended by your Inspector?—I could not say. I made an application last year, and was informed that I was too old. I am fifty-seven years of age. I am physically fit for town duty. I have not tried it for a long time, but I would stand the test with any town sergeant.

9. You would not dispute the fact that age must be considered?—Certainly not, but I am not too old. The Commissioner told the men on parade that those who had passed the examination, and who were not promoted to the rank of sergeant, would be appointed to stations where they would be Clerks of Court and of Licensing Committees, &c. That was in 1907. I have been waiting till now, and I see others who have not passed the examination, and are much junior to me, being appointed to these positions. I cannot understand why I am overlooked. Some of those who have been appointed sergeants are nearly as old as I am. One constable appointed sergeant this year joined the service the same day as I did. There has been a lot of talk about political, sectarian, and Masonic influence, but I have not seen any during the last ten years. I know of it personally previous to that. I am a Mason—as high, if not higher, than any other man in the service—and I never saw or heard of Masonic influence being used. It has never been applied in my case. Regarding the discipline and efficiency of the Force, so far as I can see, the men joining now are as good as those of fifteen or twenty years ago.

10. Do you mean physically or intellectually?—Physically; and they are educationally superior. And morally they are equal. In my opinion, the reason there is such an outcry about the police is that the discipline is more exacting now than it was fifteen or twenty years ago, and the offences we commit now are taken more notice of than in those days. Ever since Mr. Tunbridge was appointed the conditions in the service have been very much improved. In regard to the clerical and uniform branches, it seems to give dissatisfaction that the men in the clerical staff should be promoted after ten years' service, whereas the men doing the practical work are not promoted for twenty years. A man brought up in the office, while being useful in that department, would be lost in doing the work in which we gain experience on the streets. Although I am in charge of a very quiet station at present, it is not my fault I am there, and I am quite prepared to do more active work if given me. I can refer to Magistrates, solicitors, and others to testify to my ability and experience as a constable. I had a brilliant record at Blenheim. I was formerly at Seddonville, which district is now manned by three constables.

11. When did you first apply for promotion?—Last year. I did not apply before passing the examination. This is my application: "I respectfully beg to apply for promotion to the rank of sergeant, and in support of my application respectfully beg to state that I have served nearly twenty years as a constable (the last ten years in charge of stations), during which time my conduct and ability has never been questioned. I have also nine years' service in the Armed Constabulary and Permanent Militia without a blemish, and I was also successful in passing the police examination held in January, 1907. I therefore respectfully submit this my application to Inspector Ellison, trusting that he will be pleased to recommend and forward it for the favourable consideration and approval of the Commissioner." Inspector Ellison minuted: "Constable Cameron has been in an out-station all the time I have known him. He is a quiet decent man, and has given satisfaction in the discharge of his duty. There is not much active police duty to do at the station where he is." Mr. Dinnie replied: "I have no doubt Constable Cameron carries out his duties in a very satisfactory manner as a constable, but in the interests of the Department I must have younger men to place over the constables in the city districts." I took it I was too old for promotion.

12. If it is a fact that recruits are not coming forward as satisfactorily as one might wish, to what would you attribute that?—To the small pay.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were over fifty when I first took charge of the Department?—Yes.

14. And you were not recommended for promotion prior to that?—No, I never applied.

15. You know a return is called for every year, and the Inspector recommends those he thinks fit for promotion?—I believe so.

16. *The Commissioner.*] You recognise it is not necessary to apply in order to get promotion?—Yes.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think that anonymous letters should be put in the fire?—Yes.

18. Do you know that in some instances it is very important to inquire into them?—It may have been in some instances. In my instance it was a falsehood.

19. But in your instance it was signed?—The one I am referring to was an anonymous one; it was inquired into by the sergeant, and there was not an atom of truth in it.

20. Do you know the result of inquiry into anonymous communications has been very often to show that constables have not been performing their duties satisfactorily?—Perhaps so, but I am speaking from my own personal standpoint.

21. Have you ever applied for transfer?—No.

22. Are the clerical staff not selected from the uniform branch?—Yes.

23. And they have had some experience in it prior to their appointment to the clerical staff?—Yes; but they lose the benefit of it after going into the office.

24. Do you not think their clerical duties assist to fit them for promotion?—The two together.
 25. Do you know what would be the cost of the increased pay and house-allowance, free clothing, &c.?—No; but it would make a more efficient Force.
 26. You know of no influence obtaining?—No; I do not believe it does obtain.

JOHN WYBRANT ELLISON, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 130.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] How long was the witness under your jurisdiction?—Three or four years, since the district was transferred to my charge; he was previously under me in Westland for twelve months.

2. Have you ever recommended him for promotion?—No. I was called on during the last six years for a return of all men under fifty, and having over ten years' service, whom I could recommend. Cameron did not come under that category while under me.

3. If he had been recommended it would be by previous Inspectors?—Yes. The matter of the anonymous letter was not while he was under me.

JOHN TIMOTHY FOLEY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 131.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Collingwood. Have been there eleven years and one month. Was enrolled in December, 1892. Previous to taking charge of the Collingwood Station I was for a couple of years at the Manners Street Station, Wellington.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general statement to make?—There has been a good deal of dissatisfaction in regard to promotions since the 1st April, 1906. There has been quite a number of men promoted to the rank of sergeant over their seniors.

2. How old are you?—Forty-five years. I do not know that I have caused the Department an hour's anxiety as to my duties since I joined the service. I have a clean defaulter's sheet.

3. Have you ever applied for promotion?—Yes; I applied in August, 1907. This is my application, dated from Collingwood, the 15th August, 1907: "I beg respectfully to apply for promotion to the rank of sergeant, which, I presume, would mean my transfer from this to some other district. I have now over 14½ years' service, having joined on the 28th December, 1892, and several junior men to me in the service, some of whom I have served with in Wellington, have since been promoted either to the rank of sergeant or detective. Besides being in charge of this large but sparsely populated district since the 1st July, 1898, I have for the first two years after my arrival here performed the duties of Clerk and Bailiff of the Magistrate's and Warden's Courts, Collingwood, Receiver of Gold Revenue, and Mining Registrar for Collingwood and Takaka Mining Districts; also Inspector of Factories and Awards for this district, which appointment I still hold. The other appointments I gave up in 1900, there being at that time a large increase of mining work on account of the dredging boom. For all the extra work and responsibility attached to these offices I have received the very moderate sum of £10 per annum, although permanent clerks who have since done the office-work have received good salaries. Still, my services were always available there when required, and I have always assisted successive clerks to the office in becoming acquainted with their duties, especially the work relating to mining, which takes a long time to learn. As I have five children, the eldest being twelve years and the youngest two years, I am particularly anxious to get stationed once more in some one of the larger centres of population—Wellington preferred—so that I might have an opportunity of sending them to my choice school.—JOHN FOLEY, Const. No. 640." That was addressed to Sergeant Dougan, Nelson. The minutes thereon are as follows: "Forwarded to the Inspector.—J. DOUGAN, Sergt., 16/8/07." "Submitted to the Commissioner.—Please see my report of June 16th on qualifications of constables for promotion. Constable Foley has always been steady and well conducted since I have known him, and anxious to do his work well. He has been a long time away from the active bustle of city duty. He would no doubt make a careful man as sergeant if he had some renewed practice in city duty. Probably a term in a busy suburban station would be an advantage if such an opportunity arose.—J. W. ELLISON, Inspector, 19/8/07." "Inspector Ellison.—Noted for consideration, with others, as vacancies occur.—W. DINNIE, Commr., 20/8/07." It was then sent for Sergeant Dougan and myself to note.

4. That recommendation of the Inspector's is only a qualified one, I notice. It is tantamount to saying that a man, after being at a country station, is unfit for promotion, though, of course, it would not apply in the case of many other men promoted. Since then you have received no offer of promotion?—No. I know it is a difficult matter for the Commissioner to satisfy everybody; but I consider the clerical staff should be kept distinct from the Police Force, and they should be paid as clerks, and not as policemen. With regard to pay, although I now receive 9s. 6d. a day, I submit it does not come up to the average pay of the ordinary working-man, in Collingwood, for instance. I consider constables should receive 8s. a day on joining, and that the pay should rise by regular increments to 11s. I do not think the Department will get a good staff of men otherwise.

5. You have perquisites in addition to your pay?—Yes; but it is very hard earned in an up-country station like Collingwood.

6. If you were offered promotion to-morrow, would you take it?—Yes; but I should like to have the question considered as to what my position would be in relation to those who may have been promoted over me contrary to regulations.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What regulations do you refer to?—Nos. 60 and 61, I think, relate to promotions.

8. *The Commissioner.*] If you will read the regulation you will see that seniority, although it is taken into consideration, is not the only ground of promotion?—That is so.

9. There is no getting away from the fact that if you were promoted to-morrow you would rank junior to those who had been previously promoted. Would you take promotion now if offered?—Yes, sir. I only want to say that I should like to compete by examination or otherwise with those who have been promoted over me.

10. That would mean upsetting the whole roll. If you should reach the rank of sergeant, there is nothing to prevent you or anybody else from promotion to the higher ranks according to merit.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Why have you not gone in for the examination before?—Other men who were promoted did not go in for it, and I did not think it was any use.

12. *The Commissioner.*] I suppose you know nothing as regards political influence?—I can say that in the past I have used it.

13. Successfully?—It was in regard to a matter long gone by. You will probably see it in my history if you look it up.

14. Do you know of anything in recent years?—No; but I should use it if I thought I could get any benefit by it in competing with others, because it is almost a moral certainty that it is used.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But you do not think it is any good?—I do not think it has been any good to me.

JOHN DOUGAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 132.)

Witness. I am sergeant, in charge of the Nelson sub-district, and have been here for seven years. Was enrolled on the 4th January, 1879, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 7th October, 1898.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you want to make any general statement before I put some questions to you?—I think, speaking broadly, the people, through the Government, are at fault to a great extent, and there are many things that require adjusting. The people want for the Force men mentally, physically, and morally almost without blemish, and they want them at a shoddy price. The pay of a constable is not sufficient to encourage the better class of men to come forward. I consider no constable for active street duty should be under the age of twenty-six years, and I think he should be able to pass the Sixth Standard. No appointment should be made until the Department is satisfied as to the high moral character of the candidate. This is of the utmost importance, owing to the great temptations to which young constables are exposed, and having regard to the protection of the public, more especially of women and young girls; and I consider the pay of the constable should be equivalent with the importance of the duty he has to perform. I think promotion should be placed on a proper system, so that every constable would feel assured that if his conduct and long service merits advancement, he will not be passed over by others less deserving. I think the office of constable should be rendered so important and of such value to the State that every member of the Force would be looked up to by the public, and appealed to with confidence in any emergency. It is time, I think, that the people awoke to the fact that the policeman of to-day is not the old watchman of years gone by. As to the training of the men, although I do not altogether approve of religious instruction, I think the candidates for the Force should be thoroughly grounded in a strict code of moral rules which they would not be likely to forget. Early training of that description will stand by a man when all else fails, and I know from experience the temptations a young constable is subject to. If a constable has no such training he is more likely to be a menace to the community than a protection and a care. I should like the people to feel when they lie down at night, "It is all right; Constable Brown is on the beat"; and I hope to see that yet before I die. Personally, I have no grievance of any kind. I have had rows, but they have been fought out fairly and squarely, and are done with. Speaking of promotion, there is one thing some of the men feel they have a grievance about, and that is the promotion of Sub-Inspector Dwyer over Sub-Inspector Green to the position of Inspector.

2. Do you know the two men?—Yes; I know them both personally.

3. Have you compared the qualifications of the two men?—I leave that to the Commissioner.

4. I happen to know the two men very well indeed, and if you cannot get a better case than that, I should doubt the soundness of the men's contentions as to promotion?—The Commissioner may have had real good grounds for the promotion, and I have no doubt he had.

5. The grounds would be the respective merits of the two men?—Yes, I suppose so.

6. If the Commissioner has never done any worse than that in connection with promotions, he has done very well?—I am glad to hear it, sir; and I leave it at that.

7. You have advocated that promotions should be carried out on a system: is it not impossible to have any fixed system?—It is impossible, but there are other things in the regulations which are impossible.

8. Theoretically no one can be in a better position than the Commissioner of Police to know the proper men to be promoted, and necessarily the personal question must enter into the promotions?—Then, it behoves the Government to get the best brains the country can produce for the office of Commissioner of Police. I think, in making promotions from constable to sergeant, for instance, the character of the men should be fully probed into, and the record of his service should be looked into, to see whether he has been reported for anything. The main thing is to ascertain whether a man is truthful or not. If a constable is not truthful he is not fit for promotion.

9. You know there are men in the higher ranks of the Force whose defaulters' sheets they certainly would not like to have published?—I am well aware of it.

10. Probably many of them have outgrown their faults, but the contention is that those men have justified their selection, although they have had records in certain directions. If you find a man has been living down something to his discredit it says something for him?—It shows that reformation must have taken place.

11. I know one or two instances in which a man has justified his promotion, although probably I would not have recommended him?—Just so. But you must depend on the superior officers to pick out whom they consider the best men. The sergeant is the backbone of the service, and I consider a sergeant in a city does not want to be more than from thirty to fifty years old.

12. That is a very wide margin. You were advocating just now men only being admitted to the Force at twenty-six?—Yes; if a man does his duty in a city it is a short-lived one. Very few people have the remotest idea of the duty of a constable and a sergeant who takes charge of twelve or fourteen young men, and has to record two or three visits every night. I have gone home so tired that I could not sit down. The duty is most laborious, and you want active young men, who are not afraid of work.

13. What is the maximum age you would appoint a man sergeant?—Not over fifty.

14. It is a good thing to have all your sergeants in a city for a time?—Yes; I do not think a man in charge of a station is fit for promotion till he gets a brushing up in a city again. A man goes half asleep in a country place. Personally speaking, I have very good men in my district. In reference to travelling-expenses, I cannot travel on 6s. a day. I think, also, sergeants and detectives should get saloon passages on steamers. It belittles an officer in charge of a district to travel steerage. I could not do it, for the sake of the Force. I do not mean, of course, when travelling with a prisoner, but when on transfer.

15. You pay the difference yourself?—Yes. In regard to the detectives, I consider they should be promoted within their own branch. I would suggest Detective Inspectors, and so on.

16. What would their duty be?—To inspect the detective force throughout the Dominion.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think the detective force is strong enough at present for the appointment of an Inspector?—I could not say.

18. Do you know anything about inquiries made in respect of candidates coming forward for enrolment?—I know whenever they come to me the inquiries are carefully made.

19. Are the inquiries more careful than heretofore?—No.

20. *The Commissioner.*] Do you do it yourself?—As a rule.

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that prior to my coming here inquiries only went five years back?—No.

22. *The Commissioner.*] Are you ever asked by young men in your district in regard to entrance into the Force?—No; with the exception of one young man.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that young men joining the service are subjected to more temptation than if appointed to any other Government or private employment?—There are none who undergo such crucial test as young constables.

24. It is the young men you mostly have trouble with?—Yes; as a rule they come into the Force without a real grasp of the responsibilities.

25. You do not anticipate getting an immaculate Police Force?—I do not anticipate anything.

26. In regard to the system of promotion, it resolves itself into the fact of promoting men by seniority and merit combined?—All things being equal, seniority should get one point at least, but I believe in men competing for a position, and I do not believe any Inspector or Sub-Inspector should be put into the position without qualifying for it.

27. Is not an Inspector in the best position to know the qualifications of his men?—He ought to be, but in many cases he does not.

28. Is a sergeant in a better position to know?—There is no man in a better position, being in touch with the men.

29. The Inspector sometimes consults his sergeant?—Very often.

30. Then, if so, the Inspector is the man to make the recommendation?—Yes; he ought to be in the best position to do so.

31. It has been stated in Dunedin that I have a "special" man attached to each district to get information for me: have you heard anything about that?—I have through the newspaper. I do not believe it.

32. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know anything about the exercise of political influence in connection with the Force?—I never knew of it. I would consider a man who listens to the constable worse than the constable himself. I have heard men grumbling who ought to be very pleased that they are in the Force at all.

33. Have you any opinion on the question of helmets and shakos?—The white helmet may be the most suitable in the north, but the shako is most suitable in the south.

34. What men have you in your district?—Seven in the city. The district is fairly large: I do not go round it at stated times, only when I am required; it is left to myself to go when necessary. Lately the Inspector has been making periodical visits, so that it is unnecessary for me to go.

35. Would you be in favour of a period of probation before enrolment in the Force?—Yes; I would make it twelve months.

36. Do you not think you could find out all about a man in six months?—Perhaps, but a man wants a good purging to go into the Force.

37. An opinion has been expressed that no man should be admitted till he has been in the Dominion for a time?—That is altogether nonsense. I would rely on a man from the rural districts in England before any colonial.

38. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think the standard of education is rather high? Do you not think if it was the Fourth we should get many respectable men from the farming class?—Yes; they are the best class, as a rule. My opinion is that, taking the Force as a whole, they will compare favourably with any other seven or eight hundred men in New Zealand.

PICTON, TUESDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1909.

GEORGE ALBERT WILLIAMS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 133.)

Witness: I am a constable of police, in charge of the Seddon Station. I entered the Force in 1889. Have been in charge of stations about eleven years.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general statement to make?—Prior to joining the police I had about eight years' service in the Armed Constabulary. Before 1887 those men who came from the Armed Constabulary to the Police Force had their service in the Armed Constabulary counted for superannuation. I joined the police, as I have said, in 1889, and am not therefore entitled to have my back service counted. I come before the Commission now to know if there is any possibility of my getting my back service taken into consideration, as it would be an advantage to me when I retire. I understand there are others in the Force who are in the same position as I in this respect.

2. The whole matter is under consideration. It will have to be dealt with by statute, as you know. I understand from the Commissioner of Police that arrangements are being made to ascertain the views of the Force generally as to superannuation matters with a view to, if possible, providing for such anomalies as you have referred to. I may say this does not come strictly within the scope of the Commission, but it is open, of course, for me to make a recommendation to the Minister. Is there any other matter you wish to mention?—I think, looking to the present cost of living, there might be a rise in pay throughout the Force. I am now receiving 9s. 6d. a day, but out of that I have to contribute 9d. a day, which is a big item. I and other constables in the district think concessions should be given to us when travelling on leave by railway. Other Civil servants seem to have railway concessions when on leave.

3. What other Civil servants? I only know of the Railway people?—Yes, the Railway servants. A policeman is always a policeman, and when travelling on a holiday he is supposed to attend to any duty that may present itself, just as if he were on regular duty.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You receive 9s. 6d. a day. What about house-rent?—I am paying no house-rent.

5. That means something to you, does it not?—I suppose it does.

6. Do you hold any appointments?—I am Inspector of Factories, but I get nothing for that except bare expenses; and there is a lot of work in that.

WILLIAM THOMAS MASON, Sergeant-major, examined on oath. (No. 134.)

Witness: I am the only sergeant-major now left in the Force. I joined the Force on the 28th October, 1868. I was transferred to the Armed Constabulary, where I have been sergeant for years. I became sergeant-major of police on the 15th December, 1884.

1. *The Commissioner.*] When will your retirement take place?—In about ten months.

2. You retire on superannuation according to your status?—Yes.

3. How many constables have you in your sub-district?—Eight. There are four in Blenheim, and the rest are in charge of stations. Two of them are in Picton, one acting as gaoler as well.

4. Are the men up to the standard you used to see in the Force?—There has been no falling-off so far as I can see. The men here are a fine clever lot. Both as regards physique and intelligence, they are all that could be desired.

5. What is your rate of pay?—12s. 6d. a day.

6. Have you any general remarks to make?—I indorse the evidence of the last witness—that the pay of a constable should be up to the standard of the ordinary labourer. The investigations and inquiries that are made before a candidate is enrolled into the Force are such as very few services in the world require. He has to pass the Fifth Standard of education, and he must be of fine physique. I think a constable on joining the Force should be paid 8s. a day. Apart from the question of pay, I think the position of the men in the Force is very good. I have nothing to grumble at at all, and I do not think they should.

7. With regard to the gaoler here, is he exempt from police duty when he has prisoners to look after?—Yes. There is rarely a week when he has not a prisoner. He has only prisoners who are in for a period not exceeding thirty days.

8. What do they do in the gaol?—They potter about the gaol premises. It is more to save the expense of sending them to Wellington.

9. You are satisfied with your position?—Yes. Speaking candidly, I rather deprecate constables coming before the Commission to ventilate their grievances. It seems to be subversive of discipline. If they have any grievances, they ought to go through the proper channel.

10. Any inquiries that are made are with a view to seeing if there are any weak spots in the system of promotion, and so on. The Commission is not to inquire into individual grievances. Have you any other suggestions to make?—I should be very glad to see the Police Force armed and trained in the use of the rifle. It would tend to discipline, and would form the basis of an armed and disciplined force in case of emergency.

The Commissioner. That seems a very good suggestion.

Mr. Dinnie. I have made a recommendation to the Minister in regard to that.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction owing to the present control?—None at all. I have read the absurd statements made about dissatisfaction, but I think the men are fairly treated.

12. As well as ever they have been?—Unquestionably. I have seen no undue favouritism. Of course, in every Force in the world there is a certain amount of influence used; but the promotions here are very fair and equitable.

13. Is the discipline and the efficiency of the Force equal to what it was in the past?—Yes; in fact, the discipline is rather more strict.

14. You have heard it stated in Dunedin that I had a "special" officer stationed in each district to furnish me with information?—Yes; and I thought it an absurdity.

15. You did not believe it?—No, I did not.

16. Do you think the standard of education is too high for recruits at the present time?—I am afraid it is, and for this reason: that the time may come when something may break out in New Zealand, such as a goldfield, or wages may become easily earned, and you will not be able to get men of the same standard then.

17. You think that, if we instituted the Fourth Standard, we should be able to draw more young men from the farming class?—Yes, and they make the best constables you can have. I just want to add that I agree with Constable Williams that some concessions might be made to members of the Force travelling by railway when on leave. A constable is always on duty, and he cannot overlook anything that comes under his notice, whether he has paid his own train fare or not.

18. Have you made any of the inquiries with respect to the antecedents of candidates for employment in the service?—Yes.

19. Do you think they are more strictly carried out than heretofore?—Yes; in fact, I think they are too strict. The other day a young man applied, and handed in unimpeachable testimonials with his application. Yet the matter was referred back for investigation into what the applicant had been doing during fourteen days that had not been mentioned in his testimonials. As he had been shearing during that time, a constable had to go away a considerable distance to make that inquiry.

20. You thought you were put to too much trouble?—No; but I thought such an investigation was unnecessary, in view of the references he had already shown.

21. Has that man been admitted yet?—No; it was only quite recently that these inquiries were made.

WANGANUI, FRIDAY, 13TH AUGUST, 1909.

THOMAS BOURKE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 135.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Wanganui. I entered the Force in November, 1877, and was promoted sergeant on the 1st January, 1898. I have been three years and seven months in Wanganui, and prior to that in various places. I have no grievances at all, as all the Commissioners and Inspectors I have served under have treated me as well as I could have expected. But there is dissatisfaction about the promotions; junior and inferior men are promoted when senior and better men are passed over. I refer to the promotions from constables to sergeants.

The Commissioner: Write down the names of a few of the men you have in view, so that I can ascertain whether their cases are properly the subject of dissatisfaction. [Witness handed in a list of the names of men he considered should have been promoted.]

1. *The Commissioner.*] How old were you when you were promoted a sergeant?—Forty years.

2. Have you any opinion to offer with regard to the maximum age at which men should be promoted to sergeant from the ranks?—Generally, not after fifty. That is, to put him in a town.

3. You would agree that a man who has been many years in charge of a country station, on promotion, should be placed in a centre?—Not necessarily.

4. How would you distinguish?—Taking a man who has been passed over unjustly, and is thoroughly capable and intelligent, there is no reason why he should not fill the position I hold here without any probation at all in the cities.

5. Taking a concrete instance, do you know Constable Leahy, of Canterbury?—I have known him close on thirty years. He is fit to fill any position in the Force, if he had the opportunity.

6. He has been recommended for promotion on various occasions, but he is now fifty-three years of age, and, taking your idea of the maximum, he would be too old for promotion: what would you do in that case?—I would promote him to any district that is vacant. There is a man in that list who is quite as intelligent as Leahy, and is above the average policeman for intelligence. The non-promotion of men like that is a distinct loss to the Department, and to the men themselves, as they have to retire on very small pensions.

7. You know there are many excellent men in the Force who will not accept promotion: how would you deal with those cases?—I do not see why they should be allowed to refuse. If a man's promotion means furthering the efficiency of the Force his wishes should not be considered.

8. You know, as a fact, that they do refuse?—I do, and they should not be allowed to refuse. They are allowed to refuse promotion.

9. Since when?—Since Mr. Dinnie's time. I do not know of any cases before the present Commissioner's time where the men were asked if they would accept promotion, or would like to be transferred from one place to another.

10. You think that if a man is ordered to go he should go?—Yes; there should be no nonsense about it. I never had the chance but once to say whether I would go or not. When I was ordered to Wanganui I did get an option, but that was the only time.

11. With regard to men entering the Force, are you in favour of a period of probation before they are finally enrolled?—I think the period of probation should be from six to twelve months, and then if a man does not come up to the mark he should not be finally enrolled. At present we get men in the service who are totally unfit for policemen, and they should never have been enrolled.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Perhaps you will mention the names of those men?—[Witness wrote down the names and handed the paper in.] One man was stationed here for a time, and he should never have been allowed in the police at all. He was a “waster.”

13. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinion with regard to the standard of education which a recruit should satisfy?—I would keep it as high as possible.

14. Do you think the present standard, which is equivalent to the Fifth, is too high?—I do not think so; but there are some men who would make very good policemen who could not pass any standard.

15. What about those likely men who do not remain at school beyond the Fourth Standard?—If they are wanted they should be taken in. I know we can get good men who could not pass that standard, and they would make better policemen than a great many of those who do pass it.

16. What is the rule here in regard to allowing men time off when they have been on night duty, and have to appear at Court next day?—There is no rule at all.

17. Is no consideration shown in those cases?—No. The men never ask for it, and do not regard it as a hardship being called on to appear at Court next day.

18. Do the men get Sundays off occasionally?—Yes; every man gets his Sunday off in turn. It is a very good station for that, as when fully manned the men get off on one Sunday in three weeks.

19. Assuming there is a falling-off in the number of suitable candidates for enrolment, what do you attribute it to?—I think it is the pay.

20. You think that 7s. 6d. a day is too low?—Yes; I think that is the main reason.

21. Have you any views with respect to the somewhat burning question of promotion to the higher ranks of the plain-clothes' men?—No; but if you get a good man, and he shows intelligence, he should be promoted.

22. Have you from time to time made inquiries in this district respecting the antecedents of men asking for enrolment?—Yes, frequently. When it is possible to make them myself I do so.

23. When they are made by some one else, who makes them?—If the man is out in the country I hand the application to the mounted constable to see the man's employer.

24. Do you not think it most desirable that these inquiries should be made by a sergeant rather than by a constable?—I think it would be better, but in the country districts like Waitotara and Patea the constable of the district makes the inquiry.

25. Assuming the Department made it a rule that all these inquiries should be conducted by sergeants, you would be in a practical difficulty in this district in carrying that rule out?—There would be difficulty.

26. Therefore the present system is the best?—The constables in charge of country stations are, as a rule, as reliable as the sergeants, and they feel the responsibility of keeping a bad man in the service. But I do not see how closer inquiry could be made than is made under the present system.

27. Would you be in favour of establishing a special grade for detectives?—No; I think that would be to the detriment of the service. I do not think we could have a better system than we have. It brings the detectives into closer contact with the constables, and if they had a roll of their own separate from the general police, it would cause a good deal of bickering.

28. Do you become aware in any way of the previous conduct of men who have been transferred to this district? Do you hear the reasons of their transfer?—We sometimes hear the reasons.

29. Are they officially communicated to you?—No. I dare say the Inspector gets the man's defaulter's sheet.

30. Where the Inspector thinks proper to do so he informs you of the antecedents of the men?—Yes, that is done.

31. A great many men are transferred as a sort of punishment?—I think the mode of transferring by way of punishment is totally wrong.

32. Why?—The man commits an offence—some breach of the regulations—and he is transferred to a better station probably, while a good man is inadvertently punished by being sent to take his place. I have suffered myself several times in that way.

33. How would you deal with such a defaulter?—If he becomes incorrigible, turn him out.

34. But there are certain offences you would not dismiss him for?—If a constable commits a degrading offence he should be put out. If it is a breach of the regulations, punish him severely, and leave him where he is, or send him into some big town where he can be kept under surveillance.

35. How would you treat drunkenness?—Sometimes constables get drunk, but when inquired into the offence is found not to be very serious.

36. What would you do with such a man?—Send him into a big town.

37. But if it has occurred in the big town?—I would leave him there, and punish him, and if it occurred again I would put him out.

38. You would distinguish between offences committed when in uniform and when off duty?—Certainly.

39. Is there any grievance on the part of constables about uniforms?—In the case of the uniform I am wearing, the material costs about £1 5s. or £1 6s., and it costs me £2 13s. to make up. There is not so much concession in regard to the uniform as the public think when they say the police get free uniforms.

40. A good deal has been said about changing the present headgear from shakos to helmets: have you any opinion about that matter?—We have got so used to shakos that I do not think it would make any difference. I would like to see a better-wearing shako, as after rain the present one gets soft, and is knocked out of shape. The material is poor, and the shape is no protection to a man in very wet weather.

41. Hitherto I think you have been required to travel steerage?—Yes; men on transfer pay the difference for their families.

42. Have you any views respecting the length of time constables should be allowed to remain in charge of a station?—It entirely depends on the men. Some men could not stay in a place three years, when others could go on in the same place twenty years without impairing efficiency. I do not know of any reason why men should be shifted about.

43. Do you think a man loses in efficiency if he has been a very long time in one place?—I do not think there should be any rule. Some men would become inefficient in a very short time, and others would not deteriorate at all. It might not be to the interests of the service to keep a man too long in one place.

44. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards moving constables from one place to another, do you not think it takes a man two or three years to know his district thoroughly?—Yes.

45. And if that man is a good man, you believe there is no necessity to transfer him, unless he misconducts himself?—I do not think it necessary to transfer a man from a station if he is a good man, and does not give way to the public. But some men the public get hold of in a very short time.

46. It depends entirely on the man?—Yes.

47. *The Commissioner.*] Sometimes nothing is known against a man until anonymous letters have been received. The practice of writing such letters is taken very grave exception to by certain officers of the Department: have you considered that matter?—Sometimes such letters might prove very dangerous, and sometimes they are very useful.

48. Of course, those letters might come about a man who has not been twelve months in one station?—Yes, and in many cases I know there has been no ground for them at all.

49. But still you believe they should be inquired into?—There should be some inquiry into them.

50. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you ever made any representation in respect to your shako to the Inspector?—No.

51. Do you know of any complaints having been received in respect to the shakos?—I do not think any have been received. I mean that they are very little protection from the rain; they should be made of better material than at present.

52. Would you prefer the helmet to the shako?—I do not think so.

53. You know it has been put to the vote of the men, and a large majority wanted the shako?—That is so.

54. When men are punished for misconduct when in charge of a station, do you not know that they are frequently sent to the cities and replaced by other men?—I do not know that. I have often seen them shifted about to a better station.

55. It depends on the offence?—Yes.

56. Men having to attend Court in the morning do get time off, do they not?—In the towns we used to give them time off, but here they have not asked for it. If they did ask for it, and I saw sufficient reason, I would probably see the Inspector, and they would get it.

57. They get Sunday occasionally?—They are very well treated here about Sunday leave.

58. Are not the inquiries about candidates much more strict than they used to be?—Yes.

59. Do you not think it would be very difficult to arrange for sergeants only to make those inquiries?—It would be difficult, and I do not think it could be done as efficiently, as the men in the country stations know the people.

60. And we could not very well spare the sergeants?—Quite so.

61. As regards defaulters' sheets, you know that those sheets are always sent to the Inspector in charge of a district when a man is punished by being transferred, and it is for the Inspector to acquaint his sergeant if he thinks it necessary?—I know of that having been done.

62. As regards education, do you not think there are a good many of the farming class we might get as candidates if we reduced the standard from the Fifth to the Fourth?—You probably would, and you would probably find them to be the best men.

63. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think the question of the reduction of the standard of education might be left to the judgment of the Commissioner of Police for the time being?—I think a lot depends on the Commissioner and the man who has charge of the depot. I believe they send men out of the depot who should never have been sent out. It should be first ascertained whether they are likely to turn out good men or not. One man whose name I have given could not go through the first stage, and it should be patent to the Commissioner that the man would never make a constable.

64. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say there are men go out?—That is one.

65. You spoke as though there were a great number of them?—That is one.

66. That is the only one?—What I wish to convey is this: that if the officer in charge of the depot were careful, and the Commissioner listened to his representations, these unintelligent men who will never make policemen would never go out at all, and we would have less inefficient men.

67. You are talking now of what you do not know. Do you know what is being done?—I know that a man came out who should not have come out.

68. Did you represent the matter to the Inspector?—No.

69. Why not?—He had been through several hands before I had him.

70. Is it not your duty to report to the Inspector the conduct of the men, and their qualifications, if you think they are not fitted for the service?—I have never reported, and I do not think any sergeant has ever done it, without being called on by his Inspector.

71. You must admit that it is your duty to call the attention of the Inspector to a man of that description, who is not performing his duties?—I have had several talks with the Inspector about him.

72. Regarding promotions, I see that in this list you handed in the majority are clerks—eight of them are clerks?—I really could not say, not having taken notice of what they were.

73. Do you know anything about the qualifications of these men?—No; I know some of them to be really good men.

74. There is Till, for instance?—He is as good a man as any we have had in the service.

75. O'Brien: he is not in the service now?—No.

76. Do you know he was offered promotion by my predecessor?—I could not say, but if he was he should have taken it.

77. It might not have been in my time?—I am only saying that the system is totally wrong.

78. Do you know that others have not been recommended for promotion?—I could not say, but I say there are men in the Police Force who should have been promoted, and the Force would get better service from them than it is getting now.

79. Perhaps the Inspectors are of a different opinion?—That is so.

80. Do you not think the Inspectors are the better men to recommend?—The system is wrong, and influence is brought to bear by some men to get promotion. Some of the men I have mentioned, if they had used influence, would have been promoted; but because they did not do that they were not promoted; and they were wronged.

81. Speaking about influence, do you know of a single case where influence has obtained?—If I say I know of a case, will the name have to be mentioned, because the men we know have used political influence are our friends, and they will resent the names being mentioned. They told us about it and what progress was being made.

82. *The Commissioner.*] You are asked to give the names of any persons you allege have used political influence, but I will not use those names in that connection. I will send for all papers in connection with their careers, and satisfy myself as to whether any act done in their behalf was the direct result of political influence. Do you know of such a case?—I know of a constable who was passed over. He is now as good a sergeant as any in the service, but I doubt if he would have been a sergeant to-day if he had not used political influence. But he felt himself degraded by being passed over, and he used political influence. He told me what progress was being made. Whether it is entered in the records or not I do not know. That is the greatest friend I have in the Force.

83. You say he is an excellent man now?—And always was. There is no reason why he should not have been promoted before me. I know for a positive fact he had to pull very hard, and to use members of Parliament to be made a sergeant. I was told week by week the progress that was being made.

84. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was he promoted during my time?—Yes.

85. Can you suggest a system of making promotions? The same system obtains now as obtained for many years past?—As it is at present, political influence is necessary, and will be necessary. It has been used all the time I have been in the Force, and I believe it will be used after I have gone out of it. We want some Board that men who have been passed over can appeal to—some power beyond the Inspectors and above the Commissioner. An Inspector might be biassed against me—and it is the fact that we often get unconsciously biassed against each other—and he might not recommend me. And the Commissioner might have some feeling against me; and there should be some Board outside the police that we could appeal to—the Stipendiary Magistrate, a man appointed by the Government, and another by the police. Take the case of Leahy and other men: if there had been a Board of that kind Leahy would be a sergeant.

86. *The Commissioner.*] Have you always held that opinion with regard to a Board of Appeal, or only recently?—In discussing the matter lately with the Inspector I have come to the conclusion that political influence will be necessary until we have some higher power to go to.

87. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that they have the right to appeal to the Minister at present?—We have that right, but they are frightened to appeal to him.

88. Why?—It is very seldom done, and in going to the Minister the constable has got very little show against the Inspector and Commissioner.

89. Then, you believe in the present system obtaining, but with an Appeal Board so that any man, whatever his grievance, could appeal to that Board?—Yes. I think if I had a good claim to promotion I should be able to apply to an independent Board.

90. You believe in seniority and ability being considered together?—Certainly.

91. Not seniority by itself?—No.

92. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service beyond the question of promotions?—There is a certain amount of dissatisfaction about the clerks.

93. But general dissatisfaction as to control?—I do not.

94. Have you heard anything about a "special" man they mentioned in Dunedin?—No; never in my life.

95. Do you believe in the story?—I do not.

JAMES BREE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 136.)

Witness. I am a police constable, stationed at Aramoho, and am in charge of that station. I was enrolled on the 17th February, 1880, and have been in charge of a station about eleven years. I appear as a delegate on behalf of the local constables. We submit that in order to secure the services of better men the pay should be increased to 8s. a day at least on joining, while the maximum should be 10s., the increases being 6d. a day every three years. Free uniforms and boots should be supplied, and a house-allowance to the married men of from 7s. to 10s. 6d. per week. You can get a four-roomed house and scullery here for about 12s. 6d. a week.

Sergeant Bourke. I do not think there are any of the men getting a house here under 14s. a week.

Witness: I would say, 14s. a week. The annual leave should be increased from twelve to twenty-one days a year. The police are on duty every day in the week, including Sundays, and are liable to be called out at any hour of the night. The Royal Irish Constabulary get thirty days every year, and the hours are six a day.

Mr. Dinnie: Since when?—That is in existence now. In my opinion a man when on leave should get a free railway pass. There is also another matter, with reference to escorting prisoners on remand. We will say, for instance, that the *Police Gazette* arrives here containing a notice that a man is “wanted” in Auckland on warrant, and that man is arrested, and a policeman is told off to escort him to Auckland: the policeman goes in uniform, and persons seeing the two on their journey know that the man is under arrest. If the accused is found to be innocent, and if, when looking for work later on, he meets some of the people who saw him in charge of a constable in uniform, it may militate against the chance of the man getting work. I therefore submit that a prisoner on remand should be escorted by constables in private clothes. It is also submitted that a constable on night duty who has to attend the Court in the morning should get some consideration in the way of time off. That is really all I have to represent.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are there any matters personal to yourself?—No; in fact, I would not have been here at all if the men had not elected me to come here and speak on their behalf. But I submit that I should have been considered some time ago in the way of promotion. Of course, it was for the Commissioner to consider my qualifications.

2. Do you know whether you have been recommended for promotion?—Yes.

3. By whom?—Inspector Kiely.

4. Did you apply?—Yes; and the answer to my application was that my application would be considered in the usual course, amongst others.

5. And it is still being considered?—Yes.

6. How old are you?—Fifty-one.

7. Would you accept promotion if it was offered to you?—Yes; but I would prefer being sent to a country station rather than being sent to do street duty.

8. You know that has been the rule all round?—Yes.

9. What is your objection to going into a centre?—My objection in the first place is that I would have to do night duty, and when you begin to get on in years you do not feel as fit as you were perhaps ten years previously.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you recognise that there is some difficulty—I mean, as regards promotion being given to every one?—Yes, very great difficulty. We cannot all be sergeants, Sub-Inspectors, and Inspectors.

11. Do you not think twenty-one days’ leave is rather too much to ask for?—No; I think twenty-one days is little enough.

The Commissioner: None of the delegates have asked for anything like that number of days’ leave.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that the duties of the Irish Constabulary are quite different from your duties here?—Yes.

13. Their duties are much more arduous than yours here?—Yes, they are in some cases.

JAMES RIORDAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 137.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Wanganui, and am in charge of the Wanganui East Station. I joined the Force on the 12th January, 1891, and have been in charge of this station four or five months. Previous to that I was at Taradale, Hawke’s Bay.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before me?—I have two suggestions to make which I think would be beneficial to the Force. And I have one request to make. The request I have to make is that the allowances for expenses of married men be increased when on relieving duty. At present the amount we are entitled to when on relieving duty is 3s. per day after the expiration of six days. I think that should be increased to 6s. per day. In support of that I would like to mention that the cadets—who are, of course, all single—in the Railway Department, when on relieving duty, travel first class free by railway, and I am given to understand that they are allowed up to 10s. a day expenses. I suggest, also, that Stipendiary Magistrates should give their opinions as to the qualifications of members of the Force seeking promotion. If the member of the Force is not known to the Magistrate, he could be examined by him. I suggest, also, that a Police Appeal Board be set up, the Board to be constituted of three members—one, a Stipendiary Magistrate appointed by the Government; a constable to be appointed by the constables; the third member to be appointed by the non-commissioned officers and the officers.

2. For the whole Dominion?—Yes. If that were done it would have a tendency, in my opinion, to stop political influence, which I think exists, though I cannot particularise any case. It would also have a tendency to stop the “useful handy man,” who is said to be in existence. It would result in giving the senior qualified man his turn of promotion, and would thereby cause unity and content in the Force.

3. That unity and content you speak of, is that lacking at the present time; or, in other words, do you think there is any dissatisfaction?—Yes, in regard to the senior men who have been passed over; but not so far as I am particularly concerned; I have not asked for it, and do not want it.

4. Then, you do not agree with Sergeant Bourke, who said that when it was thought proper to promote a man he should not have the option of refusing? Would you compel a man to accept?—No. I would not compel anybody. If a man proves himself to be a qualified man, and being a senior man obtains promotion, I should say he should have the option of refusing or taking it.

5. Then, you do not agree with Sergeant Bourke, who considers that no man should have the option?—I think a man should get the option, because in many instances men with large families may be better off in charge of a station than in a large centre.

6. Then, there is the set-off against that of the efficiency of the Force?—That is so.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] A man promoted against his will may not perform his duties so well?—I think that is so.

8. About this “handy man,” what have you heard about him?—As far as you are concerned, sir, I have never heard anything other than what I have seen in the papers during the sittings of the Commission.

9. You know nothing yourself?—Not as far as you are concerned.

10. We have been trying to find this man?—He has been very prevalent in Hawke’s Bay; he was very much encouraged there, but not in this district.

11. Is that ancient history?—No.

12. How far back are you going?—Prior to the retirement of Sub-Inspector McDonnell.

JAMES FITZPATRICK, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 138.)

Witness: I am a constable, in charge of Marton. I was enrolled on the 16th February, 1899.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you want to bring before me?—I have a few suggestions to bring before the Commission. In my opinion, the rate of pay of constables at the present time is insufficient. It should commence at 8s. a day, with a rise of 6d. per day every three years until ten years service. At the present time the rate is 7s. 6d. per day for four years; and out of that 7s. 6d. 4½d. per day is deducted for the Police Provident Fund, leaving constables 7s. 1½d. per day to live upon.

2. But men are generally in charge of stations after a short time: what is the average time a constable serves before he gets charge of a station?—I have no idea.

3. I mean the average time of a qualified man?—I was stationed at Wanganui for six years before being put in charge of a station.

4. Under your scheme you would be getting 9s. to-day?—Yes.

5. Instead of that, what are you getting?—8s. 6d. a day.

6. Of course, there is no comparison between the men in charge of stations and other constables?—That is so.

7. Is there anything else you wish to say?—As regards promotion, under the present system there will always be dissatisfaction. I think there should be a conference of Inspectors when men are to be promoted, and the abilities of the men should be discussed, and they should be promoted accordingly. The men would then know they would have the benefit at such a conference of the presence of their respective Inspectors. Therefore a case such as that of Constable Leahy, which has been mentioned—and many others—would not occur.

8. You know that at the present time the Inspectors do recommend men?—Yes.

9. The Commissioner of Police has before him the detailed recommendations of every Inspector, and ought to act according to his judgment upon those recommendations. What do you claim for the conference?—In my opinion, the talk of the Inspectors round a table would be more in the interests of the Force than all the writing that could be put on paper.

10. You would rather have such a conference than an independent Board?—Yes.

11. What is your next point?—I think that no constable over forty-five years of age should be promoted to the rank of sergeant to do street duty in the cities. After that age he would not possess the necessary activity and energy for the position. A sergeant has a lot to do with the breaking or making of a constable, especially of the young men under his charge. If you have an inactive, easy-going sergeant you will have easy-going constables.

12. In other words, the sergeant is the backbone of the Force?—Exactly. As regards the promotion of district clerks, that is unsatisfactory at the present time. A man who has been a district clerk is promoted, whilst a man who has done actual service in ordinary police duties is passed over. I have been recommended for promotion by my Inspector, and I have also received a letter of recommendation (addressed to the Commissioner) from Mr. Stanford, ex-Stipendiary Magistrate of Wanganui. Sergeant Cummings—I am speaking on the principle and not personally—who is five months my junior, has been promoted after ten years’ service, and now becomes my senior. He has been most of his time, I understand, in the district office, and has not done actual police duties. There is not sufficient encouragement held out to the men who are responsible for maintaining law and order. Sergeant Muggeridge—I am still speaking on the principle and not of the man—who has done little or no police duty, has been promoted after seven years’ service. I say that the qualifications for promotion should be—first, ability; and I should say that the abilities of a senior man should be carefully weighed before he is passed over, but if the abilities of a junior man are greater he should receive promotion.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Supposing you had a man with twenty years’ service and a man with fourteen years’ service, and the latter was the best qualified man, would you promote him?—He should certainly be given promotion; but if the two had equal qualifications, promotion should certainly be given to the senior man.

14. Do you know what is being done at the present time?—No.

15. Well, that is the system that is being adopted. As regards that recommendation from the Magistrate, did you ask him for it?—Yes.

16. Is not that using influence?—No, not political influence.

Mr. Dinnie: I am not suggesting that you are not a fully qualified constable in every way—and I may say your name is on the list for promotion—but I am suggesting whether it is a proper thing to ask for such a testimonial.

The Commissioner: This is a letter addressed to me personally as Royal Commissioner, and I presume that Mr. Stanford is physically unable to attend the Commission. I will read the letter. [Letter read.] It does not come under the category referred to by Mr. Dinnie. This is a letter addressed to me personally, and it is entirely in my discretion whether I accept it or not.

17. *Mr. Dinnie* to witness.] Do you not think your Inspector is in a position to make a recommendation?—Yes, but the Magistrate is able to form an opinion too.

Mr. Dinnie: I was totally unaware that the Magistrate recommended this man's transfer at all, and it was not owing to his recommendation that the change was made. I specially selected this man myself to go to his present station because I knew he was a good man.

The Commissioner: I have no means of testing the accuracy of these statements now.

JAMES SIDDELLS, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 139.)

Witness: I am a detective, stationed at Wanganui. I have been a detective for four years and six months, having been appointed a detective on the 1st January, 1905. I was enrolled in October, 1877, and was a sergeant for seven years.

1. *The Commissioner*.] Did you elect to go into the detective branch?—Yes, it was at my own request.

2. Was there any particular reason for it?—I saw that you invited members of the Force to give evidence. I have given the whole question of the Police Force much thought, and have had considerable experience in the Force. I have no grievance. I have prepared a statement suggesting what I consider to be remedies, and the suggestions may assist the Commission in coming to a decision or judgment on certain points. There may be some views expressed or suggestions made that the Commissioner and Inspectors may not agree with; but I submit them for what they are worth, and in the utmost good faith.

3. The question is whether they commend themselves to me, not whether they commend themselves to anybody else?—Yes. This is the statement I have prepared: My name is James Siddells, and at present I hold the rank of detective at Wanganui. I joined the Armed Constabulary on the 9th October, 1877, and served in that Force for two years and three months, when I was transferred to the police branch, and sent to the Napier District, where I was in charge of various stations for eighteen years. I was then promoted to the rank of sergeant, and placed in charge of the Dannevirke sub-district, remaining there two years. I was then sent to take charge of the Gisborne sub-district. I remained at Gisborne for five years, when, at my own request, I was transferred to the detective branch, and sent to Wanganui, and have been here four years and seven months. Throughout my career in the Police Force I have never been fined or admonished. I am perfectly satisfied with the treatment I have received from the various officers and Commissioners that I have served under. I have every confidence that had I remained in the uniform branch I should at the present time be occupying a higher grade in the Force, but I fully recognise that this is my own fault, as I took a downward step at my own request. With regard to the Force as a body, I know that considerable dissatisfaction exists (in many cases probably uncalled for). My experience leads me to believe that many men have only imaginary grievances. Among a body of men this will always exist. There is no question but that a great many of the Force feel that promotions are not made fairly; and, in my opinion, there are undoubted cases where men have good reason for complaint—notably, where they have been passed over and subsequently promoted. I can quote many instances where this has taken place to the detriment of apparently good men. When a man is passed over and is subsequently promoted he loses his seniority, and this probably prevents him from attaining to the higher offices of the Force. Unquestionably, merit should count first; but it is questionable whether that can be shown in all cases of promotion in the uniform branch of the service. At any rate, I am satisfied that many members of the Force do not consider that it can. This probably is not the Commissioner's fault. In my opinion, there would be a better Force in every way if the Commissioner was solely responsible for the working of it, and we all, as members of it, knew and felt that such was the case. In my opinion, the Commissioner should be supreme, except that there should be a Board of Appeal to which any member could go if he considered that he was being unjustly treated. Good men would have nothing to fear, and members would not go to appeal on frivolous grounds. I am of opinion that the Force is considerably handicapped on account of there being no means of getting rid of the useless men. I have never known of a man being removed from the Force on the ground of him being useless for the work. It appears to be a recognised rule that once a man is enrolled in the Force he is there for all time, no matter whether he is capable or not. A man may be a respectable and good living man yet utterly unfit for police work. I think it would be an improvement if a man was placed on probation for six months or twelve months; by that time the Inspectors would be in a position to judge whether the man had sufficient intelligence and ability to make a good policeman. Every man in the service should be made to feel that his position in same was dependent on his carrying out his work in a proper and efficient manner. There is no question but that the Force is composed mostly of highly efficient men. The trouble is that there are some who cannot do the necessary work, and others that will not. The consequence is that those who can and will have to carry the burden of those who cannot and will not. If there was a clearance of the drones, the others would be keener and better men. It is questionable whether the increment rise is not a mistake on account of it doing away with the ambition to get on. Personally, I am of opinion that stations should be graded according to the amount of police work to be done and the importance of the district, on the same principle as the post-offices and railway-stations. If this practice prevailed, men would be paid in proportion to the work and responsibility they had. At present it frequently happens that a senior man is stationed at a small unimportant station, where a great many perquisites are to be made; and a junior is at a very busy station, where his time is fully occupied in doing hard police duty, and nothing to be made but bare pay. Another cause of dissatisfaction to the man that does not and will not pull the ropes is the way transfers are carried out. I think that when the Commissioner orders a transfer it should always be carried out. He knows his men, and makes transfers for the good of the Force and the com-

munity. Therefore, why should a man who has a number of friends be able to remain at a station when the Commissioner knows that he should go? There seems to be a widespread impression that political influence is of great value in the Force; but I cannot say anything on this point. I never used it myself, and I think I can safely say that there are many others higher up in the service who got there without any political assistance. I am satisfied that the Force would benefit greatly if it could be endued with the idea that political influence was of no value. For years past—in fact, as long as I have been in the service—the Department has been issuing circulars stating that members of the Force attempting to use political influence would be severely dealt with. The Police Commission of 1898 found that political influence was used, and it is very questionable whether it is not as rife now as ever. If it is not, it is hard to understand how some of the promotions in the Force have been made. Another factor that bears on the promotion and non-promotion of men is the personal bias of the Commissioner and Inspectors. This is only human, and often unconscious, but it not unfrequently does a good man a great injustice. In my opinion, to guard against this, an Appeal Board should be established—one for the North Island and one for the South Island—consisting of a Stipendiary Magistrate, some person representing the Department, and another the non-commissioned officers and constables. Considerable dissatisfaction exists over the amount paid to police for travelling-allowance. I am of opinion that the police are being unfairly treated when compared with other departments. In the police, a constable and sergeant is paid 6s., a detective is paid 8s. The sergeant asks why should the detective get more than a sergeant, as their expenses are the same. I myself cannot see why there should be any difference. An official in the Post Office receives 10s., and a warder in the gaol 12s. 6d. All have to lodge at the same hotels, and police frequently are out of pocket in travelling. I am of opinion that no man should be allowed to apply for promotion or other advantage. If the Force was run on the lines that every man got his just dues, there would be no need for such a practice, which often means that a good and efficient officer is left behind. The Commissioner and Inspectors know, or should know, the men who are entitled to and suitable for promotion, and they should act in the best interests of the Force and public. If there was an Appeal Board, I submit that men would be promoted in order of seniority, coupled with ability, without any need of applying for same. In my opinion, the greatest cause of complaint amongst most members of the Force is the exceptional treatment meted out to the clerical staff. It appears to be a rule that a constable employed as a district clerk is promoted to the rank of sergeant after ten years' service. Many of them, no doubt, are very capable men, but there are a number of very capable men doing duty with considerably more than ten years' service. If a man chooses to leave the office after being promoted to the rank of sergeant, it gives him a great "pull" over men who have been doing police duty for years. The clerks have no hardships to contend with, their responsibility is not excessive, and I venture to say that their pay is as good as that of other clerks in similar positions without them being raised over the heads of men more entitled to promotion. During the sitting of the Commission a good deal has been said about raising the standard of the Force, and an increase of pay. The question is, will an increase of pay tempt a better class of men to join? I am of opinion that under existing circumstances it will not. At present our recruits are principally drawn from the labouring classes. It is impossible for a person to become attached to the Police Force until he attains the age of twenty-one years, consequently there is a period between the time that a lad leaves school and is old enough to join the Force that he must start out at something. The consequence is that, as a rule, the brainy intelligent youth makes his mark and settles at some calling before he is old enough to join the Police Force. I think that if there was a system of cadetship preparatory to joining the Force some of the brightest youths would take on the work. There are plenty of ways in which cadets could be employed in the Force—for instance, some could be employed in the offices doing work that is now done by men who are in receipt of good pay. Others could, I think, with advantage be attached to the detective branch, in which I am sure they could do valuable work, and in time become experts. If at the end of their cadetship any were found unsuitable for police work, they could be drafted into other branches of the Government service. Their training in the Police Force would be an education that would, I think, stand them in good service in after-life. Such a system would be a saving to the Government, and would, I think, assist to elevate the Force, and cause a better class to come forward. In nearly all walks of life persons start young, and why not in the Police Force? Strength is all very well, and it is necessary that a Police Force should have plenty of it; but strength without brains and intelligence is a danger that requires to be guarded against. The present system of enrolment could continue as heretofore.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you took a downward step when you joined the detective department?—Yes.

5. Is it a downward step?—I think so.

6. Why did you apply for it?—It suited me at that time. There was not much prospect of promotion. I think you came to Gisborne, and kindly advised me to stop in the uniform branch. But you said that there was very little chance of promotion, and I replied that I would get more pay and less worry in the detective service than as sergeant in charge of a sub-district. I consider that the sergeants in charge of sub-districts are the most important men in the Force, and are not sufficiently paid.

7. Then it was not a retrograde step?—I went over at the same pay. I am getting more pay now than I would have got as a sergeant.

8. Then, it was not a downward step?—Not in pay.

9. As regards the Appeal Board, how do you suggest it should be constituted?—A Stipendiary Magistrate, one to represent the non-commissioned officers and men, and the other to be appointed by the Government.

10. How would they ascertain the qualifications of the men?—By evidence.

11. What evidence?—The evidence of the men. Constable Leahy's case has been mentioned. A man junior to him might apply for his case to be heard—exactly the same as in the Railway Department. He would enter an appeal to the Board. The Board would sit, and the constable would be entitled to call evidence—the evidence of the Inspectors who had had to do with him in the past. And the evidence of the Stipendiary Magistrate and solicitors could be taken to show whether the man was a qualified, intelligent, brainy man. And if the Appeal Board decided that this man was entitled to promotion he would be passed up. One result would be that the Commissioner and Inspectors would be very careful not to allow personal bias to come in.

12. Do you think they do at the present time?—Yes, but it may be quite unconscious.

13. Can you mention any particular case?—No; I would not like to mention any particular case. In every walk of life there is apt to be unconscious bias.

14. Do you suggest that I am unjust?—No, not in any shape or form. I would be very sorry to say that you were in any way biassed, but promotions have been made that the Force cannot account for. We cannot understand how some men are promoted and others are left out.

15. There are a number of men who are fitted to be sergeants and nothing more?—Yes.

16. Those younger men who are fitted to go higher than sergeants, should not they get the first chance of promotion?—I would not like to go so far as that.

17. I mean, men with a fair length of service?—Of course.

18. *The Commissioner.*] Take that list: are any of the men in that list?—No; the two men I have in view at present are Sub-Inspector Norwood and Sub-Inspector Hendrey. Right throughout the Force they are recognised as most capable men, and nobody objects to their promotion.

19. I suppose you will admit that Sergeant Dart is a specially qualified man?—Qualified as a solicitor. I do not know him.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I was in favour of an Appeal Board at one time, but whatever is done I am afraid there will be some dissatisfaction, even with an Appeal Board?—I am quite aware that there must be some dissatisfaction in all branches of the Government service. There is one matter that I omitted to mention—the great injustice to the police in connection with their pension fund.

The Commissioner: That is outside this inquiry. The matter is now under consideration, and probably something will be done.

WALTER HENRY HADDRELL, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 140.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at New Plymouth, and am in charge of that station. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant in October, 1898. I was enrolled in 1872.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any remarks of a general nature to make before I ask you any questions?—No.

2. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force based upon anything you have heard?—Only what has generally appeared in the papers—that a certain amount of political influence is the thing to put you along in the service.

3. Do you know if that exists?—No, I have no means of knowing.

4. Do you believe it exists?—I have no reason to believe or disbelieve it. I have never used it.

5. Have you anything to say with regard to promotion?—There appears to be a certain amount of dissatisfaction. You see certain junior men promoted, and a senior man is sometimes promoted later on. I consider that I was just as efficient ten or fifteen years before I was promoted as when I was promoted. I could not see why I was not promoted before.

6. Would you have promotion granted on application?—No; I think a man should never ask for these sort of things. I certainly did apply for promotion at one time, when I saw a man who was neither use nor ornament made a sergeant above me, but he did not reign very long.

7. You think that every man should be judged and treated on his merits—having regard to seniority, of course?—Yes. If a man is not under the eye of the officers he is apt to be overlooked. If I had to start over again, I would try to remain at Headquarters. If I had remained at Headquarters I feel certain that by this time I would have had rank.

8. With regard to the quality of the men coming under your notice—the recruits—do you think they are up to the old standard?—There are some very good men coming along, and, of course, you have some men who are not so good. They require training. It depends very often on the sergeant under whom they act when they first go on the beat. I remember one constable being taken off the street, and being sent to the Hospital in charge of a man who had murdered his children and cut his throat. That constable was the very last man who should have been sent. He did not know the difference between writing a report in the first or the third person. I would never have sent him. But he turned out a very good man. The sergeant who sent him did not know what he was doing.

9. It is practically admitted that the men coming forward for enrolment are not so numerous as might have been expected: what is that due to?—I should say, the flourishing condition of the country up to this year, and the opportunities for young men in other walks of life.

10. Do you think the pay is too low to attract men?—Yes, I think it is.

11. And probably that is the principal reason?—Yes; the pay is not likely to attract the most suitable men.

12. Do you think the standard of education is too high?—No; I would make it the Sixth Standard. Writing seems to be a lost art with men. We have to deal with many men who cannot sit down and write a report right off. Their report has to be written out first, and copied afterwards.

13. You do not see any falling-off in intelligence?—No.

14. You really think, after consideration, that the pay is the real factor?—I think better pay would attract a better class of men. An ordinary labourer, who requires neither intelligence

nor skill, gets 8s. a day—not constant work, nor is he paid for Sunday—but he has no responsibility nor risk. A constable accepts all sorts of responsibility, legal and physical, and for that he does not think he is well paid. I knew a very decent young fellow—a man whom I thought would have been very suitable: he gave it a trial, and left.

15. What was wrong?—He did not get out of the depot. It might have been his own fault. Of course, the discipline has a lot to do with it. A lot of young men do not care about discipline. It is perhaps rather more than they anticipated when they joined.

16. I should like to have your opinion as to whether a man should have the right to accept or decline promotion, having regard to the efficiency of the Force?—If a man is promoted, and does not accept it, he should be allowed not to take it, but he should stand at the bottom of the list.

17. Say there is an excellent man—a man who is a credit to the Force—who is in charge of a station, and it is thought proper to promote him, would you give him the option of accepting or declining?—It would be the exception to the rule for a man to refuse promotion. The rule is that they all think they ought to be promoted to be sergeants.

18. You have heard of cases where men have refused promotion?—Yes. With respect to Constable Leahy, I could never understand why he was passed over. Perhaps it is because he is rather far away. It may have been a case of “out of sight out of mind.”

19. You got promotion in due course?—I do not know whether it was in due course. Leahy is a much younger man in the service than I am.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When do you think Leahy ought to have been promoted?—I do not know, but he has been passed over.

21. He has been passed over for a great many years?—Yes.

22. Do you think he should have been promoted before I took charge?—Yes.

23. Do you know of any man who has been asked to take promotion, and who has not accepted it?—I have heard of the case of a man at Woodville—a most excellent man; but whether it is true or not I cannot say.

24. Do you think that there are any specially qualified men who have refused?—I have no opportunity of knowing.

25. Is it likely they would refuse?—No; it would not be the rule. I have always put it down to the fact that Leahy has practically refused.

26. *The Commissioner.*] He stated on oath that he never refused. What do you think the maximum age at which a man should be promoted to sergeant?—I have never thought of it. It depends practically on the man. Some men are years younger than others at the same age.

27. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know they have to take street duty for a few years when they are promoted?—Yes, that is the rule.

28. You want an active man to do that?—Yes, a fairly active man.

29. Under what age do you suggest?—I think, when a man gets over fifty he is not so active as he was.

30. You spoke of influence: do you know of any case where influence has obtained?—No.

31. As regards promotion, you know the present system has been carried on for years back?—I have often wondered whether there was a system in years back. There was no system before Mr. Tunbridge came here.

32. There has always been a certain amount of dissatisfaction about promotion?—I have no doubt about that.

33. And always will be?—I suppose so.

34. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service?—No. When Mr. Tunbridge was here there was a good deal of dissatisfaction through lack of promotions, the Police Force having been swamped with sergeants from the Armed Constabulary. Mr. Tunbridge promoted a body of men on the 1st January, 1898, on the Inspectors' recommendations. He said, I am told, that all the other promotions he would make would be on his own responsibility, and I was the second one he promoted. I do not believe I have ever been recommended by any Inspector.

35. Your promotion took place from October, 1898?—Yes.

36. Is the efficiency of the Police Force as good as it has been in the past?—I should say so, most decidedly.

37. And the discipline?—It is not so severe now, or so harassing, as it was when I joined.

38. Since Mr. Tunbridge came out, has the discipline been maintained?—I should say, most decidedly. Of course, you will always have good and bad in a large body of men, but you cannot weed them out until you have given them a trial.

39. You know about the inquiries made into candidates' applications?—Since Mr. Tunbridge took over the service the inquiries have been far more searching than they were before.

40. But within the last few years, are they not more searching?—I do not know that they are more searching now than in Mr. Tunbridge's time.

41. He used to inquire only five years back?—I did not know that.

42. Now the inquiry is from the time they leave school?—Yes; but it is difficult to inquire about their career after leaving school if they come from the Old Country.

43. We can write and ascertain?—Of course, you can do that.

FRANCIS CULLEN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 141.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Stratford, and am in charge of that sub-district. I was appointed sergeant on the 20th October, 1900, having been enrolled on the 3rd August, 1877. I was at Westport, but was transferred at my own request, on account of health. I can retire in less than two years. I have no remarks to make concerning myself.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion about the Force at present?—It is much the same as it was; I see no difference.

2. Is there any dissatisfaction with regard to promotions?—I have been in small stations lately, and could not say. I have only two men under me.

3. Assuming there is a difficulty now in getting recruits of the proper class, what do you attribute it to?—I think it is the most difficult thing the Commissioner has to do—to select these recruits. I think the pay generally is too low. A young man from Westport who joined the police stayed in the Force only a week, and when I asked him why he left, he said he was not going to accept starvation wages.

4. Did he not know the wages before he went?—I told him, but he thought he could live very well on them. He went back to his former billet.

5. Then, beyond the pay, you cannot show any reason?—I think the system of recruiting could be improved. When a recruit joins the Royal Irish Constabulary he has to go to the District Inspector, who examines him himself. If he passes the education test he sends him on to the County Inspector, who again examines him. If he passes the test there, and the doctor and everything else, he is sent on to the training staff depot. There he is again examined, both physically and intellectually. He is then put through six months' training, and the list of subjects includes all the duties a constable has to perform. Then if he is not up to the mark he is discharged. If he passes all requirements he is sent to a county, and the County Inspector disposes of him wherever he wants him.

6. There is not much difference between that system and the one here?—I think, if the Inspector saw the recruit himself, and examined him, it would be better. In the Irish Force, in dealing with promotions, the Inspector puts down the names of the men he deems suitable for promotion, and on a certain date he calls them all in and examines them. The list is then sent on to the County Inspector, who again examines the men for sergeant, acting-sergeant, or head constable. If they pass they are placed on his list, and are then promoted according as they are placed on that list.

7. At present here the system is for the Inspector to recommend certain constables for promotion. There is not much difference?—They are examined in one case, and not in the other.

8. But the Inspector is always examining them if he does his duty?—But in the case I refer to the men are called in and examined in his office. I heard a constable's name mentioned here—Constable Leahy. I served with him for years in Christchurch, and found him an excellent man. With regard to his age, he is just the age I was when I was promoted. I was fifty-three when I was promoted. Mr. Dinnie examined my books on the West Coast last March twelve months, and he remarked to Inspector Black that there was less undetected crime there than at any other station; so that it shows that the age did not interfere with the work being properly done.

9. You think there should be no limitation of age?—I could not advocate it myself. One man might be game up to seventy and another man go under at fifty.

10. How old would you put a man on the streets in charge of men?—That would depend on the man himself.

11. Then, you would want a physical examination as well as one respecting ability?—I did not feel any difficulty in doing the work in Wellington, although I was that age.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you on street duty?—About two years five months.

13. Then you got charge of a station?—Yes.

14. It was during Mr. Tunbridge's time?—Yes.

15. I suppose you know there has been dissatisfaction for many years with regard to promotions?—Yes, since I joined.

16. You know the difficulty of giving satisfaction in that respect?—I know I was offered promotion by Mr. Tunbridge before I took it, but I refused, because financially I would have lost.

17. *The Commissioner.*] Why did you take it afterwards?—I had to take it. I was told I was going to be transferred to another district.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your reference to the Royal Irish Constabulary is to a good many years ago?—Yes; I dare say there have been changes since.

19. You know the system of inspection here in regard to recruits?—Not quite.

20. You do not know that the men are inspected before they are taken on at the probation class?—They are inspected by a doctor.

21. Besides that, they are inspected by an Inspector, and by myself when I am there?—I did not know that.

22. And they are put through an examination as soon as they go into the depot?—I did not know that.

23. And they have to pass an examination when they leave the depot?—I did not know.

24. *The Commissioner.*] Do you suggest the promotion of the district clerks?—I think it is a very good thing to make the district clerks sergeants, because they are in a very responsible position, if they have had the service.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think they are entitled to promotion after ten years' service as a district clerk?—Yes; I have known them in the Royal Irish Constabulary to get promotion in three years.

STEPHEN TILL, Sergeant and District Clerk, examined on oath. (No. 142.)

Witness: I am a district clerk at Wanganui, and a sergeant of police. I was enrolled in September, 1898, and promoted to sergeant in September, 1908, after eight years' service as district clerk. I served as assistant clerk in Christchurch for about eighteen months before being made district clerk.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You think a man can qualify as a district clerk without that service?—Some men can.

2. Something has been said about utilising the services of the assistant clerks for relief duty on Sundays: what do you think of that proposal?—I know the clerks themselves would not like it.

3. Would it affect their efficiency as clerks?—It could not do that, but it might make them dissatisfied with their appointments, and lead them to choose some other walk in life.

4. How many men have you?—One. He is a constable with between five and six years' service. He has been in the office between two and three years. The hours are from 9 to 5, closing on Saturday at 1. His position compares favourably with that of a constable.

5. Do you think it would affect the efficiency of the district clerks if they were required to take street duty on Sundays?—They would become dissatisfied after being clerks, and might refuse to go into a station, preferring to go back on the streets, and then to get a country station.

6. Would they not be much better off in charge of a country station?—Very often they are, but some men prefer clerical work.

7. You think in that way, by causing dissatisfaction, it would impair their efficiency?—Yes.

8. Do those men look forward to becoming district clerks?—Yes, certainly; as a rule, a man enters the office with that in view.

9. How long does it take a man, putting aside your own experience, to become efficient as district clerk, after entering as an assistant clerk?—Two or three years before he could get a thorough grasp of the work.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know a number of the assistant clerks have gone out and taken charge of a station?—I know of one lately.

The Commissioner. At their own request?

Mr. Dinnie. Yes; I would not send them out without.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards doing street duty, are you not liable to be called to the office at any time?—Yes; I have often been back in the evenings.

12. And you want your assistant clerk to come back occasionally?—Certainly.

13. So that if he were out on duty you could not get him?—No.

14. Not only that, you would not have the same number of applications for the office-work if they had to take outside duty?—No; that is where the objection would be.

15. You know we have only a few applications at the present time?—I have seen it in the papers, but I would not know of it.

16. And there are not very many men who would be competent to discharge the duties of assistant clerk?—There are a great number who would not be able to do it.

17. We have to select him?—Yes. If a vacancy occurs in a district office, and a clerk is wanted, the selection should be made from the whole Force. I do not think all the suitable men are considered when such appointments are made. Very often the Inspector has a very suitable man for office-work, and if he wants a clerk he recommends this particular man, and he is appointed. I do not impute favouritism, but such appointments should be spread over the Force as a whole.

18. *The Commissioner.*] Your point is that there may be half a dozen men in the Force in other districts who are senior to him and quite as capable?—Yes.

19. The complaint is made by some that men are not appointed locally, but from outside, and you are voicing the other side of the question?—I do not know it is the case now, but at one time it was.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It is not the case now. You know I send for returns asking the Inspector to recommend a certain number of men, that is for the purpose of making a selection?—Yes.

21. *The Commissioner.*] What rent do you pay?—I have a house of my own.

EDWARD WILSON, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 143.)

Witness. I am an Inspector of Police, in charge of the Wanganui District, which comprises thirty-nine stations. Three of these stations—Ongaruhe, Taumarunui, and Raurimu—are managed from the Auckland end by Inspector Cullen, although they are in my district. I have a Sub-Inspector at Palmerston North. There are eight sergeants, sixty-three constables, one district constable, and three detectives, the latter being stationed at New Plymouth, Wanganui, and Palmerston North. I was enrolled in 1871, and commenced my thirty-ninth year of service on Sunday last. I was appointed sergeant on the 16th December, 1884, being promoted from district clerk. I was a district clerk about four years before being promoted. I was transferred to Christchurch to take the district clerkship there, but Captain Lanauze had more friends than I had, and he was retained while I was sent out on the streets.

1. *The Commissioner.*] After you were actually transferred there for the purpose of taking the district clerkship?—Yes.

2. Your friends were very useful there?—They were. I was made a Sub-Inspector in 1899, and promoted to my present rank in 1902.

3. Have you any general statement you wish to make?—I am not aware of any general discontent in the Force, and I have no cause for complaint. I have not heard of the "handy man" till the Commission sat. With regard to candidates for admission to the Force, the inquiry which has been made of late years has been very careful and minute. I do not think the sergeants are promoted early enough. I think, if the Commissioner and Inspectors cannot recognise a man's ability in ten years, they will never recognise it.

4. At what age would you promote them?—I would bring it down as low as ten years' service.

5. What would you make the maximum age?—Fifty, excepting in some special cases where men have been overlooked.

6. Then, you would still promote them?—Yes, the men who were overlooked.

7. What would you do?—If it is recognised by the Commission that these men have been overlooked, I would give them country stations. I would not put them on the street. A man who is promoted to go on the street as a sergeant should undergo a strict medical examination to see

whether he is fit for street duty, because I know of men who have been promoted and have taken up street duty, and they have not been long in that position before they have gone in the legs, and so on.

8. Would you be in favour of making a man do street duty after he is first appointed a sergeant?—Undoubtedly.

9. Except in those cases which have been overlooked?—Yes.

10. Of course, those men would lose their seniority?—Yes; but you could not help it. I think the sergeants should get more pay. There is not so much complaint on the part of single men, but for married men it is certainly a very difficult position. You cannot get good reliable married men with only 7s. a week house-rent. It is not sufficient inducement. When I was on the West Coast—I lived there about two years ago—I used to get men down there at 7s. a day. And as soon as they landed on the wharf they found that the lumpers on the wharf were drawing from 10s. to 15s. a day. The lowest-paid man in the mines was earning 9s. 6d. a day—a man who did not require any character, and who simply had to shove a truck along. And men wheeling out sawdust from the saws were getting 10s. a day. The men in the Force were naturally dissatisfied with their position. It is the same here. You want men in the Force who are mentally and physically good. I am satisfied that the inducements offered are not sufficient to attract suitable men. And this is more felt in the case of married men. A single man can put on his hat and go anywhere he likes, but a married man cannot; and, as a rule, the married men are more steady, and look after their billets better. I heard it said that some officers objected to recruits from the depot. I do not object to them; in fact, I like to get recruits and break them in here. I do not get men straight from the depot. They have passed through somebody else's hands. I understand that it is the system to draft the recruits out to the four chief centres under sectional sergeants. I am not satisfied with the present increment system for constables. I consider that it destroys individual energy, and a desire to perfect a man in a knowledge of his duties. With very few exceptions, a man has to wait four years to get a rise. If a constable were told that he could get from class to class by passing an examination, and on getting a favourable report from the sergeants and Inspectors, and, say, one year off each period, it would stimulate these men to perfect themselves in their duties, and would be a benefit to the Force. They would lean more on their sergeants and Inspectors; they would look to them more; and there would be a better feeling between them. I think the district offices should be used more than they are as a learning ground for prospective sergeants—that a man should go through a couple of years in the office. And with regard to the higher positions of Sub-Inspector and Inspector, I think the men appointed should have at least two years' service in the district office.

11. I was inclined to raise that point myself, but it was objected that it would upset the organization of the office, the constant changes that would result?—I was going to say that I consider that each district clerk should be a sergeant. I think the position warrants it. And a man coming in should learn his business under him. I understand that there are four clerks in Auckland; three or four in Dunedin, and Wellington, and Christchurch. I have only got one district clerk and one assistant.

12. Do I understand you to say that upon a man's appointment as sergeant you would bring him into the district office?—No; I would let him do street duty first, and if we found he was likely to go on.

13. Are there any sergeants who would be of no earthly use in the district office?—Yes; but if we found a man a good efficient sergeant, and we said, "This man in a few years will probably be appointed a Sub-Inspector," in that case I think he should go into the district office for a time. I make these suggestions for what I consider the benefit of the service. It is a fact that the larger number of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors are men who have been through the district offices. I may say that I find that there are very few men who are really suitable for clerks.

14. Are you in the habit of recommending men?—Yes. I have only a limited number, but I have recommended a man or two since I have been here. I do not think the discipline is quite so good as it was years ago.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What do you mean by years ago?—Perhaps ten or fifteen years ago. I will bring it back to the close of the South African war. I think our colonial troops were found wanting in discipline. I think that the altered conditions, and the position of the ordinary labourer nowadays, has affected the position of the men in the Force to a considerable extent. The conditions of colonial life are not conducive to the implicit obedience to orders that there used to be. The regulations under which I joined the Force provided that when a man entered the Force, if he was careful and industrious, and looked after his business, all the upper positions in the Force were open to him. I think the detectives should stand on just the same ground as the other members of the Force. If a man is the best man, no matter whether he is a sergeant or a detective, if the opportunity comes, he should get promotion. There is a general impression that there is a good deal of political influence. I have not had brought under my notice many cases; but there is no doubt that it exists. In March last year I got a telegram from the Commissioner directing the transfer of a detective from Palmerston North to Wellington, and another was to be transferred from Wellington. The Palmerston North papers published a statement that the member for the district had sent a protest against the change, and here is a telegram that was published in the *Wanganui Chronicle* on the 24th March: "Palmerston North, March 23.—Telegrams were sent to the Government to-day by the member for the district and the President of the Chamber of Commerce protesting against the removal of Detective Quirke to Wellington. A petition is also being circulated by the member for the district." That transfer did not eventuate.

16. *The Commissioner.*] It was actually ordered, and then cancelled?—It was held over. The transfer never came off, and three or four months have elapsed since then. I do not think, when men are promoted to the position of sergeant, they should be allowed to refuse. The Government

pay the men, and have a perfect right to select the men for any position they like, and the men should accept it.

17. And no consideration of family or convenience or anything else should intervene?—I do not think so.

18. And the same with regard to transfers?—I think the men should not be allowed to remain too long at any station.

19. That where a man has been transferred he should not be offered the position: he should be ordered?—It seems to me that within the last few years a system has arisen of saying, "There is a station vacant, will So-and-so accept it?" I think if there is a vacancy, say, at Marton, a man should be sent there; he should not be asked if he will accept it.

20. You do not think it is conducive to discipline?—I think it destroys discipline. I also think a constable should serve a period of at least six months' probation.

21. You were going to say something about a man not being allowed to remain too long at one station?—I do not think a man should be allowed to remain too long at a station. I think it would be better if the men were removed occasionally. There are some men who can stop a long while; but if a man goes to a station, and brings up his family at that station, his children going to school with his neighbours' children, it is natural that there should be a tendency to relax on his part. With regard to the escort business, I think it would be a very good thing if the Government were to build a railway carriage for this Island and another for the South Island—running from Auckland to Wellington, and from Christchurch to Invercargill, once or twice a week, and thus do away with a lot of this escorting of prisoners. This would get over some of the difficulties that have arisen. I think the present leave granted is fair. The men get twelve days every year, and they can allow it to accumulate up to thirty-six days. They ought to get one Sunday a month off, and the duty should be arranged accordingly. I try and arrange it so in my district. I think the leave should be on a sliding scale. I think a man with under ten years' service should get twelve days, and a man of over ten years' service and under twenty should get so many more. I think the older the man and the longer he has been in the service the bigger leave he should get. I believe that that system exists in the Post Office Department, and I think it is a fair one.

22. What is the maximum leave you would give?—Twenty-one days. I have got no data for what I am going to say, but it always seems to me that the Commissioner has never had a proper free hand in the management of affairs. I think the Commissioner should have an absolutely free hand, and be responsible only to Parliament for the management of the Department.

23. That is to say, he would go over the political head of the Department?—I think that is so in other places, and I think it is a right thing.

24. You would be rather in favour of that than an Appeal Board?—I am not too keen on an Appeal Board. I have been thinking about it, but I cannot say that I am in favour of it.

25. You would make the Commissioner answerable to nobody except to Parliament?—That is so.

26. Rather a big order that?—Well, I think it is done in other places.

27. You would have to have an exceptionally good man as Commissioner: he would have to have an exceptionally stiff back sometimes. You are assuming that there is undue influence brought to bear on him?—There might be. I am inclined to think that every Commissioner is interfered with. I do not say that Mr. Dinnie is in particular.

28. We are only dealing with the system?—Yes; and that is my opinion. With regard to Constable Leahy, I may say that in 1888 he was then doing sectional sergeant's duty, in charge of the reliefs going out. I was away from Christchurch for a couple of years. He used to do sectional sergeant's work, and was watch-house keeper, and his work in both positions was satisfactory. I never could understand why he was not promoted. In my opinion, he was fit to fill almost any position in the service. I mentioned his case to Mr. Tunbridge on two occasions, and told him what a good capable man he was.

29. You think he is capable of filling any position?—I have not seen him for twelve years. I think, if he had had the opportunity, he was capable of filling any position in the service.

30. How would you deal with him?—I should promote him, and give him a country station, and I think it would be most satisfactory.

31. He would still lose his seniority?—Yes; but it would be righting a wrong.

32. His would be an exceptional case?—Yes: it is an exceptional case now.

33. Is there an exceptional case in your district?—I think Constable Bree should be promoted.

34. Have you recommended him?—He was recommended by Inspector Kiely on a couple of occasions. I came up in May, and in the same month I was asked to recommend men for different promotions, and I wrote across the face of these reports that I was not long enough in the district to make any recommendation. The next time there was an opportunity—twelve months after that—I found that Constable Bree had turned the age of fifty, and he was not recommended by me.

35. Otherwise you would have recommended him?—Yes. I think, if I remember right, the return says, "ten years' service, and not over fifty."

36. Would you consider that in his case age should operate as a bar?—I do not think so. He is a man in good physical condition, I think. But I should have a strict medical examination in such cases to see whether a man is fit to do street duty. I have seen dozens of young vigorous men who could not stand it.

37. In these exceptional cases where a man has arrived at over fifty years of age, and who has been passed over, you would not apply the medical examination?—No, not in those cases. You are simply righting a wrong.

38. You get the defaulters' lists of men when they are sent to your district?—Yes; but the regulations say that unless a man is fined 5s. for an offence he is not put on the sheet; but he can do many things, perhaps trifling in themselves, but in the aggregate they might be very serious

to the Department. I think that if any charge is brought against a man, all the papers should be attached to the file, and the file should follow him wherever he goes.

39. But you would not put them on his defaulter's list?—No.

40. But what difference would it make?—It is the rule. I should then know why he was sent to my district. I sometimes get men sent here, and I know absolutely nothing about them; there is nothing on their sheets.

41. But would a man be sent to you as a matter of punishment in respect to a matter not on his defaulter's sheet?—Yes, I think so; and I would know nothing about it. That is my impression.

42. I have gone through your defaulters' lists. I am not going to mention names; but here is a very bad one [indicating same on the list]: what is that man's efficiency?—During the last two years he has been doing his work fairly well.

43. He has lived down what is bad against him?—Yes, as far as I am concerned.

44. The passing-over of his offences has been justified?—Yes, I think so.

45. With regard to drinking, where a man has been found to be giving way to drink, either in connection with the discharge of his duty or otherwise, how would you treat those cases?—In a small country district like this, where a man has been convicted of drinking, I think he should be dealt with here; and then he should be sent, with the whole of his papers, to one of the four centres, where he would be under the immediate attention of a sectional sergeant. In a number of cases it is the surroundings that make men drink; it is the companions a man has got in with; and if he is sent to another place it gives him an opportunity to pull himself together.

46. Assuming it occurred in a centre, how would you deal with it?—If it occurred a second time it would be the last. In the first case I would still keep him there, and fine him. If the Inspector found that the man had got in with a number of companions, and that was the cause of the offence, I would recommend a transfer, but I would allow the papers to go with him.

47. I understand that you would not recommend a transfer as a punishment?—Not as a general rule. There are seldom two cases "on all-fours." I think each case demands a particular method of dealing with it.

48. And it would greatly depend on the report to the Commissioner?—Yes, I think so.

49. Do you think that in all inquiries before the Inspector the evidence should be taken on oath—of course, it would require a statutory provision?—I think it would be better.

50. Would it not place you in a better position?—Yes, I think it would.

51. You know very well that it is human nature that a man will state sometimes what he knows to be untrue in an open inquiry when he would not do so on oath?—I think it would be better to take the evidence on oath.

52. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—Yes, but I do not exercise power in that way.

53. What do you think with regard to the standard of education and admission to the Force?—That is a very big question. I think if the standard were lowered to the Fourth Standard it would do no harm.

54. Do you think it would enlarge the area of choice?—I think it would. And I think that when these men go before an Inspector he should examine them orally, and ascertain their degree of intelligence. My experience is that it is not always the best-educated man who makes the best policeman, but the self-made man with a moderate education is generally the best man in the long run.

55. Do you recommend any men from your district for assistant clerkships in the district offices?—I prefer always to recommend a man in my own district for any position in it if I have a suitable man, because I know what I am doing. I would not recommend him unless I was satisfied. A man from another district is an unknown quantity to me.

56. Something has been said about the assistant clerks in district offices doing occasional relief duty: would that affect their efficiency?—I do not think so. I think it is a fair thing to allow them to take turn and turn with the men. They are constables, and ought to stand on the same level with the others. They could be utilised on Sundays.

57. Is there any genuine hardship in connection with their Court duty where men are on night work?—In some places, yes. In Christchurch I have gone to Court at 10 o'clock after having been on night duty, and had to be at Court again at 4 o'clock in the afternoon; but in places like this we get that over very quickly. The men here get well treated in respect to Sunday leave—I think, every third Sunday off.

58. Do you see any special difficulty in making a special grade for detectives?—I do not think there should be a special grade. I do not think the Chief Detective should rank any higher than a station sergeant, but he should have the opportunity of going to Sub-Inspector and Inspector if he is a suitable man.

59. It has been contended that they should rank as Sub-Inspectors?—I do not agree with it.

60. What is the position of the Chief Detective at present? He is not answerable to the Sub-Inspector?—Yes, he is, if the Inspector is away.

61. You think he should be a police officer pure and simple, under the control of the commissioned officers?—Yes.

62. Have you had anything to do with the station sergeants?—Not here; there were none when I was a Sub-Inspector.

63. The point has been raised as to whether the Sub-Inspectors should not have duplicate copies supplied to them of the defaulters' lists of the men placed under their charge: what is your opinion of that suggestion?—If the Sub-Inspector applied for them I would certainly supply them.

64. If it is the correct thing to do, should it not be done as a matter of every-day work?—Yes. As he gets the men he should get the sheets too, and know all about them.

65. Just look at this list [list handed to witness]. Have you heard anything about that man [name pointed out]?—I have heard that that was not his right name.

66. Was it the subject of remark?—I think it was known to a few. That man was at Utiku when I came here.

67. But you do not know anything about the facts?—No.

68. It would not affect his efficiency as an officer?—I do not think so; but still, if it were the fact, he should never have occupied the position.

69. You would take it that immediately a matter of that kind became known it should be threshed out, and if true the man dealt with?—A man who gets anything under false pretences should be dealt with.

70. You say this has been known apparently?—When I say I did know, I meant I heard a remark or two. That is all.

71. I do not know that I feel disposed to go very much beyond that at present, but would the knowledge of that fact—rightly or wrongly—have any effect upon the *morale* of the Force?—No doubt, if there were any truth in the statement, it would affect the *morale* of the Force.

72. If a man does not go under his proper name there is generally a reason for it?—Yes; he relieved me in Auckland in, I think, 1900.

73. Is there anything you wish to add?—Sergeant Bourke mentioned a man this morning as inefficient. I think I reported on that man to say that he would never make a constable.

74. If your opinion were correct, and if Sergeant Bourke were correct, there was no warrant for his remaining in the Force?—He is one of those incompetents, and will always be so.

75. You recommend a list periodically for promotion?—Yes.

76. Do you find your recommendations carried out?—I do; almost every one I have recommended has been promoted. I will not recommend a man unless I am perfectly satisfied he will do me credit.

77. Is there anything else you wish to mention?—You were asking about political influence and unrest in the Force.

78. I am directed to inquire whether any political or other improper interference exists in connection with the Force, and if so, whether such interference has any influence on the administration?—That is what I want to get at. It is with regard to the complaints and unrest in the Force. Well, complaints, in my opinion, go from private individuals to members of Parliament, and to ventilate them without inquiry stimulates the belief that political influence is valuable and necessary. And the fact of these complaints being listened to by members of Parliament, and being ventilated in Parliament without due inquiry being first made, has, in my opinion, a most pernicious effect.

79. Well, I take it that this Commission is the result of such complaints?—It is. I consider that if the men knew that they had only their officers to look to, and possibly even a Board to go to beyond their officers, instead of going to members and getting their complaints ventilated in Parliament, it would be a great deal better for the Force.

80. But I doubt very much whether the complaints as a rule come from members of the Force I think they come from men out of the Force?—A great number do.

81. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think it would be desirable that before the statements were made on the floor of the House they were first inquired into?—That is what I mean.

82. Your recommendations have been pretty well carried out?—Yes.

83. You think that detectives should be under the Sub-Inspector as well as under the Inspector?—I think so.

84. And the Chief Detective also?—I consider he should be under the Sub-Inspector.

85. Do you know the system in other Forces?—I do not know the other systems. My experience is confined to the New Zealand Force.

86. As regards the clerks, do you know that in some districts the clerks have to go back at nights to do extra work?—I do. In Auckland we used to be back there every night and on Sundays. It is so here. The work must be done.

87. Do you not think that if they were sent out on ordinary duty on Sunday it would interfere with their work?—There is no occasion to send them out. You could put them into the watch-house to relieve the keeper. Then, again, some men have to be kept in reserve, and they could do that. It would mean a considerable expense, because a lot of these men do not have any uniforms, and if you are going to send them out on the streets they would have to be supplied with uniforms.

88. I suppose you are aware that a great many men are refused admission to the Force because they cannot pass the Fifth Standard?—I did not know that.

89. When a man is found under the influence of drink in charge of a station, is he ever left at that station?—It depends entirely on the man's history.

90. Do you know of any case where a man has been left at a station when found under the influence of drink?—No, I cannot call it to mind.

91. You know that returned troopers were taken on in preference to other men for a time, and they did not turn out a success?—Yes; they did not understand discipline.

92. And a good many have been dismissed since?—Yes.

93. You suggest that men should be promoted when they have about ten years' service?—Yes.

94. Do you know that I promote men at thirteen years?—I believe you have done so. One witness said this morning that the Force at one time was filled with sergeants from the Armed Constabulary Force. That was incorrect. It was men from the Provincial Government service who were promoted when the General Government took over the functions of the Provincial Governments. In Canterbury nearly every second man was a sergeant-in-charge, and that is what we had to fight against for several years.

95. You think it is advisable to send recruits to cities to learn their duties first instead of to out-stations?—At a station like Wanganui or Invercargill, they would learn just as well as in the big centres.

96. But are they not under better supervision in the cities than in the out-districts?—I prefer to get a man straight from the depot, as I then have a chance of making something of him.

97. Would they not be under more strict supervision in the cities than they would be outside?—I do not think they would. Under Constable Gillespie a recruit will very soon learn his business, and he would make him a more efficient policeman.

98. Are not there fewer cases in the country as compared with the city?—They have all-round work here.

99. You want the young men to break in yourself?—Yes, I do.

100. As regards the clerical work, you would suggest that it would be a good idea to put the assistants in the office for about five years, and then send them out for practical experience before promoting them?—Yes; but it is generally the opposite way round. Men are generally from two to four years in the service before they are put into the office.

101. Supposing they remained in the office another five years, would that do them any harm?—I do not think it would.

102. And then send them out?—Yes.

103. Once a man is promoted to district clerk he should go out within three years?—If he elects to remain a sergeant all his time he should stay in the office, but if he does not so elect he should go out.

104. But the clerical work is of great assistance?—The greatest possible assistance. I owe my present position to my clerical training. The knowledge and education I acquired in the district office has been invaluable.

105. As regards Constable Leahy, he is said to be a pretty good man?—Yes; he used to practically run that station in Christchurch. He should have been promoted about 1890.

106. Then there are a few more than myself responsible for his non-promotion?—Undoubtedly.

107. The same applies to Constable Bree?—I do not know much about it, but from what I do know I reckon he is a very good man.

108. What is his age now?—Fifty-one.

109. Then, he should have been promoted a long time ago?—Oh, yes.

110. Do you know Constable Jackson?—Yes.

111. Do you think he is specially qualified for promotion?—I do not.

112. In what respect has he failed?—As a constable I do not think he was a particularly brilliant man. He was in this district, and he did not get on very well here.

113. In what respect did he fail?—I think he lacks education, and he is small in physique. I must confess I like to see good big men as sergeants.

114. Do you know Fitzgerald at all? Is he fitted for promotion?—I would not trust him. I know him well, and I would not recommend him.

HORTON CHARLES DAVID WADE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 144.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Eltham, and am in charge of the district. I was enrolled in July, 1899, and appointed to the charge of a station about two years and a half ago. I wish to make a statement with reference to Fitzgerald's remarks about my getting promotion. I applied to Commissioner Tunbridge for promotion, and it was granted. I also wish to refer to his and Moloney's statements that I had written anonymous letters. I absolutely deny having written any such letters, and no Inspector, sergeant, or any one else can produce any letter of that kind written by me, or sent to them by me.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you ever quarrelled with those men?—I have had no quarrel with Fitzgerald or Moloney.

2. What do you attribute their attack to?—I have no idea. With regard to my promotion, I applied for promotion in order to get married, and it was granted by Commissioner Tunbridge.

[Certain evidence given by witness Fitzgerald at Christchurch was read over to Constable Wade by the Commissioner. The constable denied the truth of the allegations, and stated that Constable Fitzgerald had done him a great injustice in stating the things mentioned.]

3. Then you are here to give an absolute denial on oath to the statements made?—Yes.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It has been suggested that you were favoured in respect to getting a station: is that so?—I had six and a half years' service before I was appointed to a station, and I think during all the time I have been under an Inspector or a sergeant I have been an efficient constable.

5. What would be the motive in these men making these statements about you?—As far as Moloney is concerned, he came to Waimate with about twenty months' service, and perhaps because he did not participate in the "mileage" when he was there that was divided between the two senior constables—about £25 or £27—he made these charges against me. But that was afterwards arranged, and it was divided amongst the three of us who were there.

6. What about Fitzgerald?—I cannot account for Fitzgerald's action in any way, unless he was spoken to by ex-Constable Christie in any way.

7. Ex-Constable Christie had to leave the service because of drinking habits?—Yes.

8. You said that it was six years and a half before you got a station?—Yes.

9. Where were you stationed first?—Taihape.

10. Why did you have to leave Taihape?—Because they made it a sub-district, and put a sergeant there.

11. It was suggested that you were put to another and better station than Taihape?—It was made a sergeant's station, and I am now at Eltham.

12. And, as far as you know, giving satisfaction?—Yes. I have no political influence. I got the position through my work and attention to my duties.

13. You used no political influence, or any other influence?—I have never used influence of any kind whatever.

14. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any other remarks?—I should like to see the Land Regulations amended to permit a constable to take up land in view of his retirement from the service, and to have the residence clause dispensed with until such time as he actually retired. At present a man has to reside on his section within four years of taking it up, but constables cannot afford to leave before their time is up.

15. Is there any special reason why constables should be specially provided for? The system of superannuation presumes that a man will not be left unprovided for?—Some men would rather do without their superannuation than fail to qualify for taking up land.

Mr. Dinnie: Perhaps Inspector Wilson will certify whether this constable has done his duty satisfactorily?

Inspector Wilson: This constable was first at Taihape. It was a very difficult place, with plenty of work, and his conduct there was very satisfactory. His work at Eltham has also been very satisfactory.

Mr. Dinnie: You have no cause to believe the statements which have been read?

Inspector Wilson: I do not think so. I have had no anonymous letters of any sort. I have had plenty, but none I can attribute to him.

PALMERSTON NORTH, SATURDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1909.

MARTIN DUDLEY STAGPOOLE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 145.)

Witness: My name is Martin Dudley Stagpoole. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Palmerston North. I was enrolled in the Force in February, 1872, and was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1887. I have been in charge of stations ever since. I have been in three of the large centres, but not in Dunedin. I have been a couple of years in Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You have had pretty considerable experience?—I should say, a good deal.

2. Have you any general remarks to make with regard to the efficiency or otherwise of the Force?—I have not much to say. I think the whole of the ground of police complaint is want of sufficient pay. The pay seems insufficient to attract the right class of men. We want to get the right class of men; that is the main thing, I consider.

3. When you refer to pay, you mean in comparison with the pay that obtains in the ordinary walks of life?—Yes; a labouring man in the street gets more pay. The members of the Police Force are expected to be physically, mentally, and morally good. A bricklayer, or bricklayers' labourer who carries bricks, gets 10s. and 12s. a day, and he can wear poor clothes, and need not have much more brains than a monkey. Yet he gets more privileges than the ordinary policeman. The travelling-allowance is not sufficient, and you cannot pay your way on it unless you go to a very cheap place. A constable should not be forced to associate with the lowest class. His position should be such as to enable him to associate with a better class of people.

4. What do you think would be sufficient?—I think, 2s. a meal and bed, or 8s. a day should be allowed when travelling on duty.

5. The detectives get 8s. a day?—They have different work to do. I have done a lot of investigation in my time; and detectives have a little more work to do than ordinary men. No man wants to make anything out of the travelling-allowance, but he does not want to lose money by it.

6. But at the present time I understand that a man can recover his actual expenses?—Not so. In our case here we cannot do it.

The Commissioner: Is that so, as I have stated, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: That is so, in every case.

Witness: It is not so in Palmerston North.

7. *The Commissioner.*] If you sent in a claim for actual expenses they would be refunded?—It has been in my case. I send a constable on escort duty—say, to Wellington. He arrives there with the prisoner, and delivers him up at the gaol at 8 o'clock, and gets back to town at 9 o'clock, and then he has to hunt round the town for a cheap place to board; and he is only allowed 1s. 6d. for meals and 1s. 6d. for a bed.

8. Have you ever sent in a claim for expenses on behalf of a constable that has been refused payment?—Yes, for Constable Barry, and another one lately; those claims were refused.

9. Is there anything else of a general nature you would like to say?—I think the recruiting could be improved on. A great many men are taken into the depot on their papers, and the Commissioner rarely sees them. We have got some splendid men from the depot. I think that every recruit, before he is sent into the depot, should be seen as to his physique and appearance.

10. He has to pass a standard in physique?—That is so, but a man can pass a standard without being an ornament to the Force. I think that if such a precaution were taken—that the Commissioner or the Inspector in charge of the district where the recruiting is carried on saw the man, he might be able to say, from the man's appearance and his knowledge of the man generally,

whether he would make a smart man, and a man who with a little training would be a credit to the Force. I also say that it is an impossibility for any instructor, no matter how good he may be, to turn out good, nice clean men in two months at the depot. The men should be in the depot at least six months—not less. While they are in the depot the men should get a couple of hours a day military physical drill, and then in six months they would be turned out smart, active, fine-looking young men. I think they should also be taught by a professor wrestling holds and grips, so that they may know how to handle a prisoner with care and safety both to themselves and the man they are handling. I also think they should be taught boxing. That can all be done in six months.

11. You think they are insufficiently trained?—Yes, I do.

12. You think they come out half-trained?—Yes, because they have not time in two months to grasp all they are taught. They try to get men from the country, and it is impossible that they can be turned out properly in two months from the depot. There is one other matter I would like to bring forward, and that is with regard to constables travelling by steamers. On this point I can speak from my own experience. You and your family are only allowed steerage passages. I have never gone steerage, because I have always paid the difference out of my own pocket, and have travelled saloon. I think it would be a disgrace for me to allow my wife and children to go steerage, and have to associate with the people there—more particularly in coastal travelling. I think it is degrading for the wife and children of a constable to travel steerage, or that he should have to pay the money out of his own pocket.

13. Do you know anything about political or other interference, and, if so, whether it affects the efficiency of the Force?—Personally, I have not.

14. Have you heard of it?—I have heard talk about it, but I cannot say it exists. I think it is impossible for any one to say so definitely.

15. Have you any views on promotion?—I think the promotion is not satisfactory. I do not know why it is.

16. What feature of it do you particularly find fault with?—Junior men have been promoted over senior men in all branches; but I am speaking for myself particularly. I have been passed over. I have been twenty-two and a half years a sergeant, and as you are aware I have held some very responsible positions. As far as I am aware I have done my work creditably. I have had no complaints in regard to it, and yet I have seen very junior men passed over me.

17. You admit that seniority must not always govern promotion—that exceptional qualities should be taken into account?—Yes, unless a man is far above the ordinary standard.

18. You know of no reason why there should be some of these cases?—No; I feel naturally sore about it.

19. As to the general promotion from constable to sergeant?—I know several good men—senior men—who have been passed over. I think that, if otherwise capable, and all things being equal, and that they are men with a good record, promotion should go by seniority.

20. Do you think that creates any dissatisfaction in the Force?—Yes.

21. And therefore affects its efficiency?—I cannot say that it affects its efficiency.

22. A discontented man will not do his duty so well as he otherwise would?—He may do his duty.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you know of two cases in which travelling-expenses of constables have not been allowed: were the circumstances explained?—Yes.

24. How long ago was that?—Within the last couple of months.

25. Do you know anything of the system that obtains in the probation class?—I have not been there, but I have heard from constables who have come from there.

26. Do you know anything of the condition of the men when they go into the depot, as regards their education or knowledge of police duty?—They know nothing at all.

27. Do you know what they are like when they come out?—My experience in that respect has not been satisfactory.

28. How is that?—Because when they come to me straight they try to teach me my duties.

29. It is apparent that you do not know much about it?—I know what they are when they come to me.

30. Do you know that they have to pass an examination in police duties and in the law appertaining thereto?—If they do, it is a very poor one.

31. Do you know the officer who trains them?—Sergeant Dart

32. Do you know anything about his qualifications?—I understand that he has passed as a solicitor.

33. You say they come out of the depot worse than when they go in?—Yes.

34. You are the first who has said it?—There are others who will say so.

35. Who have you got direct from the depot?—O'Connor is one.

36. Was he a married one?—Yes.

37. Had he any previous service?—Only in Dunedin.

38. Any others?—I think a man came from the depot the other day. He had previous experience at Home. He is a very good man. Another constable had not been long out of the depot when he came to me.

39. Had he not been twelve months in a city?—That does not say much for the depot if he had been twelve months in the city after coming out of the depot.

40. About your own promotion: you ought to have been promoted a long time ago, should you not?—Yes, by my service.

41. By your abilities and qualifications?—I have had a good deal of experience.

42. Were you ever recommended for promotion?—I cannot say. I would never know.

43. You have applied on many occasions?—I have.

44. You were promoted to sergeant through some special action of yours in saving life?—Yes.
45. Do you think your educational qualifications are sufficient to have justified promotion?—Yes.
46. How is it that you were not promoted long ago—before I came here?—I cannot say; promotion was very slow at one time. I am not talking of Mr. Dinnie's time.
47. But there were a great many promotions when my predecessor came here. My predecessor did not seem to think you were suited for promotion?—That appears so; otherwise I suppose I would have got it.
48. You say that some good men were passed over—I suppose they were like yourself?—No doubt the superior officer thought fit to pass them over.
49. Do you think the system of recommendations is a good one—the Inspector to recommend?—I do not know much about it.
50. Do you not think the Inspector is the proper man to recommend promotion?—He should do so, but very often he does not.
51. Do you think the Inspectors do not do their duty in that respect?—Human nature is a very hard thing to alter. Men have their likes and dislikes in every class of life.
52. Still, we must have some system of recommendation?—Yes.
53. The Commissioner must be guided to a very great extent by his Inspectors?—A good deal, but he should have every man's papers in front of him.
54. What papers do you mean?—The papers which show a man's ability, age, and length of service, and if he has been frequently in trouble.
55. That is his defaulter's sheet?—Yes.
56. Beyond that, what papers are there showing his qualifications?—You have the papers.
57. Do you know of any other system except the Inspector recommending?—By a man's seniority. If a man is capable he should be promoted before a junior man.
58. There is an examination held occasionally, is there not?—Yes.
59. Have you ever passed that examination?—There have been no opportunities in my time.
60. There are examinations now?—I do not know of any sergeant who has gone up for examination.
61. Do you think you could pass that examination?—Beyond doubt.
62. I am afraid I am not of the same opinion as you, sergeant. As regards efficiency, what do you say about it now as compared with the past?—I do not think there is much difference.
63. And as to the discipline maintained?—I can see no difference. The men are just as good now. Perhaps they may not be physically as good as in years gone by. We used to get a better and bigger class of men. I think we should get a better class of men physically.
64. You think the pay is insufficient?—If there was better pay, better men would offer themselves for the police.
65. You suggest that the men should be six months at the depot?—Yes.
66. Do you not think there would be a difficulty in keeping our strength up?—In the last part of the time they could be doing duty.
67. Do you know that at the present time we have a difficulty in keeping the strength up?—That is the reason; you cannot get the men.
68. It is not the class we are talking about—it is the number?—Why should there be a difficulty in getting more men—they can be replaced by new men.

CHARLES BOWDEN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 146.)

Witness: My name is Charles Bowden. I am a sergeant of police, in charge of the Feilding sub-district. I was promoted to sergeant in September, 1901. I was enrolled in 1877. Since I have been promoted to sergeant I have been stationed at Invercargill for five years, and the rest of the time at Feilding.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You have only been in charge since you have been at Feilding?—I was performing all the duties of sergeant previously.
2. Have you any general remarks to make with reference to the Force?—I can only say that I regret exceedingly, after my years of service, that there should be any necessity for a commission of this kind, and that there should be such dissatisfaction throughout the service.
3. What does this dissatisfaction arise from?—I should say, from want of loyalty on the part of some men to the Commissioner and the Inspectors.
4. Explain yourself?—If the newspaper reports are true of what was said before the Commission at Dunedin, I say it is a regrettable thing.
5. I do not want your opinion on that. You say there is dissatisfaction: what does it arise from?—The rate of pay, particularly promotions, and as to travelling-expenses.
6. As to the promotions, who do you think is responsible?—The Inspectors, I think.
7. You think the Inspectors are responsible for the inequalities in the promotions?—I do.
8. And through them, you say the Commissioner suffers?—I do.
9. Of course, you recognise that the recommendations to the Commissioner would probably come from the Inspectors?—Yes. If Mr. Tunbridge and another officer has been here I would have held a different rank to-day. I was promised by both of them.
10. You are dissatisfied?—I have no grievance, and I would not have come here to-day if I had not been called.
11. I mean in regard to whether you consider you have been unfairly treated in regard to promotion?—I only objected once, when Sub-Inspector Black was promoted.
12. What is the remedy, in your opinion, of this dissatisfaction, as you allege?—I think a great deal of dissatisfaction arises from the appointment of these district clerks.

13. Their appointment as sergeants?—Yes; and not only that, but with regard to district clerks generally, and as to their manner—there are exceptions—to men who are senior to them. Too much is left to them.

14. Do you mean that they have the ear of the Inspectors, or what?—I believe that in some cases the tail wags the dog.

15. Would you have no district clerk a sergeant?—No. I should do away with all these “recording angels.” They should be in Wellington, and there should be a superintendent to supervise the various districts.

16. You would have no Inspectors at all in charge of a district?—Not in country places. I would have them in Wellington.

17. What would the Inspectors do in Wellington?—They could assist the Chief Inspector there. A proper supervision could be made of the men coming out of the depot to insure that they were likely men for the service.

18. How could they possibly obtain the same knowledge in Wellington that they would gain by coming in contact with the men in the country districts?—I respectfully submit that they would know more, because it would be their business to know. One Inspector in Wellington would supervise these things.

19. Have you given any thought to the matter? I do not follow you with regard to controlling everything in Wellington?—I mean each of the four centres—Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

20. You would do away with the Inspector in charge of this district?—Yes, I would have him in Wellington. Regarding travelling-expenses, I think there should be one scale. A man should get his actual travelling-expenses.

21. Do you think a daily rate leads to abuse?—I would not say that; but there is a great deal of quibbling regarding the payment of these expenses.

22. How many men have you in your district?—Five.

23. Is there any dissatisfaction amongst them?—No, we are all comfortable in our district.

24. All good men?—Yes.

25. And the district is efficiently worked?—Yes; I think our Inspector will admit that.

26. Do you know of any dissatisfaction with regard to promotions in this district?—I do not know of any promotions since I have been here.

27. There was one sergeant's promotion?—Yes.

28. Is he a capable man?—I do not know whether he is a capable policeman or not. I have been referring to the system of appointing district clerks. I am not referring to the district clerk here.

29. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have no grievance with regard to the control of the present service?—None whatever, except in regard to our pay. There is a great deal of trouble and talk about promotions. We cannot all be promoted, whether we have the qualifications or not; the service is too small; but I say that a man in charge of a station should go up. Then, there is no equality of pay between detectives and sergeants. A man is appointed a detective, and in a certain number of years he gets 14s. a day, but a sergeant is kept down to 12s.

30. There must be some system of pay?—Yes, but I think the system stops rather suddenly at the sergeants.

31. *Inspector Wilson.*] Is not your position as good as that of a detective at 14s. a day?—I do not know. I think we ought to get more pay.

HENRY BEATTIE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 147.)

Witness: My name is Henry Beattie. I am a sergeant, stationed at Taihape, and have been there about eighteen months. I was promoted in 1906, and was enrolled in the Force in 1889. I came from Mount Cook, Wellington, to Taihape.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make with regard to the Force?—Yes; the rate of pay for constables is too small. I think a constable joining the Force should receive the pay of an ordinary navvy—8s. a day at the least. My idea would be to introduce the old system of first, second, and third class constables. I think it would be a good thing, and would be an inducement to men to join the Force, and would be an incentive to them afterward. Say, two men join the Force at the same rate of pay, and one is superior to the other: the superior man has all the work to do; the inferior man plods along, and at the end of four years he gets the same rate of pay as the other. I think the superior man should receive extra recognition. I think in five years he should be promoted to the rank of second-class constable, and receive 9s. a day; and if after ten years he is deserving I think he should receive the rank of first-class constable, and should get 10s. a day. That system was formerly in existence, and was an incentive to the men to work. I was four years in the service when I was made a second-class constable, and I felt quite pleased to feel that the authorities recognised my services; and it put additional spirit into me to do my duty. In my opinion, the married constables are not getting sufficient house-allowance. One of my constables stationed at Taihape is paying 17s. 6d. a week house-rent, and he only gets 7s. a week house-allowance. He is a splendid man, and is only watching his chance to better his position outside.

2. Is that case exceptional?—No; living and house-rent is very dear there.

3. What does it cost to live?—It costs me nearly £10 a month to keep us going in groceries, &c. I have a big family. As I have said, living is very dear.

4. Have you quarters found for you?—Yes.

5. Is there any other point?—I am quite satisfied from my experience in the Force that as long as detectives are taken out of the uniform branch dissatisfaction will exist. I do not care

who is in charge of the Force there will always be trouble. I have heard it said that they take the intelligent men out of the uniform branch. I say we want our intelligent men in the uniform branch. I think the branches should be distinct.

6. You suggest creating a special district branch for the detectives?—Yes.

7. As to the clerks, you must make them clerks pure and simple—Civil servants—or you must take them from the Force?—I would have the clerks educated to their work. The system of promoting sergeants to be clerks I have nothing to complain about. There have been no junior men promoted to me. I have received my proper turn in promotion. I have heard a great deal of talk about this: that the men are very dissatisfied with the promotion of sergeants, particularly the district clerks and clerks in the offices generally. I think they would be better taken from civilians and be broken into their work there. With regard to travelling, I take no exception to travelling second class on the Main Trunk line or any other railway-line, but I did take exception to taking my wife and six daughters steerage in a steamer. I have only had one experience of that—going to the West Coast and back. It was certainly not a place for my family.

8. I think that is going to be remedied?—I think the leave is rather short. I think the allowance for meals when away on duty should be 2s. instead of 1s. 6d.

9. The Commissioner has stated that the Department would have allowed you that 2s. if you had applied for it. With regard to district constables, they have generally to deal with Natives, and Natives will not take notice of a man unless he has some uniform?—I think something should be done in regard to that

10. What pay do they get?

Mr. Dinnie: From £40 up to £100. It depends on their work.

The Commissioner: Do they get any other privilege or concession?

Mr. Dinnie: No, they have their own business that they can carry on.

Inspector Wilson: The man just referred to gets £50 a year, and a very good house to live in.

Witness: I think they should have the distinction of having a uniform. At Raetihi we have had frosts at Christmas, and I think both the constables should be allowed a big coat. It is extremely cold there.

11. *The Commissioner.*] Does the dissatisfaction you refer to with regard to promotion arise mainly from the promotion of district clerks? You said it causes a lot of talk?—I have heard a lot of talk about it. The Department may know more about the senior men who are promoted.

12. Do you know anything about political or other interference?—I cannot say anything about political influence.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you know that there always has been dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion?—Yes, as long as I can remember.

14. You know the difficulty there is in giving satisfaction in regard to promotion?—Yes, it is very hard to give satisfaction.

15. Can you suggest any better system than the present one—the Inspectors recommending annually the men whom they think are fitted for promotion?—I can see no other way than the present system.

16. With regard to district constables, do you know that some of them object very strongly?—I have never heard of it.

17. As regards districts clerks, do you not think, seeing the responsible positions they hold, that it entitles them to the rank of sergeant?—I think they are entitled to a higher rate of pay, but I do not think it is quite the thing to make them sergeants.

18. Do you not think the clerical training is an advantage?—They cannot have too much of it.

19. Keeping to promotions, do you not think a clerical training is of great advantage to them afterwards if they are promoted?—Yes.

20. Is there any general dissatisfaction in the service except in regard to promotions?—It is chiefly about promotions and detectives.

21. *The Commissioner.*] We had a witness yesterday who said he took a step down when he gave up the position of sergeant and took up that of detective?—Yes; he said he considered it a step down.

22. You seem to think it is promotion to be a detective: it is not sought after to any extent, is it?—There are a lot of men after it. They like to get into that branch.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I get very few applications?—I would take them all, and let the Chief Detective break them in himself.

24. Do you not think it would be better for a man to have some training in the uniform branch first before being selected for the detective branch, and that we should know something of his qualifications for that position?—I think he could receive his training and be broken in the same as a constable is.

25. Supposing he began as a probationer, what should be done then?—I would pick out well-educated smart young men.

26. Of course, you know it is not the best educated man who makes the best detective?—I have not had much experience with detectives. I cannot say much about them. I notice that the Chief Detectives down South are applying for the rank of Sub-Inspector.

27. What is your opinion about detectives having the same promotion as the uniform branch?—I think they should be kept to their own branch.

28. *The Commissioner.*] You would not promote detectives at all. How do you think the Chief Detectives should rank?—They know the position when they join the detective branch. They get better pay.

29. Do you think the only way to get over that would be to create a separate branch?—Yes.

FREDERICK WOODS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 148.)

Witness: My name is Frederick Woods. I am a police constable, in charge of Foxton. I have been there two years and a half. I was enrolled in the Force as a district constable in 1898, and was appointed to the Permanent Force in 1899. Foxton was my first station. I did not get married till two and a half years ago, and then I got the station. I am a delegate from the constables of the Palmerston North sub-district. The first thing I wish to bring before your notice is the question of pay. I would like to suggest that we should receive 1s. more a day than we are receiving at present.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Entering at 8s. 6d., instead of 7s. 6d.?—Yes; with increments practically the same as now—1s. every four years, until the maximum of 10s. 6d. is reached. Before I joined the Force I was getting 10s. a day. When I joined the probation class in Wellington I was getting 6s. a day, and was then turned out to do street duty at 7s. a day. I consider the pay too little altogether.

2. Why did you give up 10s. a day?—Because I had an inclination to join the Force.

3. You wanted to make it your profession?—Yes. I consider the pay too small, in view of the cost of living at the present time. The second subject is that of allowances when on special relieving or temporary duty. I would suggest that constables receive at the rate of 8s. per day for the first seven days, and after that 6s. a day. In 1879 the pay was 6s. a day, and before 1899 it was reduced to 3s. a day after seven days. Speaking on this subject, I have a constable under me at Foxton. He was ordered to do special duty at Wanganui during last winter. There had been a lot of fires there. He could not get board at a private boardinghouse, and he had to stay at a hotel. The cost of board at the hotel was £1 10s. a week. I did not think he was fairly treated in the matter of allowance. An application for better treatment was made, but was refused. I suggested to him that he should apply to have the voucher brought under the notice of the Commissioner, but he said he did not want to fall out with the Inspector.

4. It never reached the Commissioner?—That is so.

5. What reason did the Inspector give for refusing the application?—He pointed to a circular which he said governed such special cases.

6. You regarded the case as exceptional?—Yes; I think that 6s. a day is right enough, but when it is brought down to 3s. a day, you cannot get board at 3s. a day. The next subject is house-allowance. I would like to see it increased to 10s. 6d. a week—an increase of 6d. a day on what we are getting now.

7. To be on the same footing as a sergeant?—Yes. It is impossible to rent houses in country places under from 12s. to 17s. a week, and an allowance of 7s. a week is too little altogether. The constable I have at Foxton is paying 12s. a week, and that is recognised to be a cheap rent. The next point is regarding clothing. We would like to be supplied with free uniform, and also with a pair of boots per annum. We have to pay £2 5s. for the making-up of the cloth. Yet the Department say we get free uniform, whereas we have to pay double the value of the stuff for the making-up.

8. Do you know what is done in other branches of the public service—say, mental hospitals, gaols, &c.?—Yes; in gaols the warders get free uniform and two pairs of boots per annum. I think the annual leave should be increased from twelve to eighteen days, and that constables should be given a second-class free railway pass. As to district clerks, I would like to see them do Sunday duty with the constables.

9. You mean the clerks in the district office—the assistant clerks?—Yes, the assistant clerks. I think they should do Sunday duty, so as to relieve some of the constables on the beats; and they should also take their turn in doing uniform duty on holidays. I would like to keep the detective branch separate from the uniform branch. Then, as to applications for outside positions—Circular No. 1408—we ask to have that cancelled. As to constables travelling with their families while on transfer, we would like to see them given saloon passages by steamer. That is all we have to bring before you. I would like to mention, in support of what Sergeant Beattie has said in regard to district constables, that I was a district constable for over twelve months, and I found it very difficult to keep order without a uniform at small meetings. I was at Ohaea-wai, Bay of Islands, and applied to the Inspector for a uniform, and Inspector Cullen said he could not grant the request, but he had a kind of uniform sent up which did for the purpose; it helped me very much in keeping order at small meetings.

10. The Commissioner of Police states that many district constables do not like to wear uniform?—I do not hold with that. I think district constables do like to have to wear uniform. They think it an honour to wear uniform. I did.

11. What salary did you get?—I started at £20, and went up to £50. I was on a farm at the same time, and was liable for duty when called upon.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know that some district constables do wear uniform?—Yes.

13. All those who wish to do so can wear it?—Yes. I left the constable who relieved me my uniform.

14. You know the regulations regarding travelling-allowance?—Yes.

15. Do you know Regulation 239, which says, "Other members of the Force shall receive their actual expenses"?—I saw that, sir. That governs the case I pointed out. I recommended the constable's application.

16. I do not know anything about that: it never came to me. How long is it since you left the depot?—Over ten years.

17. Can you tell me anything about the system there?—Sub-Inspector O'Donovan was our teacher there.

18. Do you agree with the representations of Sergeant Stagpoole—that a man comes out worse than he goes in?—I did not learn very much there, but have learnt more since I went out on the streets.

19. But you had the technical knowledge there?—I learnt a little about the law.

20. You learnt a bit of drill?—Yes.

21. And about the Police Regulations?—Yes, and one or two of the Acts.

22. Were classes in vogue there then at the various stations?—Not in my time.

23. Still, all that was of service to you afterwards?—Yes, it was a foundation.

24. That is what is required?—Yes.

25. As regards the certificate about seeking other employment, is it not desirable that the Commissioner should know a man was applying for another situation, because he might have that man in his eye for promotion, or wish to transfer him?—If a man applied for an outside position, and the Commissioner knew he was after it, he might very likely give him a bump downwards instead of upwards.

26. But do you not think he would encourage him to remain if he were a good man?—Naturally you would think so.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Is there anything you wish to add?—With regard to district clerks being promoted to sergeants, I hold at Foxton six other appointments besides that of police constable, and I have the same responsibility as the Clerk of the Court. Men who joined the service at the same time as I did have been promoted to sergeants. I do not say I have a grievance, but, as I have a lot of the responsibilities of district clerks, and they have none of the responsibilities of my position, I think I should be considered for promotion before them.

28. *Sub-Inspector O'Donovan.*] You said you were taught one or two things in the depot?—Yes, and several Acts.

29. How long were you there?—Two months.

30. Who was the instructor?—You were.

31. What course were you taken over?—Through the drill.

32. Were you taught drill before going in there?—Only in the Volunteers.

33. Who drilled you?—The sergeant-major.

34. What else did you learn there?—The different Acts, evidence; and we were taken down to the Court, and listened to the cases, and after we went back to the depot the proceedings we had listened to were explained to us by our instructor.

35. Were you instructed in general knowledge?—Yes, it was imparted, but the time was too short.

36. You were taken over a complete course of the regulations?—Yes.

37. In general knowledge, the Fourth Standard was the test at that time, was it not?—Yes.

38. Were you taken over that?—Yes.

39. Did you learn arithmetic?—No.

40. Spelling or dictation?—Yes; but the time was so short, and the course so great that you did not know where you started or finished. We just read enough for a foundation.

41. Come, now: had you any idea before you went there, excepting a vague one, of general police matters?—Yes.

42. Did you have any idea of police work or discipline?—I did not know what an information was.

43. Did you know your ordinary work?—Yes.

44. You also had to pass the course of the St. John's ambulance?—Yes.

45. Would you rather have had that course or not?—I would sooner not have had it. We had too much to learn and remember. I think the time should be extended to three months.

46. You were suffering a bit from mental indigestion?—Yes.

47. Supposing you had remained in another month?—We would have had a better grounding.

48. So that the course of instruction was pretty wide, and covered a lot of ground?—Yes, but we could not retain it.

49. You were not allowed to be idle?—No.

ROBERT EDWARDS, Architect and Justice of the Peace, examined on oath. (No. 149.)

Witness: From my observation of the Police Force for many years I consider that every possible encouragement within reason should be given them. The position of the service should be improved so that men would be attracted to it, and would afterwards strive to rise therein. The police, from the lowest grade upwards, have a great responsibility on their shoulders, but their wages are too low. Policemen should start at 1s. a day at the least above the present rate of pay. The house-allowance is too low. As a Justice of the Peace, I consider that the police have a much greater responsibility than the general public imagine, but you cannot get good men unless you pay them well.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How do you think the police carry out their work as a body?—Very well indeed.

2. Do you think a rise in pay and house-allowance would secure more applicants, and that there would be a better field to select from?—I do. The pay is probably not so low as to keep many good men out, but if it were raised I think a great many better men would apply.

3. Of course, you know that the annual crime returns indicate pretty well the efficiency of the Force—the number of arrests and the action taken by the police?—That is so; but, still, there may be dissatisfaction all the same. Men always live in hope, and look forward to rising in the service, and they will remain in the service very largely for that reason.

4. I suppose you know that in all large bodies there is always a certain amount of dissatisfaction in connection with promotions?—No doubt.

5. It cannot be prevented?—No. I do not wish to pose as an authority on these matters, but merely remark that the Police Force ought to be made as attractive as possible, in the interests of good government.

WILLIAM HENRY McLEOD, Mounted Constable, examined on oath. (No. 150.)

Witness: I am a mounted constable, doing duty in Palmerston North, having been enrolled on the 1st February, 1904. I wish to refer to the question of house-allowance to men living out of the station, and who have to keep their mothers. I am a single man, but I am keeping my mother. I also wish to speak for Constable Bevan, who is in the same position. I have been five years and a half in the service, and I cannot keep two homes. I received permission to stay out of barracks, but I am in the same position as a married man, and have the same claims.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is your mother entirely dependent on you?—Yes.

2. Have you made any representations about the matter?—I have applied, but was informed that it could not be granted, because the regulations only referred to married men.

3. You think an exception ought to be made?—Yes, in cases where the Department is satisfied that a man is doing his duty by his relatives.

4. You would not go beyond the mother?—Well, his father too.

5. What about an invalid sister? Would you draw the line?—I would draw the line at the mothers.

The Commissioner: Has this matter come under your notice, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: I believe it has, but it has not been the custom. I would consider it favourably, but it depends entirely on the circumstances. I would treat each case of its merits.

ALEXANDER RUSSELL, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 151.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Palmerston North, and I joined the Force in 1897. I have never been in charge of a district. I think we should get a substantial rise in pay—1s. a day rise at least—as the cost of living has very much increased the last few years. It has gone up by from 30 to 40 per cent., while our pay has remained at a standstill. Compared with other branches of the public service, the police are the worst paid of any. With regard to the question of the promotion of the district clerks, if any alteration is made in that respect they should revert to street duty after they have been promoted. I think the detective branch should be kept entirely separate from the preventive branch. The fact of Chief Detectives being promoted tends to cause dissatisfaction amongst the rank and file.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any dissatisfaction over that matter?—I have heard complaints from time to time about detectives being promoted to Sub-Inspectorships. I am in favour of the examination system in the Police Force, and promotion accordingly. I think that men on taking charge of a station should even be required to pass an examination, and sergeants and Sub-Inspectors, before being promoted, should be examined all round, to ascertain if they are qualified for promotion. The leave should be increased. Twelve days is not enough. It should be increased to eighteen days a year, or allowed to accumulate for two years. The house-allowance should be raised considerably.

2. Are you a married man?—No, single.

3. What does it cost you to live?—About £2 10s. a month.

4. Then, you do not know much about the question of house-allowance if you are not married?—No, I do not.

ALEXANDER CROZIER, Police Pensioner, examined on oath. (No. 152.)

Witness: I am a police pensioner, and left the Force on the 10th December last, after serving from 3rd May, 1870. I had about thirty-seven and a half years' service. I left because my time was up. I wish to enter a complaint against the manner in which the lodging-allowance was administered in my case. I was stationed at Ohingaiti for two years while the great viaduct was being built, and on that station being closed I was transferred to Palmerston North to do mounted duty. I left my family at Marton, as two of my boys were in good situations, and came here, where I occupied a small room in the back of the police-station. At that time there was nobody excepting Constable Woods on the station. He was the only single man there, and I had to answer the door at all hours of the night. I was paid lodging-allowance for one month, and then it was stopped, for what reason I have never heard. I was advised by the sergeant to make an application about the matter, but I considered it was not my business to remind my superior officers of their duty. This was the position until I was appointed gaoler, in August, 1905.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When were you granted lodging-allowance first?—In December, 1902.

2. And appointed gaoler when?—5th August, 1905. Ex-Detective Benjamin, who was transferred from here to New Plymouth, was situated similarly to myself. He did not shift his family, but occupied a room there, and drew lodging-allowance all the time he was there. Detective Henderson for a long while drew lodging-allowance in Auckland, while his wife lived in Dunedin, keeping a boardinghouse. Sergeant Mulville was in a similar position, and drew his allowance. Constable McCormack was transferred from the South Island, and occupied apartments in the Wellington Police-station, and drew lodging-allowance. Constable Hogg, in the Inspector's office, Auckland, came to the colony as a widower with two children, and he lived on a station and drew lodging-allowance. The reason given by Inspector Kiely for not paying lodging-allowance (according to the Commissioner) to me was that I had accommodation at the police-station. If that was his interpretation of Circular 28/99, why was I paid one month's allowance, and never asked to refund it? And, further, why was I not informed that it was to be disallowed in future? If there were any reason for not paying me lodging-allowance before I was appointed police gaoler

there was certainly no reason after, as it was my duty to sleep on the premises. The gaoler who succeeded me at Palmerston North was paid lodging-allowance from the day he relieved me by the Police Department, and house-rent by the Prisons Department. On the 2nd February, 1909, I asked Inspector Wilson by letter why I was not paid lodging-allowance for the three months previous to my discharge from the Force, and he referred me to the Commissioner. One Inspector—Mr. Kiely—paid me the allowance for one month, and then stopped it without the knowledge of the Commissioner, or telling me that it was stopped, while the other officer—Inspector Wilson—referred me to the Commissioner. This indicates a lack of discipline.

3. *The Commissioner.*] What about your letter applying for the correspondence?—I made application for a copy of the correspondence, and why I was not paid lodging-allowance for the three months' leave of absence on being discharged from the Force. Neither Inspector Wilson nor the Commissioner answered that question, but the latter paid me the three months.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You referred to this letter of yours to the Minister that never reached me?—That is a procedure I have never seen before. There is nothing on the letter to show that it ever reached the Minister. I had to send it through the police.

The Commissioner. I will call for the file, and see the correspondence.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When you found your allowance stopped in a month's time, were you not anxious to know the reason why?—I felt very much annoyed; but I allowed the Department plenty of time to find out their mistake, and at the very time I was being treated in this way other men connected with the Force were being paid the lodging-allowance.

6. Then, you made no application for it at all?—No.

7. Yet you must have thought there was some reason for paying you a month and then stopping?—It was for the same reason that I was not paid for the last three months I was in the service—it was wilful neglect.

8. Then, you had a complaint and kept it two years?—I had a complaint, but I objected to the Department not knowing their duties.

9. What does clause 74 of the regulations say?—I think it is that if you have a grievance you can write to the Department.

10. Why did you not comply with that?—I did not comply because it was a matter of going to the back door.

11. You would not comply with that regulation because you knew that there was a reason for that money not being paid?—I know there was a reason, but I left it to the Inspector to find out his mistake.

12. Were you not told the reason at the time it was stopped?—I never was told the reason.

13. Did the Inspector not tell you himself personally?—He never did.

14. Then, he is not speaking the truth if he says so?—Who?

15. *Inspector Kiely.*—He never indicated the matter to me, either by writing or any other way. Mr. Dinnie and the Inspector visited the station here. That was the first time he knew anything about me, and when they were leaving Mr. Dinnie asked me if I had anything to say. I said "No, excepting with regard to my lodging-allowance," and the Inspector got a chance of speaking, but he did not open his mouth. Mr. Dinnie asked me why I was transferred from Ohingaiti, and I told him because the station was closed. He said he would have to look out for another station for me. I spoke to him about the lodging-allowance, and he said that he did not see his way clear to establish a precedent by paying men lodging-allowance when occupying police quarters, as "quarters" in the regulations meant quarters for married men, and there was no need at that station for married men. Mr. Dinnie said he would see into it, and that was the last I heard of the matter.

ALBERT GRAHAM, Farmer, examined on oath. (No. 153.)

Witness. I am a farmer, residing at Apiti, and I applied for admission to the Police Force. I want to know from the Commissioner whether any false reports regarding my character have been sent down to Wellington. I applied over twelve months ago. I filled in the police form on the 19th February, 1908. About a fortnight or three weeks afterwards I got a note stating that the Commissioner, upon inquiry, could not entertain my application. Not being satisfied, I went to Wellington, and produced all the references I had, but the Commissioner never looked at them. I do not know why I was refused admission. I have here references from people who have known me fifteen or sixteen years.

The Commissioner. What is the position in this case, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie. This was an applicant for employment in the service. Inquiry was made. Of course, we do not look at references, but simply want to know where the applicants have been since being at school. The result of the inquiry was not satisfactory, and the witness was refused admission.

Witness. Has any complaint been made regarding my character?

Mr. Dinnie. I cannot tell you anything about complaints. Reports are sent in, and on those reports we judge whether you are fit for the service or not. I cannot give any information about those reports; it would not be right to do so.

The Commissioner. The reports are obtained in the district in the fullest possible manner, and I am not going to allow this Commission to be used as a means by which any one can traverse the decision of the Police Commissioner with regard to the admission of men to the Force. If any man has been improperly admitted I should certainly consider that question, but I am not going to reconsider his decision in the matter of refusing a man admission. Do you still want admission?—Yes.

The Commissioner. If you are not considered a fit and proper person, I think it is unwise for you to question the decision. I will call for the papers, go carefully into them, and notify you further on the matter.

JOHN O'DONOVAN, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 154.)

Witness: My name is John O'Donovan. I am Sub-Inspector, in charge of the sub-district of Palmerston North, acting under the Inspector at Wanganui. I was appointed a constable in April, 1879; promoted to sergeant, January, 1898; and promoted Sub-Inspector, July, 1902. I was in charge of the training depot, Wellington, for some time—from the time it was established until I was promoted Sub-Inspector.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are there any remarks of a general nature which you wish to make?—With regard to constables, and the improvement of the material of the Force, a great deal depends upon the class of men available to be recruited from.

2. We are faced with the fact now that they are not coming forward?—I should say that the low rate of pay is detrimental from that point of view.

3. You think that the pay should be raised?—I think that a man who joins the Police Force should receive a rate of pay that would put him in a respectable position as regards maintenance, and as regards his status in society. His salary should be such as to put him in a respectable position, and a little above the position of an ordinary labourer. I think constables should begin with 9s. a day—that is, three guineas a week. I base that upon this: that in the City of Wellington, for instance, there are about four hundred men in the tramway service who are receiving from £3 to £3 10s. a week. I consider that the pay of a constable should be equal to that, in order to keep a good class of men in the Force. In my opinion, if that were done a good class of men would come forward. With regard to their qualifications, I need not touch upon physique; that is too obvious. Then, as to their education, and the method of selection, the Commissioner undoubtedly is very much handicapped in this way: he hardly ever sees a man, so far as I am aware, until the man gets into the training depot. (To Commissioner Dinnie): Am I correct?

Mr. Dinnie: No. I see the men before they go into the depot. They apply to me for forms, as a rule.

Witness: I think there should be a personal interview. I understand that the method pursued in Melbourne is this: The Commissioner advertises that on a certain day applications will be received for the Police Force, and all who present themselves are examined on that day by a competent officer in the presence of the Commissioner; and if more than the required number of men are picked out, the final selection is made from them. I think that such a system as that would be better than the system adopted here. I only mention that as a mere suggestion that something of that sort might be done to help the Commissioner to select a better class of men; and he could go through the educational qualifications of the men, and have their characters inquired into. All that sort of thing could be done in a more complete and thorough manner. The Commissioner would see the men, and could ascertain what class of society they came from. There are numbers of men who are living in certain walks of life in which they contract habits which will never be eradicated—habits which are detrimental to their moral character and to the efficiency of the Police Force. They are not necessarily men of bad character, but they contract certain habits. I think that care should be taken in that respect. With regard to education, there is a great deal of divergence of opinion with regard to the standard. When I was in the training depot the standard was the Fourth. I said nothing about it. It was fixed according to "The Civil Service Act, 1886." I consider that that standard is quite high enough if the men really attain a fair degree of efficiency in that standard, and if they have not forgotten what they learned at school. What I would do in that respect is this: Simply ask the men to sit down and write certain things from dictation, and write out a report of what they had done or saw on their way to the depot. That would, I think, enable the Commissioner to form a better opinion of the men straight off, and what they could do in the way of a report, and without any further educational test, provided they had passed the Fourth Standard. The Commissioner could test them by a very simple examination on the spot. So that the education question is very simple, if it is dealt with in a proper way. With regard to the promotion of constables to the rank of sergeant, every witness that I have heard of is agreed that that has been a long-standing grievance. I myself was nineteen years in the rank of constable. Some of the men complained of my promotion, but they made no complaint when they were promoted over others. We are all alike in that respect. I think the Commissioner is entitled to receive not only the aid of one Inspector, but of four Inspectors. I think that men with a certain fixed length of service should be eligible for promotion. Let the Commissioner and his Board of three or four Inspectors go through the list of those who are qualified by seniority, and agree amongst themselves upon the men who are to be promoted to the rank of sergeant when the time comes to promote them. The conditions and state of affairs vary at different periods. I think the Dominion is getting to that stage when a step forward should be made in the matter of arranging for promotions; and I throw out the suggestion that the Commissioner should be assisted by four of the chief Inspectors, who probably would have knowledge of each individual who asked for promotion. The Inspectors would get their knowledge from the way they are moved about. With regard to the method of selection, I think this would be a good way: that out of the district offices five, six, or eight reports furnished by the candidates for promotion should be submitted to the Board, and let the officers form their own opinions as to the capacity of each of the candidates. I think the position of station sergeant is more or less of an anomaly and a stumbling-block. I think it would be better if that rank were abolished altogether. In saying this, I am speaking from my own experience. It would be sufficient, in my opinion, if a sergeant were simply placed in charge of the station. The principal part of a station sergeant's duty is simply to supervise the work of the watch-house keeper and to attend to callers who require special attention at the watch-house. The station sergeant has practically no responsibility whatever with regard to the street duty. So that there is no necessity whatever for the rank.

4. I suppose you know that the duties have never been defined?—Yes; that is so. I know from my experience in Wellington that the station sergeant's duties are limited in the way I have indicated. His duties do not necessitate any superior rank whatever to the sergeant doing duty on the street. The Sub-Inspector really supervises the work at the station.

5. The creation of the rank in the first instance was with the view of relieving the Sub-Inspector from a great deal of detail work?—It would do equally well if a competent sergeant were there.

6. What difference does it make?—It creates difficulties, and in my opinion the rank is not necessary. And if a man is once made a station sergeant and is not found suitable, what are you going to do with him?

7. What do you do with a Sub-Inspector when you find him not altogether suited? Does not the same thing apply?—Yes. I simply mention it as my opinion that there is no necessity for the rank.

8. You think they are a sort of fifth wheel?—Yes, and rather a stumbling-block to the efficient discharge of the duties within the station. If the station sergeant is not suitable he can be sent to another station, or be given street duty, as the case may be. He does not really exercise any direct control over the sergeants, nor does he really supervise the street duties. I think that any man who is promoted to the rank of Sub-Inspector should submit to an educational examination—an examination which will show whether he is qualified or not. Any man who is not qualified by passing the necessary educational test or examination should not be promoted to the office.

9. You mean an ordinary educational test?—They should submit themselves to some examination like the Dublin police, who have to undergo a very stiff examination for the rank of Sub-Inspector.

10. Do you not think a man might pass an examination with sufficient ease? But there is also the personal equation. I do not say that an educational test is not a valuable adjunct, but I say it is not everything?—I admit it is not everything.

11. It is admitted in all walks of life that an examination test is not a true test?—I quite admit that.

12. How do you propose to get over that?—The trouble arises principally from men who really are not qualified, but who have seniority alone. I think that when once a man comes to the position of Sub-Inspector there should be some test—he should be subjected to some examination, either by the University or by a special Board set up for the purpose. If that is not done, there are sure to be constant complaints.

13. What would be the maximum age at which you would promote a constable to be a sergeant?—I certainly should not go beyond, say, forty-two years.

14. Do you consider it a good thing for the efficiency of the Force that the moment after a man is promoted he should be sent to one of the centres?—Not from country stations.

15. We want to put the Force on a thoroughly efficient footing. With that in view, would you suggest that no man should be promoted after he was forty-two years of age?—That is the limit if they are to be sent to city duty. If these men could be provided for in country stations, it is not too old.

16. But you would have endless trouble and difficulty if some men were left in charge of country districts and some men were sent to the towns?—Practically the man's age might determine it then.

17. Would not you determine it, then, by having one rule, and one rule only—that no man over a certain age should be promoted?—I would fix it absolutely at forty-five. But with regard to duty in the cities, I consider that young men should be promoted to the rank of sergeant who would be available for the more active life required in the city. And if the system of promoting district clerks after ten years' service is followed, I should certainly say they quite fill that gap I am speaking of—that younger men should be promoted to serve on the streets for a number of years, until they are forty-two or forty-five years of age, and then be sent out into country stations. I think that would be a better system—to have the younger sergeants in the city, where greater activity and alertness is required, and where there is a greater draw upon their vitality than in country stations.

18. You know that at the present time the system is to promote district clerks to be sergeants?—Yes; that is causing a lot of discontent.

19. You think it causes discontent?—It seems so from the evidence I have seen in the papers.

20. Immediately you promoted a district clerk by service qualification to be a sergeant you would send him out into the street?—Not immediately. That would be a matter for arrangement within a period of one or two years.

21. Why do you promote them at all?—I do not know why they are promoted, except that they are a better class of men.

21A. You would have a clerical staff?—Yes; and they would be selected for the work, and be subject to a test. In that way, you would select the very best men throughout the colony. With regard to the duration of training, and training in general, that point was touched upon by Sergeant Stagpoole. I think that a period of training is necessary.

22. For what period do you think men should be in the depot?—For three months at least. At the end of two months they are beginning to grasp what they have been taught.

23. You are breaking in the raw material in the first two months, and they are finished off in the third month?—Yes. When men leave the depot a great deal depends on whose hands they get into.

24. You would place a man on probation?—Yes; and if he did not give satisfaction in the first twelve months from the time he joined the depot, he should not be retained. The course

of instruction in the depot is very comprehensive and very practical. With regard to detectives, I think their position should be defined somehow or other, if they are not kept in a separate class.

25. Do you see any sound objection to the creation of a separate class, making what is known as the plain-clothes constable a constable detective, and your present detective to what answers to a detective sergeant, and so on?—Yes; because at the present time there is no co-ordination between the detectives and the ordinary Police Force.

26. What would you make the Chief Detective—a detective inspector?—Certainly not; he must be subject to the Sub-Inspector. It would undoubtedly lead to trouble if he were given exactly the same rank as the Sub-Inspector, who is to control him in the absence of the Inspector. I do not see any necessity for giving him the rank.

27. But in the absence of the Inspector, you become Acting-Inspector, and he, as Chief Detective or Sub-Inspector, would simply be in charge of the plain-clothes branch, whereas you would become head of the station?—At the present time, with the rank of Chief Detective, the Sub-Inspector has quite enough to do to avoid conflict with him. The Sub-Inspector simply takes control in the absence of the Inspector, but he is still only Sub-Inspector.

28. He is only Sub-Inspector in rank, but he is holding delegated powers from the Inspector; he is *de facto* the Inspector?—I quite agree with that; but the Chief Detective might not be so ready to recognise that as you are.

29. That is a matter of discipline, of course?—Yes.

30. Recent appointments have been from Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector?—Yes; but he ceases at once to be Chief Detective, and goes over to the uniform branch.

31. The last appointments seem to have given general satisfaction?—I quite agree. Sub-Inspector McGrath is an able officer.

32. You would still allow the Chief Detective the same opportunity as a man in the uniform branch of getting further promotion?—Certainly; but going into the detective branch is a shorter cut to promotion. I do not object to the promotion of Chief Detectives. When the Chief Detective has qualified by service for rank, I say that rank ought to be co-ordinated with some other rank in the Police Force, and when he is eligible for the position of Sub-Inspector he should get that rank by examination. Speaking generally as to promotion, men complain of being passed over. Undoubtedly a good man here and there will be passed over by the system I have referred to, but they will be in a minority to what they are now. I have not had time to go into details; the details must be worked out in the Commissioner's office. I only throw out the suggestions.

33. Is there anything else you wish to say?—I am not aware of anything else. I have mentioned about the position of clerks in the district office, and also the junior clerks—that the best way to select them would be by examination and competition.

34. But Mr. Dinnie informs me that in the whole of New Zealand there are only eight applications at the present time for the position of assistant clerk in the district office, so that it cannot be a position sought after to any great extent; and if there was to be a competitive examination that would further reduce the number?—But if it is a short cut to promotion.

35. If it is a short cut to promotion, why are there not more applicants?—I do not know. I only mention it in connection with some complaint about a man not being fit, or something of that sort, and a man who was not wanted by one Inspector being sent away to another. I consider, if a man is appointed under a proper system, he is entitled to be put under any Inspector. I wish again to say, with regard to the pay of constables, that I think the pay ought to commence at 9s. a day, and in five, six, or ten years they should receive 10s. a day, with 1s. a day house-allowance.

36. Do you see any objection to empowering Inspectors to take evidence on oath in inquiries with regard to complaints against constables?—I think it would be a good thing.

37. I understand that Sub-Inspectors in charge of sub-districts do not get the men's defaulters' lists?—No, sir.

38. Do you think it would be an advantage to have that knowledge of the men?—I ought to have some information as to the men coming to my station.

39. I have not heard any reason why it should not be?—I may say I have not asked for it.

40. Mr. Dinnie.] Defaulters' lists are sent to the Inspector for his perusal, to do what he thinks proper with them; he may send them to you if he thinks proper?—Yes.

41. When you are in charge in the absence of the Inspector, are you not the Inspector *pro tem*?—I quite agree that I am,

42. You are not the Sub-Inspector?—I do not agree that I am the Inspector; I am exercising his power.

43. You do not expect that we can promote you for the time being?—I am simply exercising whatever routine powers or discharging the routine duties that fall to me. The orders are that important matters are to remain over till the return of the Inspector—that is, important matters that do not require to be dealt with at once.

44. The Chief Detectives are under you during that time?—Yes.

45. And you ought to act as if you were the Inspector?—Yes, I ought to do; but I find a greater line of resistance.

46. The Commissioner.] I know, if I were Sub-Inspector, the position I would take up?—A man can take up a very peculiar attitude without leaving himself open to anything very definite.

47. Mr. Dinnie.] If you are acting as Inspector, you ought to act up to the position of Inspector?—Yes.

48. It depends entirely upon yourself, does it not?—A great deal depends upon myself. It is not the view that the Sub-Inspector takes, but it is the view the other man takes when the Inspector is away.

49. *The Commissioner.*] I should want to know the reason why, and that very quickly too, if my position were questioned?—There is apt to be conflict.

50. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What do you say about the discipline and efficiency of the Force now as compared with former years?—It is very like the weather. It is very hard to compare the weather at any particular time with what it was ten years ago. I should say that, generally speaking, there is a tendency on the part of the men—I do not say it is actual—but there is a tendency to relax in discipline—for the men to disregard the necessity for discipline slightly more than there was years ago.

51. How long back are you speaking of?—Ten or twelve years ago. I may say that one of the reasons that might account for that is that formerly there were numbers of men in the Police Force who had served in the Armed Constabulary—who had been subject to years of discipline, and who had acquired habits of discipline. At the present time one of the weaknesses of our Force is that a man is only a short time in the depot, and has not acquired the habit of or seen the necessity for strict discipline. He is sent out amongst other men who are in the same state as himself, or probably more so.

52. It depends greatly on the Sub-Inspector and Inspector as to discipline?—Yes; and a great deal depends upon the non-commissioned officers into whose hands the constables get.

53. Yes; it depends greatly upon yourself and the officers as to the discipline that is maintained?—That is quite true.

54. It is for them to maintain discipline in the district?—It rests principally on the sergeants.

55. You suggest that the Commissioner should examine the men. Do you know that the men are all paraded by the Inspector and by myself before they are put on the probation class, and when they are taken into the probation class they undergo an examination?—Yes.

56. And that examination is submitted to me at once?—I did not know that.

57. The result of the examination is submitted to me with the report from the sergeant in charge of the men, and on that it is decided whether the men shall be retained in the depot or not?—I was not aware of it.

58. You said that in Victoria the Commissioner advertises that the men are to appear on a certain day, and he then selects the men: how can he select the men without knowing something of their previous history?—I said that a larger number of men than were actually required were picked out in the first instance, and the selection is made from these men.

59. Supposing their characters are bad, what is the use of picking out the men in that way?—The whole thing is gone into then.

60. Do you not think the whole thing should be gone into beforehand?—The system gives the Commissioner an opportunity of at once selecting the men who *prima facie* are suitable for police constables.

61. You know that we inquire into the history of the applicants?—I do not find fault with the system, but I throw this out as a suggestion which would enable the Commissioner to have a more complete control.

62. If the men were advertised for, as in Melbourne, and a certain number were picked out, perhaps they might all have to be discharged again because nothing was known of their previous character or history?—That is the time the inquiry should commence.

63. You would retain those men until the inquiry was made?—Certainly not.

64. What would you do?—Let them go back to their occupation. Let them present themselves on a certain day, on the understanding that if they are picked they will be required to attend the depot for training.

65. Do you not think they would lose their situations, coming from a distance?—Not necessarily.

66. I do not see the advantage of it. As regards promotions, you suggest another system. You say there are a number of men who are passed over now who should be promoted?—I say there are a number of men who are complaining that they are passed over. I was in that position myself. I was nineteen years with the rank of constable, and a number of men were promoted over me. As I have said, the men who complained that I was promoted over their heads did not complain when they were promoted over the heads of others.

67. You are not suggesting that men are passed over now who ought to be promoted—simply that they are complaining?—Yes, that is so.

68. Do you not think there will always be that, even with a Board?—I suggested that there should be a Board to assist you, and take away the responsibility in this respect to some extent.

69. What would that Board know of the men in the short time they had the men before them?—You have Inspectors in the different centres who have been in the different districts.

70. These are the men who would recommend?—Yes; each one of the Inspectors would know men who were eligible for promotion, and they would probably know from actual experience the qualifications of all the candidates.

71. As regards the clerical staff, I suppose you admit that the clerks are specially qualified?—I admit that they are, and they ought to be. There is exceedingly great difficulty in getting clerks.

72. And being better qualified, they are entitled to promotion early?—They are certainly entitled to promotion early.

73. The position of district clerk is an important one, is it not?—Yes.

74. Their work is often of a confidential nature?—Yes.

75. It is the case, is it not, that men are removed from that position because they are not confidential and are not qualified?—They must possess the qualifications that the Inspector and the position require.

76. I suppose you believe that a man who has gone through the district office is more likely to go to higher rank because of his clerical qualifications?—Yes, because of his educational qualifications, which is the same thing.

77. Most of our Inspectors have gone through the office, and it has been a great assistance to them?—Undoubtedly, in administration it has.

78. Are the inquiries made about candidates for the Force not more strict now than they ever have been?—They are certainly more complete.

79. *The Commissioner.*] The question has been raised as to whether when a man is promoted he should or should not be given the option of accepting or not?—I certainly would promote no man against his will. A man may have reasons for declining promotion.

80. Yes; but the point is whether the service should stand first or the individual?—I certainly would not promote a man against his will. I would sooner leave him in a position where he would do his duty with more confidence.

81. You will admit that there is a great deal to be said on the other side?—Yes.

82. The same with regard to transfers: would you give a man the option of being transferred or not?—Certainly not.

83. You would say, "You have to go to such-and-such a place," and he would have to go?—Certainly.

84. You know the practice is to give the option?—Very often.

85. You would not give that option?—I certainly would not have it a rule.

86. A rule with variations is not a rule at all. You recognise the importance of it?—I would say that if it is necessary to move a man from one station to another, and the Commissioner decides that he has to go, he should obey orders. I would give him no option.

87. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If it is in the interests of the service to transfer a man, he should be transferred whether he wishes it or not?—Certainly.

88. *The Commissioner.*] If it is in the interests of the service, he should have no option?—Yes, he certainly must obey, and go to whatever district he is sent to.

The following further statement was received from Sub-Inspector O'Donovan by post after the departure of the Commission from Palmerston North:—

My suggestions regarding promotion by examination to the rank of Sub-Inspector would not apply to men who now hold the rank of station sergeant, or Chief Detective. These have already, I consider, acquired a title under the existing system to consideration for promotion. The rights of those who attain to the position of station sergeant or Chief Detective before the date of the first examination might also be considered. Regarding the promotion of Chief Detectives to Sub-Inspectorships, I consider it a source of very probable friction if these Sub-Inspectors remain in charge of the detective staff, and that staff remain in its present position in relation to the general Force. The uniform Sub-Inspector at present assumes the duties of the Inspector in case of sickness, leave, or absence of the latter. This arrangement could not be kept up if the Detective Sub-Inspector happened to be the senior officer of the two. If, however, the detective branch be made a distinct branch, administered and controlled separately from the uniform branch, I have nothing to say regarding any ranks which may be created specially for the detective service. On the other hand, if Chief Detectives are to be eligible for promotion to Sub-Inspectorships in the uniform branch, in order to enable the uniform branch to compete on anything like fair terms with the detective branch, owing to the disparity in numbers between the two branches, it would be necessary to abolish the rank of station sergeant, or to give the right to promotion by examination to every sergeant who has served a certain period in his own rank.

ANDREW DUNCAN THOMSON, Stipendiary Magistrate, examined on oath. (No. 155.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] There is a constable stationed in Canterbury who wants me to ask you one or two questions with regard to his personal qualifications. Do you know Constable David Jackson, now in charge of the police-station at Addington?—Yes.

2. What was your knowledge of him?—He was Clerk of one of the Courts I visited, I think, in 1903, for about twelve months—for some months, at any rate.

3. You had ample opportunity of judging of his capacity?—Yes.

4. What is your opinion of him?—He was not what I should call an alert man in a way, but thoroughly trustworthy and capable. He did all the work in connection with the Court quite to my satisfaction.

5. His grievance is that he has been passed over in the matter of promotion?—Yes.

6. Would you say from your knowledge of him that he is suitable for promotion to the rank of sergeant?—I am not capable of expressing an opinion upon that. I do not really know what a sergeant's duties are. I see a sergeant in Court, and that is all I know about his duties.

7. You can only say that he was a sufficiently good clerk?—Yes; that the work he had to do for me was well done.

8. He was a reliable man?—Thoroughly reliable.

9. And, so far as you saw, his duties as constable were efficiently performed?—Yes.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose there are other constables who have come under your notice equally well qualified with Jackson?—Oh, yes; there is no doubt about that.

11. You do not say he possessed special qualifications?—He seemed to me to be a solid, steady-going reliable man. I always felt I could trust him thoroughly.

12. He gave you every satisfaction?—Yes; he gave me every satisfaction.

NAPIER, TUESDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1909.

THOMAS JAMES WILTON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 156.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Spit, and I was enrolled in February, 1897. I am in charge of the station, and appear as a delegate on behalf of the police of the district. There is a unanimous desire that the pay of the Police Force should be increased, and also the house-allowance. We think the pay should be increased by increments at intervals of three years. The house-allowance—7s. a week—is too low, as the average rental for a four-roomed house and scullery, or a five-roomed house and scullery, in this district is 16s. 6d. a week. We also suggest that a free pass should be granted when on leave, as policemen are never exempt from duty, but are liable to be called on when on leave. And their holidays do not take place at the time cheap fares are on. We think the leave should be increased from twelve days to twenty-one days. There is also a desire—it is not unanimous—in favour of the issue of a free uniform; the average cost at present of making up uniforms is £2 5s. each.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you mean by saying that it is not unanimous?—Well, only some of the constables have made that suggestion. Some also suggest a free issue of boots—two pairs per year; but others again are against the suggestion, and say it is not feasible on account of the variation of the sizes.

2. Do you know what is done in other Departments?—I do not, excepting that in the Post Office they get a uniform free; and I have been informed—although I do not know it personally—that the Prisons Department officers get a free uniform and boots.

3. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force excepting in respect to promotions?—There has been dissatisfaction for a number of years concerning promotions.

4. I mean any general dissatisfaction in respect to other matters?—There is dissatisfaction that men in country stations are being neglected while men who are district clerks are promoted before them, although the clerks have not been brought into contact with the public and have not the same important class of duty to perform as the constables.

5. Do the police think that the district clerks should form a separate clerical branch?—That is the view that is taken of it. They allege that it is not fair that the district clerks should be on the list for promotion, as there is only a limited number of places to be filled.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How do you make out that the promotion of the constables is delayed owing to the promotion of district clerks?—I do not make it out.

7. But you suggest that. If a clerk is promoted, what difference does that fact make to the position of the constable?—To state a case: supposing a man has fourteen years' service, he is in charge of an outside station, and other things being equal he should get the promotion; but the district clerk, with his ten years' service, comes along and gets promoted, while the other man does not.

8. But there is no vacancy outside. If there is a vacancy outside, does the district clerk come in there?—Certainly not; but as there are only a limited number of sergeantships available, if all the district clerks were made sergeants, they would "corner," as it were, a certain number of sergeantships, thereby rendering a longer period necessary before promotion would come to the ordinary constables, who say that if these men were not promoted promotion would come to them sooner. I am not prepared to say whether that would be the case or not.

9. But is it so in practice? Can you show cases of it yourself?—No.

10. The mere fact of a district clerk being promoted to sergeant after ten years' service, does it affect the position of promotions?—There is a misconception evidently.

11. You are in charge of a station?—Yes; Spit.

12. Rent-free?—Yes.

13. And the pay?—9s. a day.

14. Do you hold any other appointments?—Inspector of Fisheries.

15. Do you get anything for that?—£7 10s. a year.

16. Any other appointments?—No.

17. Do you know that in many stations the police hold various other appointments?—Yes.

18. And that they get remuneration for the various other offices they hold?—I understand they do; but when I was holding another appointment I did not receive anything, excepting for Clerk of Court. I was Inspector of Fisheries and Deputy Clerk of Awards under the Arbitration Act.

19. But in the majority of cases there is something to look forward to with regard to the emoluments paid?—Undoubtedly.

20. So that the position is equal, if not better than, a sergeant's in the city?—Yes.

21. Do you know how long it is before a man gets a chance of getting the charge of a station, provided his conduct is good?—In my own case, I think it was after six years' service.

22. It runs from five to six, as a rule?—Yes.

23. *Inspector Dwyer.*] You said that the average rent for a small house in Napier was 16s. 6d. Just look at this list prepared by the clerk showing that the average is 19s. a week. Is that not so?—Yes.

The Commissioner: It is higher than it is in some of the centres.

Inspector Dwyer: It is higher than it is in Wellington.

WALTER TORR, District Constable, examined on oath. (No. 157.)

Witness: I am a district constable, stationed at Wairoa, and joined the Force on the 24th September, 1898. I have been a district constable all the time, and receive 7s. 6d. a day. I am a married man, with a family.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you been receiving that all the time?—No; I generally had a salary of £60 a year, until it was increased. The whole of my time is devoted to police duties, and I do exactly the same work as the regular police. I have no free quarters, but provide my own house. I am the Acting Clerk of the Court in Wairoa, and I do not know whether I am getting anything for that position or not, as I am only relieving another man who is sick. I have often to work late at night to keep ahead of it, but I am not complaining of that. The work is a pleasure to me, but I should like a remuneration equal to my work. I wish to be placed on the same footing as the regular police. I have several times applied to the Commissioner to be put on the regular Force, but have been told that my age debarred me. I shall be forty-three in November.

2. Is it your desire to be enrolled as a regular constable, or merely that you should receive remuneration commensurate with the duties you perform?—I would like to be enrolled as a regular constable.

3. Assuming that that cannot be done, you would be satisfied with extra remuneration?—I am ambitious to a certain extent, and would like to rise in my profession.

4. When did you first apply to be enrolled?—A good many years ago.

5. What was the objection then?—The age. Each Inspector I have served under has very strongly recommended me for this transfer, but without avail. I have given every satisfaction in my work. It has been urged as a bar to my transfer that if I were taken into the regular police I should lose my back service, but I would point out that I am not paying into the Police Provident Fund. I joined the Public Service Superannuation Fund, and surely I would be allowed to go on contributing to that fund, and I believe my additional service from the time I joined will be allowed, and my pension computed from that time.

6. What service was admitted when you joined the Civil Service Superannuation Fund?—From the time I joined as a district constable.

7. How long have you been acting as Clerk of Court?—A month now.

8. Are you speaking on behalf of yourself only or for the other district constables?—There is another man in the same position as myself.

Inspector Dwyer: I told him I would get this district constable to speak for him. His name is Constable Pratt. He is a half-caste, and getting 7s. 6d. a day. He joined in 1899. (See report at end of Napier evidence.)

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When you were first appointed a district constable you received £60 per annum?—Yes.

10. And you were not supposed to devote your whole time to this work?—No.

11. You did not do so for a very long time?—I found that all my time was taken up.

The Commissioner: I see that this man is in uniform.

Mr. Dinnie: He asked for a uniform, and it was given him. In many instances the district constables would not wear it, but I have always allowed it when they asked for it.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You are not paying into the Police Provident Fund at all?—No; I am paying into the Public Service Superannuation.

13. *The Commissioner.*] What do you pay?—Eight per cent.

14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Would it be fair to let you join the regular police, and let you subscribe to the Police Provident Fund?—No; I would like to continue subscribing to the Civil Service Fund.

Mr. Dinnie: The whole matter is being considered at the present time, and the question of appointing you to the Police Department will be another secondary consideration.

15. *The Commissioner.*] Is that all you wish to mention?—I would like to receive 8s. 6d. a day.

16. What for?—For my services. I have been eleven years a district constable.

17. But you have been paid the same as a constable?—I receive the same as a constable starting, but I am doing more work than a man getting 8s. or 9s. a day.

18. You want to get the higher rate at once?—Yes, considering my good work here.

Mr. Dinnie: This constable has been specially treated because he has worked well.

WILLIAM WILSON SMART, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 158.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police at Hastings, and am in charge of that sub-district. I was enrolled on the 1st July, 1875, and promoted sergeant in 1899.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make with regard to the matters that come within the order of reference?—I do not wish to make any remarks at all.

2. How does the Force at the present day compare with what you remember it as not many years ago?—Taking the men under me, very favourably, both physically and intellectually.

3. Do you know of any dissatisfaction in the Force with regard to promotion, or other matters?—None at all that I have heard of, from my own men.

4. May I take it that the Force as you know it is thoroughly efficient?—Speaking for the men who have been under me, yes. I do not know what it is in the large towns.

5. Have you ever been in a city since you were promoted?—No.

6. Do you know anything about political or other interference in connection with the Force?—Nothing at all.

7. You hear it spoken of?—Frequently; but I know nothing about it.

8. You have never used it yourself?—No. I make a point of having nothing to say to a member of Parliament, or as little as I possibly can.

9. You keep out of his way?—I do.

10. What do you know about promotions? Do you think that promotions are made fairly and equitably?—I think that, even putting service aside, the best man should be put up, if he is a junior.

11. That merit really should govern the position, but if all things are equal, then seniority and station?—Yes.

12. What do you think should be the maximum age at which men should be promoted from constable to sergeant?—I think a man should not be put up after he is forty-five.

13. You know the practice now is to send every man after promotion into a city for a couple of years to do street duty?—Forty-five is quite low enough, and a man is not fit for city work after that age.

14. How old were you?—Nearly fifty.

15. You would not have cared to go into a city?—I declined to go. The Commissioner made an exception in my case. It is very hard work for a man after forty-five to go out on beats.

16. Have you given the matter of the pay of men entering the Force any consideration? It is beyond doubt at present that there is a difficulty in getting the right class of men to join the Force. What do you attribute that to?—Work outside the Force has been so plentiful, and the outside prospects very much better than those inside the Force, because as soon as a man joins he gives away his liberty; but if he gets good employment outside he is a free man.

17. You think really that it is the small pay that is causing the falling-off?—The pay has been better outside, and a man is freer.

18. Do you think that raising the pay would make the Force more attractive?—Not as long as the men can get work outside.

19. Why? There is regular pay and other advantages to look forward to?—And there are things to look forward to outside.

20. I suppose you have not regretted entering the Police Force?—No. Things were rather slow then in New Zealand.

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When were you promoted to sergeant?—In 1899.

22. There were a number of others promoted at the same time?—I think not. I think there were only one or two on the list.

23. Where were the vacancies then?—I do not know that there was a vacancy. Hastings had a constable when I was appointed sergeant.

24. There was no vacancy in the city then, though?—I declined the offer in the cities.

25. And somebody else got it?—Yes; a district clerk got one vacancy.

26. But the system of sending men to the cities was adopted before I came here?—Yes, it was the rule when I was appointed.

27. Do you know of any case where influence has obtained?—None whatever.

28. But it is spoken about considerably?—It is often spoken about.

29. It has been alleged in Dunedin that I have a "special" man attached to each district: have you heard anything about that before?—Nothing at all.

30. Do you believe it?—No.

31. What is your opinion with regard to detectives going into the uniform branches on promotion?—As a rule, I do not think they are quite suitable for the uniform work. It is quite different from our work.

32. But if you have a Chief Detective who is specially qualified for promotion, and better than any one in the uniform, would you not give him a chance?—I would think the matter over.

33. You think merit ought to be considered?—Most undoubtedly.

34. As regards promotions, I suppose you know the difficulty of giving satisfaction in promoting men?—Yes; there are a large number of men fit for promotion, and very few openings. There are men who have been a very long time in the service, and they have not got promotion, but they are all looking for it.

35. But perhaps they are not all qualified, are they?—I do not think so.

36. You believe in promotion by merit?—Yes.

37. Merit and seniority combined?—I do.

38. You know there are always some dissatisfied men in the service?—Yes.

39. As regards the clerks, do you think they ought to be sent out on duty on a Sunday?—I do not think so.

40. You think it would interfere with their duties?—I think so.

41. I do not know whether you are aware or not that we have very few applications for the position?—I did not know that.

42. You know that it requires a confidential man as well as a good scholar to be put into the office?—Certainly it does.

43. And the reason for their promotion is that they are the better qualified?—As against that they already get extra pay.

44. They wear plain clothes?—Yes.

45. And they get 1s. a day for that?—I understand that they are getting 1s. for being district clerks.

46. One shilling a day as plain-clothes allowance?—Yes.

47. Have you ever made any inquiries about the candidates at all?—No.

Sergeant Cummings: May I ask Sergeant Smart a question?

The Commissioner: What about?

Sergeant Cummings: The delegate complained that district clerks were unduly promoted over men in charge of country stations, and Sergeant Bowden complained that they wrote impertinent memos, and so forth.

The Commissioner: You may ask the question.

48. *Sergeant Cummings.*] During your experience, Sergeant Smart, have you ever received any impertinent memos of any kind from any district clerk?—It all depends how you read that. A good many men consider it impertinent for a clerk to write them a memo. when their Inspector

was away for a day. I have received memos that I do not think you should have written in the absence of the Inspector. The sergeant should have written it.

49. Give an instance?—The Herbertville hotel case; you wrote the memorandum and Sergeant Folley signed it.

50. Is it not his memo. if he signed it?—No; it was the district clerk's memo., and the sergeant signed it. I do not think district clerks should be allowed to write memos to senior officers when the Inspector is away only for a day.

51. Who should write it?—The sergeant.

52. What was in that memo. you took exception to?—You were almost ordering me to send a detective out of my district into another man's district.

The Commissioner.] I cannot allow the district clerks to enter into any controversy with the sergeants.

53. *Sergeant Cummings* (to witness).] Do you consider that the district clerks are entitled to promotion after ten years' service?—I think the outside men should be as much entitled to it after ten years as the district clerks; but if the district clerk is a good man, I do not see why he should not be promoted.

54. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the writing of memos, if his sergeant signs the memo. surely that is the sergeant's memo.?—It is not.

55. Do you mean to tell me that the man who signs it is not responsible?—He might be.

56. The same thing would apply to anybody. If the Inspector had signed it the same would apply?—Well, the Inspector was more responsible for it.

57. Supposing my Chief Clerk wrote a memo., and I signed it, that would be my memo.?—If you were there.

58. The same thing applies to the sergeant?—I think it would be better if the district clerk allowed the sergeant to write it himself.

59. To write his own memos?—It would be very much better. I take exception to district clerks writing memoranda to their district officers.

ALEXANDER CRUICKSHANK, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 159.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Dannevirke, and was enrolled on the 29th January, 1879, being promoted to the rank of sergeant in March, 1900. I have been at my present station over seven years.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you had any previous experience in the large centres?—I was two years a section sergeant in Wellington.

2. Have you any general statement to make on any matter that you think would be of interest to the Commission?—No, I have nothing to volunteer, and I have no complaints to make.

3. With regard to the physique and intelligence of the Force, how does it compare now with your previous experience?—It is not quite up to the standard of many years ago.

4. What do you attribute that to?—To two things—the Force years ago was composed mostly of men from the Old Country who came here without trades. They were fairly intelligent, and their physique was good. That class has largely fallen off, and the native-born is joining us now; but colonial life does not lend itself to the strict discipline required. There are also better opportunities for men outside the service.

5. That probably is the principal factor, you think, in the difficulty of recruiting at present?—It is a factor, in my opinion.

6. Not the pay?—Yes; the pay as well. Men can do better outside. A man with the same amount of intelligence and steadiness, by devoting his time to work outside, can do better there than in the Force.

7. Would you have any period of probation for men before being finally enrolled after going through the depot?—Seeing that there is no system of getting rid of men that are unsuitable, I think a period of probation would be a very good thing. I would fix it at six months. If you make it too high it might deter men from coming forward.

8. And it would give you plenty of time to really test the quality of men who sought enrolment?—Yes.

9. Do you know of any political or other interference in connection with the Force?—I have always heard a lot about political influence.

10. Have you ever seen any concrete instance of it?—I could not produce facts.

11. You have seen things that appear to you to bear the colour of that sort of thing?—Yes, it had a slight resemblance to it.

12. You could not account for them in any other way?—That is about how I would put it.

13. You think it is due to men securing the interest of members of Parliament, or how do you think it is done?—I will put it this way: If six men are equal in intelligence and service, and five do not use a friend, I think the sixth man would have the advantage.

14. Have you any views on the question of promotion?—Promotion should be by merit three-fourths, and by seniority one-fourth. Merit should predominate. If a junior man were promoted over me, and I knew he was a much superior man to me, I would have no misgivings at all.

15. Are you able to say that all the promotions made lately bear that impress?—I cannot put my finger on any man who has been promoted who has not been qualified. I know them all.

16. Then, in your opinion, there is no sound reason for finding fault with any of the promotions made?—Not as to ability. I could not put my finger on one who is not able to discharge the duties that he has been promoted to discharge.

17. What about the district clerks we hear so much about?—He is in a peculiar position. He must be of superior education. If a district clerk gets promoted on ten years' service, and a con-

stable in charge of a station is not promoted until he has fifteen or twenty years' service, and further appointments go according to seniority, of course it must be to the advantage of the man who has the country station.

18. That is the personal advantage. I mean from the standpoint of efficiency, do you know of any reason why district clerks should be promoted over the heads of others simply because they have been doing work in the office?—My own opinion is that there ought to be a separate scale of pay for them.

19. And be paid as other clerks?—Pay them well and give them increments according to the work done.

20. Do you think the dissatisfaction is over these district clerks?—I do not think so.

21. We hear a lot about it, so I suppose it is discussed?—I have not heard much of it.

22. How long is it since you were in a city?—I served in Wellington from March, 1900, to May, 1902.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know, I suppose, as regards district clerks, that the fact of their going from the district office is a great assistance to them afterwards when they are promoted?—Decidedly.

24. It is a qualification for the position?—It is one of the finest training-grounds an Inspector could have, and they have graduated from that position.

25. Then, to make them Civil servants you would lose that opportunity of getting these men for the higher ranks?—I do not mean that they would be Civil servants, but that they would have extra pay, and wait their chance with those men whose service was equal.

26. I suppose you believe in the system of putting them into the office for five years, and then letting them go out and take the chance of promotion?—It would save a lot of jealousy if that were done.

27. You know that the longer a man remains in the office the more use he is to the Inspector?—That is so. If you specialise the man, and he follows that special line, the more proficient he gets.

28. It has been said in Dunedin that no one can go into the office and make an efficient clerk. Do you think that?—I do not.

29. As regards promotion, I suppose you would divide the period into three months' training and three months on the street?—I think six months would be a fair period of probation. In the depot you only lay down the technical foundation, and the next six months the sectional sergeant is educating the man in practical work. I think in six months he would have a fair grounding.

30. After the three months of probation closed you would give him three months on the streets, which would be six altogether?—Six would be a fair period, and a sergeant would be able to tell if a man were going to be useful then or otherwise.

31. You say the physique is not so good as it was a good many years ago?—Yes.

32. You are going a long way back?—Yes.

33. Is there any difference between the last eight or ten years?—I cannot say there has been a great deal of difference during that period.

34. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction as regards the present control of the service?—No.

35. Of course, you know that there is some dissatisfaction as regards promotions?—Yes.

36. And always has been as long as you have been in the service?—Yes; I was dissatisfied myself a little bit, but it is not worth talking about.

37. What was it over?—In 1900 I passed the second competitive examination, and came out top of the list for the colony, and I had a telegram from the examiner that I was recommended for promotion, and was to get a first-class certificate, but I did not get either promotion or a first-class certificate.

38. That was before my time?—Yes; but I am not complaining of that at all.

39. *The Commissioner.*] It only shows that under any conditions there will be dissatisfaction?—Quite so.

40. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you could formulate a system whereby we would do away with that dissatisfaction?—It is impossible.

41. As regards influence, you said that if there were six men, and one had influence and the other five had not, that that one would get advancement?—That is the general feeling.

42. You will not say more than that?—No, for I do not see that any Commissioner of Police could help that kind of thing if it did exist. I am not referring to the Commissioner at all when I say that.

43. I understand that. Do you know the Commissioner has the promotion of men from the rank of constable to that of sergeant?—I was not aware that he entirely had that power.

Mr. Dinnie: The fact is he submits the names of those he recommends for the information of the Minister, and he approves. But there is no need to submit them, as the Minister has always approved of my recommendations.

The Commissioner: It is a very different thing having to submit them to the Minister and having the power to make them yourself.

Mr. Dinnie: I will not say we have to submit them, but it is the practice. There is no regulation providing that we have to submit them.

The Commissioner: As a matter of fact, you do submit them.

Mr. Dinnie: Just for the information of the Minister.

The Commissioner: You submit them before you make them. It is clearly not only for the information of the Minister, but for his approval.

Mr. Dinnie: There is no regulation on the subject, but it is the practice.

44. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know anything about the inquiries made about candidates?—Yes.

45. You know they are very much more strict than they used to be?—I do. Any inquiries we make now are most searching.

46. In my predecessor's time I think it was only five years they went back, and sometimes not that?—I forget the practice.

47. There were not so many inquiries in Mr. Tunbridge's time as there are now?—No; they have gradually become more searching.

48. Have you heard anything about the "special" man mentioned in Dunedin who I have stationed in each district to get information?—Never.

49. But it was said there that it was so. We are trying to find him, but we have not been successful?—I have never heard of him, and I do not believe it for a moment, and I communicate with men in the police service in many parts of the colony. I have never heard it suggested.

50. It is said that great unrest prevails amongst the public in respect to the Police Force. Do you know anything of that?—The only unrest as far as I know arises from the conduct of a few agitators, and probably two or three men out of eight hundred, and it certainly has a very serious effect on the public, because the latter look on us not as individuals, but as a body of men.

51. And probably by some of them writing to the Press?—Yes.

52. As regards the detective branch having opportunities of getting into the uniform branch by merit, have you any objection to that system?—No, not by merit; but I have a slight objection to the detective branch competing with the uniform branch—in this way: a detective specialises his work, and he does not come into antagonism so much as the uniform branch with vested interests, or the public on the beats. Then, on account of his special work he has opportunities of becoming known socially and professionally, more so than the man in uniform. At the same time, if he was an exceptional man, and a man qualified to govern and direct other men, then I would certainly say, "Go up."

53. We may sometimes find a specially qualified Chief Detective—one more fitted for promotion than an officer in the uniform branch?—In that case I always bow to the man who knows more than myself—to a man thoroughly qualified for the position.

54. You have been in charge of men in the cities: you know they have to be in at 11 o'clock at night?—Yes.

55. Do you not think that is late enough to be out?—Yes, except under exceptional circumstances.

56. They can always apply and get the time off under exceptional circumstances?—Yes.

57. *The Commissioner.*] You said you think there will be trouble if Chief Detectives are promoted to be Sub-Inspectors: in what direction?—If one Chief Detective is promoted the whole of the Chief Detectives will expect the same treatment.

58. There are five Chief Detectives and four station sergeants: should there be any difficulty in picking out suitable men?—There should not be.

59. Where would the trouble come in? You would be satisfied as long as the selection was made purely on merit?—Yes, absolutely so.

60. *Sergeant Cummings.*] During the absence of the Inspector, do you think the senior sergeant should be in charge?—If the Inspector is absent on temporary duty, I would not expect the senior sergeant of the district to be brought in for the purpose of writing a memorandum. If you wrote a memorandum to me—and I am your senior—and if that memorandum did not quite come up to my ideas of what it should be, I would put it down to your inexperience.

61. Have you ever received a memorandum of that sort from me?—No, never. I have been treated by all the district clerks and Inspectors since I joined the Force with the utmost courtesy and consideration. I may say this also: that I was twelve months at Lawrence, ten years at Dunedin, ten years at the Lower Hutt, two at Wellington, and seven years and a half at Dannevirke, and have never been shifted so far except at my own request.

WILLIAM FOLLEY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 160.)

Witness: My name is William Folley. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Napier. I was enrolled on the 5th January, 1880, and promoted sergeant on the 1st January, 1901. Since then I have been sergeant at Dunedin for a month or two, or a very short time; then at Reefton, in charge of the sub-district; then at Hokitika, in charge. At Reefton I was nineteen months; at Hokitika a little over six years; and from Hokitika I came to Napier.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make?—Only similar to those made to the Commission in other parts of the colony. I may say this, with regard to the promotion of Chief Detectives to the rank of Sub-Inspector: I may alter my opinion, but if the present system is carried out with due regard to the Force, I see no reason to alter it. The detectives only form about 5 per cent. of the whole Force. I have not any objection personally to the Chief Detectives getting the rank of Sub-Inspector, provided they get it in proportion of the number of detectives to the whole Force or the officers of the Force. The Chief Detectives are all my juniors, so that I am not speaking so much in regard to myself, because I am almost giving up hope of further promotion; but I do not think I would be doing my duty to the service if I did not refer to the matter. I do not wish to say very much about the pay, but the detectives have a very much better class of pay than the sergeants. Sergeants and constables in charge of stations particularly have to do detective work. Good detective work is done by these sergeants and constables. This is done in those places where it is impossible to detach a detective for the work. Sometimes it is impossible to get the detectives up in time. In saying this, I do not wish to speak disparagingly of the detectives. I did not wish to come forward and give evidence, but, being here, I feel bound to refer to this matter. There is another matter that has been referred to in different places where the Commission has sat, and that is second-class railway fares for sergeants. It has been pointed

out very pertinently that in the event of a sergeant in charge of a station and a detective travelling by railway together, the detective, although really subordinate to the sergeant, can travel first class if he likes, whereas the sergeant travels second class. I think in cases of transfer saloon passages by boat should be provided. I must say that I feel it very keenly that a sergeant should have to travel steerage, or pay the difference out of his own pocket. Even the subordinate officers in the Post and Telegraph Department are granted saloon passages, whereas a man who has seen perhaps thirty years' service in the Police Force is only granted a steerage passage. I think it is degrading that a police officer should have to take his family into the steerage, or pay the difference himself, while a mere boy in another Department is granted a saloon passage, and is given 10s. a day travelling-allowance. The position of a sergeant in the Police Force is a responsible one. In making these remarks, I do not desire to reflect on the present Commissioner in the slightest degree. I am satisfied that the rate of pay to constables should be increased, and I have said so for years past. The men on the West Coast, where I have come from lately, were getting 9s. and 10s. a day as ordinary labourers, and they could always command that rate of pay. A constable only gets 7s. a day. There are certain advantages that a constable has over a labourer, but the labourer has also some advantages.

2. Do you think the smallness of the pay is causing a falling-off in the number of recruits?—I cannot say definitely, but I should think it would be so. With regard to the educational standard, to my mind the present standard is quite low enough. I think the Fifth Standard, or its equivalent, should not be lowered.

3. The question is whether the requirement as to the examination is at present operating to a certain extent as a bar to admission to the Force of suitable men?—That, of course, I could not say; that is a matter known to the head of the Department.

4. That is not so. The question is whether a reduction from the Fifth to the Fourth Standard would facilitate obtaining the services of a number of suitable men who at the present time do not present themselves because they are not up to the standard, and whether lowering the standard would impair the efficiency of the Force?—I am not in a position to say anything as to that. With regard to the educational standard, there are many things we have to do. Constables have to be Clerks of Court, Receivers of Gold Duty, Mining Registrars, Registrars of Births, Deaths, and Marriages; and these duties necessitate a certain standard of education.

5. What do you think of the physique of the Force?—My experience is that it is as good as it has been. The young fellows nowadays go in more for physical culture than they used to do. From the point of view of physique, I have had some splendid young fellows under me.

6. Do you think that the efficiency and discipline, taking it on the average, is as good now as it ever has been?—Yes, I think so.

7. What do you think of that which we have heard so much of—political and other improper influence?—I know nothing about it.

8. As to promotion, do you think that seniority and merit should count?—Seniority and merit, but not seniority alone.

9. It is suggested, having regard to the efficiency of the Force and nothing else, that when a man is considered fit by the Department to be promoted that he should be promoted, and should not be given the option of accepting or refusing it?—If the Department thinks that a man is fitted and qualified to hold a certain position, I think he should be compelled to accept it.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you not of opinion that very few men who are qualified for promotion would refuse to accept it?—Judging from my experience, I would say that most of them would take it.

11. Men to be qualified for promotion must have a considerable amount of energy?—That is so.

12. An energetic man will not remain still?—No.

13. Not if he gets a chance of being promoted?—That is so.

14. You do not know how many men we have refused because they cannot pass the Fifth Standard?—No.

15. With regard to promotion, I suppose you know that dissatisfaction has always existed?—I have not had so much experience of that, because I have been in small places, and not in the large centres.

16. You know there must be a difficulty in making promotions?—Yes, there must be considerable difficulty.

17. You know that sergeants in out-districts have a great many reports to make and a great deal of clerical work to do?—Yes.

18. Therefore you think they should have a pretty good education?—Yes.

19. That is why you think the Fifth Standard should be maintained?—Yes.

20. You admit that a constable in charge of a station, with his emoluments, is much better off than a working-man?—Yes.

21. So that they have something to look forward to in joining the service, even if they do not get promotion?—Yes; their aim is to get in charge of a country station. Most constables wish to get out to a country station if they can.

22. You suggest that the pay should be increased: do you mean for the whole service?—No.

23. How far would you go?—For the constables only.

24. *The Commissioner.*] What would you make the maximum?—I would make it 10s., starting at 8s., with an increase of 6d. a day every three years, rising to 10s.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you have not heard anything of this "special" man who has been mentioned?—No.

26. When you were in the city it was the rule for men to be in at 11 o'clock at night?—I think that is quite late enough for them to be out.

27. Unless they get leave in special cases?—Yes; it was always granted in special cases when applied for.

28. You know there have always been a few dissatisfied men in the service?—Yes.

29. Years ago as well as now?—Yes.

30. And do you not think that is the cause of the dissatisfaction—a few men being dissatisfied?—Yes; I should say it was to a very large extent.

31. *Detective Hill.*] Is there not a great difference in the hours of duty of a detective and sergeant?—My hours have been pretty well all hours.

32. I am referring to the sectional sergeants?—They do their eight hours.

33. The sectional sergeants get the same pay as you get?—Yes.

DAVID DEARLOVE HUTTON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 161.)

Witness: My name is David Dearlove Hutton. I am a police sergeant, stationed at Gisborne. I was admitted to the Force on the 13th March, 1890, and was promoted sergeant in March, 1906. I have been at Gisborne about eighteen months. Prior to that I was two years at Mount Cook, Wellington.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks you would like to make?—Yes. I would like to say that I have been brought down to this Commission, and I am only allowed a steerage passage. I have come saloon, but the difference comes out of my own pocket. I wish also to emphasize the anomalies existing between the allowances of sergeants and detectives, which I consider unfair. A detective is allowed 8s. a day, and a sergeant is only allowed 6s. a day. It frequently happens that a sergeant has to organize an expedition, and he has to arrange for horse-hire, finance the expedition, tip the grooms for any additional services, pay for horse-cloths for the horses at night, and his allowance is 6s. a day; whereas a detective's allowance is 8s. a day, and he would have nothing to do in connection with the matter except to give his evidence in the case.

2. Is the sergeant out of pocket at 6s. a day?—Undoubtedly.

3. It has been stated by the Commissioner of Police that in any case where actual expenses are paid he has always considered it?—That is so; but there is so much trouble sometimes in obtaining those expenses that it is a question whether the game is worth the candle. I am also of opinion that in transferring men from a country station, especially where there is a sea-voyage, instead of the present system of calling for the cheapest tender, the men should be enabled to secure good packing instead of cheap and nasty packing which results often in breakages and damage to furniture, and there is no chance of recouping the amount of the damage. As regards pay, I consider that both constables and sergeants should have extra pay. At the present moment I think the detective force is treated exceptionally liberally—better than the sergeants; and you cannot say that the detectives are more intelligent men than the sergeants. That is all I have voluntarily to bring before you.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say the detectives are treated more liberally than the sergeants?—I think they are.

5. Do you know the duties of a detective?—Yes; I happened to be in the detective branch myself years ago.

6. You know the incidental expenses they cannot charge?—Yes. At the time I was acting we had no extra 1s. a day, and I had to make it up myself.

7. You know from that the detectives require the extra pay?—Yes; and they subsequently got it.

8. You consider the increased pay is owing to their incidental expenses?—Yes, that may be so; but the incidental expenses are not so great as that.

9. A sergeant has not to incur incidental expenses?—Occasionally he has. Detectives may be subjected to a little more expense, but I do not think the difference is so much as is allowed for.

10. As regards travelling-expenses and saloon fares, I may tell you that that matter is being rectified at the present time. Do you know if there is any general dissatisfaction in the service?—I have always found since I joined that a certain section of men were agitating and were discontented.

11. A small section?—Yes; and if you get one of those men in a crowd he would probably be the means of increasing the trouble.

12. That has always been the trouble?—Yes.

13. And that is the cause of the present unrest?—Yes.

14. Have you had any inquiries to make about candidates for the Force?—Yes, repeatedly.

15. Are they not more strictly carried out now than they were in the past?—Yes; in fact, they are sometimes carried out in such a way as to prevent men entering the Force. I will show how. A boy leaves school, and never keeps a diary. He may do contract work, shearing, or bush-felling, and he may be one of the very best fellows you could possibly find, yet he may be unable to supply the blanks in his career since he left school, and the consequence is that he is ignored as a candidate for the Force. I know of several very worthy men who have been refused admission to the Force on that very ground.

16. If we admitted one or two of those men might there not be complaints?—Yes.

17. What is your opinion in regard to the method of promotion?—I think a man who has shown particular merit should, with seniority, receive consideration; but I do not think it is right to promote a man right off the jump for any particular action, because there might be a certain amount of luck in it; but I do think where a man has shown consistent merit extending over a number of years, merit should have priority to seniority.

18. You know there has always been a considerable amount of dissatisfaction in regard to promotion, and always will be?—Yes.

19. With regard to being in at a certain hour at night?—My experience at Mount Cook barracks was this: that a man might sometimes come in a quarter of an hour after 11 o'clock, and under ordinary circumstances I would pass him in—for instance, a young fellow might have been visiting his young lady, or taken a friend to a dance or the theatre, and the theatre might not come out till 11 o'clock.

20. He should not keep a young lady out after 11 o'clock at night, should he?—I am afraid we have all committed a breach of that rule.

21. You know nothing about influence obtaining?—I heard a great deal about it one time and another, but I cannot put my finger on it.

22. In Wellington you know there are a few discontents?—Without doubt there is a considerable amount of discontent there.

23. Have you heard of this "special" man?—I was in Wellington City and suburbs for about sixteen years and a half, and I never knew of an Inspector or Commissioner who favoured such a man, or even that such a man was in existence.

24. *Inspector Dwyer.*] You complained of being harassed in regard to your expenses?—That was not in your time.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were allowed those expenses?—Yes; the matter was submitted to the Head Office. I have seen Sergeant Dart's name repeatedly mentioned. Coming from Mount Cook, Wellington, I may say this: he was not an intimate friend of mine, but I found him an exceedingly conscientious officer, and, to my mind, you could not have a more capable man in the Force. I do not altogether agree with the system adopted at the probationary school; it is one of cram. My experience is this: that when these men come directly out of the probationary class they find that theory and practice are two different things. I have found men almost like infants so far as practice is concerned after coming from the probationary school.

Mr. Dinnie: They are not supposed to have the practical knowledge. They are supposed to have the theoretical knowledge, and acquire the practical knowledge after they come out.

The Commissioner: You cannot have the finished article in two months.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think three months would be sufficient in the probationary school?—No.

27. Do you know that the London police are well spoken of?—Yes.

28. They are only a fortnight in the probationary class. Do you not think it would interfere with recruiting—that there would not be so many candidates come forward—if the men knew they would have to remain long on probation?—It might be a block.

29. *Sergeant Cummings.*] Have you any complaints against the district clerk?—No, not at the present time; but I have heard it mentioned in various quarters that in the absence of the Inspector men have been subjected to scurrilous dirty memos from district clerks.

30. Have you had any from me?—I can take no exception to you. We have always worked amicably.

31. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish me to understand that there are districts where the district clerks write dirty scurrilous memos?—I have not had any experience of that myself, but comrades have mentioned it to me. I do not believe they were telling an untruth, and that from their standpoint the memos were scurrilous.

32. Has that been of recent date?—Not since I came into this district.

33. Any particular district?—Yes; it alluded to Napier District.

34. Were those memos signed by the Inspector or by a superior officer?—No; I understand they were signed by a clerk, in his absence.

Sergeant Cummings: That was prior to my coming here.

DENIS JOSEPH CUMMINGS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 162.)

Witness: My name is Denis Joseph Cummings. I am district clerk in the Napier office, and am a sergeant of police. I was enrolled on the 1st July, 1899, and was promoted sergeant on the 1st July, 1909.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to say anything of a general nature?—As to pay, I think a constable should start at 8s. a day, and go up by increments every three years until he reaches the maximum of 10s. a day. I think a sergeant should start at 11s. a day, and go up every two years until he reaches the same maximum as a detective's pay. A detective's pay, I think, should start at the same mark as the sergeant—11s. a day—and go up at the same rate until he reaches the maximum. A station sergeant, I think, should start at the same mark as the Chief Detective as regards pay. As to promotion, I think it should be open to all. I do not approve of a Chief Detective having special rank. When a vacancy occurs in a Sub-Inspectorship I think the promotion should be given to detectives or station sergeants on their merits. As to transfers, I think all ranks should be granted saloon fares. I have been transferred on two occasions, and have had to pay the difference between steerage and saloon fare. With reference to leave, I think after a man has served, say, four years he should get eighteen days a year, and when on holiday leave he should get a free railway pass, because when the cheap fares are on it is impossible for any member of the Force to get away at all, because they are all required for duty. If that could not be granted, I think the least that should be given is a return fare at single rate.

2. How long have you been district clerk?—Since the beginning of 1907.

3. Were you an assistant clerk in the district office?—Yes, for about seven years.

4. How long have you been in the Napier office?—Since March. I was transferred from Invercargill.

5. The question has been raised in different places as to utilising the services of assistant clerks in the district office for relieving work, so as to enable men to get off on Sundays?—I think that

would be very unfair. A man is shut up in the office all the week, and sometimes he works eight and ten hours a day. And at the end of the quarter, half-year, and year a lot of returns have to be prepared, and he has then to go back at night, and sometimes he takes work home with him. The work in the office is accumulating, and it would not be fair to ask me to do street duty, and then have to overtake the work that has accumulated in the office.

6. Have you an assistant?—He is watch-house keeper, and assists me in the office.

7. Have you been in a big centre?—I was in Wellington until I went to Invercargill.

8. You know the work in the large centres?—Yes; there has been a lot said about the rosy time of the district clerk. If I had my time over again I would never go into the district office. There is a great deal of worry attached to the position—more than outside.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You would have been better off really in charge of a station?—Much better.

10. In a pecuniary sense?—Yes.

11. And not so much trouble or worry?—No trouble at all.

12. You have been in Wellington some eight years?—Yes.

13. How long is it since you left?—I left in 1907.

14. You have heard of what has been said by Mr. Arnold in respect to what has been carried on in the barracks?—Yes.

15. Do you consider that is true?—No. It never happened during my time. If it had I should have heard something of it.

16. I suppose you know there are a few malcontents there?—Yes.

17. And do they cause any dissatisfaction in the service?—Yes; malcontents do, no matter where they are.

18. *The Commissioner.*] Are they constables?—No.

19. What does the discontent arise from?—Principally from rewards, I understand. In one particular case it was alleged that some men got rewards and others did not for practically the same service.

20. Do they become agitators over a matter of that sort?—They started it.

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have simply to kindle a fire, and it then spreads?—Yes.

22. Were they in the detective or the uniform branch?—In both.

23. It is that sort of thing that creates dissatisfaction in the service?—Yes.

24. I suppose you have seen certain letters in the Press?—Yes.

25. You do not know from what source they came?—I could not say positively who the authors were, but they come from some one in the service.

26. *Inspector Dwyer.*] What is the difference in the cost of living in Wellington, Invercargill, and Napier?—This is the dearest place I have been in. In Wellington I paid 18s. a week for a first-class four-roomed house, hot water and all conveniences, a good garden, and close to the office. In Invercargill I paid 16s. a week for a five-roomed house, all conveniences, and a quarter of an acre of land. In Napier I pay £1 a week for a five-roomed house, with a yard not sufficient for drying purposes, and no hot water or conveniences in the way of cupboards.

27. *The Commissioner.*] This is the first time I ever heard Wellington being cracked up as better than other places in the matter of rent. Where was your house?—Alongside the Basin Reserve.

28. You were lucky. What makes the rent high in Napier?—Perhaps the heavy charges of the port have something to do with it. I have no hesitation in saying that it is dearer to live in Napier than in Wellington. As regards recruiting, I think the inquiries made are very exhaustive. In fact, I have heard complaints that the inquiries have gone too far; at any rate, they are very exhaustive.

29. *Mr. Dinnie.*] More so than they have ever been before?—Yes, very much more than when I joined. When I joined there was very little inquiry.

30. Then, the statement made by Mr. Arnold is not accurate in that respect?—Not so far as colonials are concerned.

31. *The Commissioner.*] To what do you attribute the falling-off in the number of recruits?—The pay is only 7s. 6d. a day, and a man can do much better outside. 7s. 6d. a day is far too low, and then a man's superannuation payment has to come out of that.

32. You think it is absolutely essential, if we are to keep up the standard of the Force, that the pay should be raised?—Yes.

33. *Detective Hill.*] Before you got your promotion you received 1s. a day clerical allowance. Since then you have got the 1s. a day?—Yes.

34. Your position now is equal to that of a detective with eight years' service as far as pay is concerned?—I do not think so. My pay is not equal to yours, and you have not got eight years' service.

35. *Sergeant Folley.*] If the detective is singled out for a sergeant's commission, how about all the other sergeants? Should their pay be raised to 12s.?—Yes.

36. And the detective be raised to what?—15s.

37. There is, then, a difference of 3s. a day?—Yes; it is too much.

38. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But there is the question of free rent, the sergeant having a free house?—Yes, but he is only one of many.

39. But all these sergeants in charge of stations have free houses?—Yes.

40. *Detective Hill.*] Sergeant Folley singles you out as one of the district clerks. Do you know what the sergeants in the Commissioner's office receive?—No.

41. Do you know that they receive another 1s. a day more than you do?—I cannot say they do. When I was in the Wellington office the clerks in the Commissioner's office were paid from the Wellington office, and they got the same as I do now.

WILLIAM EDWARD HILL, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 163.)

Witness: I am a detective, stationed at Napier; and I was enrolled in 1897, and appointed detective in 1905.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to say?—It is in connection with the appointments from Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector. I do not think our branch of the service is sufficiently strong to warrant Sub-Inspectors, detective sergeants, and detective constables being appointed, but the gate should be left open to us to go forward to the rank of Sub-Inspector.

2. It has been opened by the appointment of Chief Detective McGrath, and it is not likely to be closed again?—During the last thirty years only two detectives have been appointed to the commissioned ranks—Messrs. O'Brien and McGrath. There are thirty-six detectives and eighteen acting-detectives for the whole colony, and I consider them, as far as the detection of crime is concerned, the backbone of the service. Fully 50 per cent. of the arrests throughout the Dominion for crimes involving dishonesty are effected by the detectives. Many a time the detective has extra responsibility thrown upon his shoulders, and I think he should be paid accordingly. The travelling-allowance of 8s. a day is also insufficient, as it costs us 10s. a day to live when away from home, and very often you have to put your hand into your pocket and pay for information. This may have to be done in such a way that you cannot apply for a refund of the money. I advocate detectives being granted saloon passages when not travelling on escort duty. As far as the educational test is concerned, I see it was suggested at Palmerston North that the Fourth Standard certificate would be sufficient. Well, in the Railway Department I understand that no one is accepted unless he has passed the Sixth Standard. The police should be fairly well educated, and I consider the Fourth Standard test is really too low.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think that we might lose a good many of the farming class by introducing the Fifth Standard?—I do not know. The majority of country lads are fairly well educated. Sometimes a young fellow when he leaves school goes away back farming, and has no opportunities for further education, but he may subsequently apply for admission, and may make a good constable.

4. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service as regards the present control?—No, sir; I cannot say that I do.

5. Do you approve of the present system of promotions?—Yes; of course, you will always have discontent.

6. Where were you before here?—Dunedin.

7. Do you know anything of that "special" man we were told about in Dunedin?—No, I cannot say that I do.

8. Nor since you came here?—There were a lot of "special" men when I came here first, but not in connection with your office.

9. Not in connection with me?—No; I think they have been weeded out now.

10. *The Commissioner.*] It must have been in a very bad state, this district?—It was when I came here first.

11. Was there considerable trouble?—Yes; a lot of discontent.

12. Until certain changes were made?—Yes. Things are very different now. It is now one of the best districts in the colony.

13. Do you know anything about the inquiries made about candidates?—That matter does not come under my notice.

14. *Inspector Dwyer.*] What is your experience of the cost of living here, and house-rent, as compared with other places you have been in—Christchurch and Dunedin?—In Dunedin I paid 14s. a week for five rooms. A good house here is £1 a week, and you might get one at 18s. The cost of living here is fully 25 per cent. more than it is in Dunedin.

15. *The Commissioner.*] What do you attribute that to?—They say it is owing to our harbour dues, but I do not know that they should make a difference of 3d. a pound on soap and 3½d. a pound on candles as compared with Otago.

16. *Inspector Dwyer.*] Then, you lived at Christchurch?—I did. I paid 14s. for a new five-roomed house in Christchurch, with a good garden attached, and close to the station; and the 18s. house here would not be equal to the 14s. one in Christchurch.

17. *Sergeant Cummings.*] Do you ever get any complaints against any of the district clerks?—Not at all.

18. Have you ever, during the absence of the Inspector, received a memorandum written by me to which you took exception?—No, I have not. I have been treated with every courtesy.

JOHN DWYER, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 164.)

Witness: I joined the Police Force in November, 1878, and was promoted to the then-existing rank of acting-sergeant in 1887. In 1902 I was promoted to Sub-Inspector, and on the 1st February this year I was promoted to the rank of Inspector, and am now in charge of this district.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make on the matters coming within the scope of this Commission?—The pay of recruits has been discussed, and I certainly think that it has not been sufficient to induce the right class of men to join. In my travels I have met men who would have made good constables, and have spoken to them on the subject, but they have told me that they could do better out of the service. I think that is one of the chief reasons why so few are coming forward. Men working for the Corporation sweeping the streets get 9s. a day. In the London Metropolitan Police and the Royal Irish Constabulary the pay of a constable is equal to that of the mechanic, but here it is not equal to that of the labourer. If it were equal to the mechanic's wage, the police would get from 12s. to 14s. a day.

2. What do you think about the standard of education?—I think it can be lowered excepting in very special cases, and that should be left to the Inspector. If a man could not produce the Fourth Standard certificate, if he fulfilled the necessary requirements in all other branches, and he was a likely man, the certificate might be waived in respect to the Fifth Standard.

3. Of course, you agree from your long experience that there are a number of men occupying good positions to-day who could not pass the Fourth Standard?—Yes; they have made good policemen. I know men who by hard work and application have made themselves useful after four or five years.

4. Would you have any period of probation after the men pass through the probationary school, and before they are enrolled?—I would give them six months before deciding to retain their services. That would be time enough to ascertain if they were the right class of men. We have a regulation now that if a man proves a "waster" he is turned out, and I have followed out that practice, excepting on one occasion, when we got leave to shift him.

5. With regard to inquiries by yourself as Inspector, are you in favour of power being given to the Inspectors to take evidence on oath?—I always favoured that.

6. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—Yes; by virtue of my office.

7. You have been sworn in?—No.

Mr. Dinnie: You are not a Justice of the Peace at present?

Witness: I signed a document swearing in a constable. I think there is a regulation in the *Gazette* of 1871 empowering Inspectors, by virtue of their office, to take declarations.

The Commissioner: I would swear those men in again if I were you. I am absolutely certain that no man can be a Justice of the Peace, or act as such, until he has been duly sworn in by warrant appointed by the Governor.

8. Do you know anything about the clerks in the district offices?—I regard the district clerk as being the next responsible person in the district to the Inspector. There must be a trustworthy man in the office. He has charge of the accounts, and the handling of all moneys—the pay, and everything else. He has to treat everything that passes through his hands in a confidential manner, and I have heard it suggested that he should go out on the streets.

9. Not the district clerks?—Well, then, the assistant clerks.

10. Yes?—I do not approve of that at all. If we put them on on a Sunday it takes all the heart out of their work. They then look on themselves as rouseabouts. I have had some experience as a district clerk myself, and it was tried with me. I was sent out on the streets, and I resented the matter, and looked upon it as lowering to my position to be put into uniform, and I asked to be sent back to the streets altogether. The question was referred to the head, and I was never again asked to go into uniform on a Sunday. The clerks are not only here in office-hours, but after hours, and the district clerk is of great assistance to the Inspector.

11. You are in favour of making the district clerks sergeants after a certain period of service?—That has been the custom.

12. Do you think that it is the proper thing to do—to appoint these men as sergeants, or to give them special consideration, for the extra service they are called upon to perform?—I am afraid it has induced a little discontent in the service, and, for the sake of promoting harmony in all ranks, it would be better to give them a special allowance, instead of making them sergeants. When these men are promoted the men who become juniors to them are dissatisfied, and always have a grievance.

13. With regard to giving time off after attending Court after night duty, have you had any difficulty about that matter?—If the man applied for it I have always given him the time off for the time he put in in Court if in the afternoon, but in the mornings he never got it, and never asked for it.

14. Have you any opinions on the question of the promotion of detectives?—I think the channels of promotion should be open to the detectives the same as to the commissioned branch. Promotion should be through ability and merit. As to the suggestion that the Sub-Inspector should be graded as the Chief Detective, I am not in favour of such an absurd proposal. I think the Chief Detective is the proper grade, and they should be satisfied with it; and in their turn for promotion, if they have the ability, they should not be barred from the higher ranks of the service.

15. You have had to do with centres since the appointment of station sergeants: what is your opinion as to the efficiency of station sergeants?—I was never much struck with the proposal. I think if the Sub-Inspector had a useful clerk it would prevent a lot of this circumlocution in regard to correspondence, and that kind of thing, and it would be more beneficial to the discipline of the service. If we had a useful man who entered up the records, and gave minor orders, I think it would be a safer thing.

16. You know the duties of station sergeants have never been defined?—I know that. I asked on one occasion that they should be defined, and I was told that regulations were to be issued, but it has not been done.

17. Do you think it is necessary to do that?—I do indeed, because very often the Sub-Inspector might be looking to the station sergeant to carry out a certain duty, and the Sub-Inspector would be held responsible by the Inspector, and when the matter was looked into it was found that there was no binding regulation.

18. What is the number of the Force in your district?—The district comprises twenty-four stations, and the strength is forty-nine men, ten men being in Napier—one sergeant, a district clerk, a detective, and six constables.

19. Is your district a handy one?—It extends from Woodville to the East Cape, and is about three hundred miles in length. We go into the Auckland District at one point, but we work it because it is more handy for us.

20. You cannot suggest any alteration, having regard to greater efficiency?—No; it is an easy district now. From Gisborne north is under the control of Sergeant Hutton; Dannevirke is under Sergeant Cruickshank; Hastings under Sergeant Smart; and the Napier sub-district is under Sergeant Folley.

21. What is the general conduct of the men under your control?—I have been now in charge twelve months, and, with very few exceptions, I have found the men very well conducted indeed.

22. There will always be bad ones?—I have not a bad one in this district.

23. How did you find it when you came here?—There was some trouble here on two or three occasions.

24. But that has been rectified?—Yes; and the men who have been causing the trouble have been transferred, or have left the service. Things are going very well now.

25. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction with regard to promotions, apart from the district clerks?—I have heard of dissatisfaction among the men who are passed over. They know their own capabilities perhaps better than the Inspector does. But there is one thing regarding the system of promotion from the ranks to sergeant I never approved of. A man who was perhaps two hundred junior to men over him is promoted to-day, and in six months' time the man who has been passed over is promoted. I say that once a man has been passed over, unless there are some exceptional services or reasons, he should not be looked at again. I mean that there should be no retrospection of the list. Once a man is passed over, and has lost his seniority, he should stay there, excepting something has happened in the meantime—some meritorious act of duty—to justify his promotion. When these men are promoted they have always a grievance, because they say their juniors were passed over their heads, and they become their seniors for all time. The Inspectors submit a list of the men they consider suitable for promotion, and when the promotions are made they should be made from that list, in the order of seniority as recommended by the Inspector, because the Inspectors have a perfect knowledge of the men they are recommending, and are consequently best able to judge of their ability.

26. Is there anything improper in the way in which district clerks treat the men and sergeants in your absence?—I have never heard a complaint, and I was rather surprised at Sergeant Smart to-day making the reference he did to that matter, because I am not aware that such a thing was in the sergeant's mind at all. I have never any impertinent memorandum written by a district clerk that I am aware of.

Sergeant Smart: I did not say an impertinent letter.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Is there anything in the statement?—I say I never saw an impertinent memorandum written by a district clerk that I am aware of. The district clerk has charge of the correspondence, and he knows better what to do with it than the sergeant, who is brought into the office simply to sign his name. Of course, the sergeant assumes the responsibility the moment he signs his name. And it is the same in my case—I take all responsibility when I sign the letters. The clerk must write a lot of memoranda and correspondence, because the Inspector has not time to do it. The routine correspondence is generally managed by the district clerk.

28. Have you any views about the length of time men should be allowed to remain in charge of stations?—I do not know that I have. It entirely depends on the individuals. I think some men should be transferred after a time, while other men are always useful at a station. They go heart and soul into their work. With regard to the promotion of sergeants, I think, too, that before they are promoted they should be medically examined. I have two or three cases now in view—I pointed them out to Mr. Dinnie before—of sergeants who I think should have been medically examined before they were appointed. I think so still. I have had men under me who were very deaf, and could not hear. These are the men I am referring to now.

29. With regard to the case of Constable Torr, what sort of a man is he?—He is an excellent man, and gives every satisfaction. He has a good grasp of his work, and he is a most useful man amongst the Natives. He is the second constable at Wairoa. The constable in charge is in hospital. Constable Torr is doing all the work, and his services are invaluable.

30. How would you treat his case now?—I would accede to his request, and place him on the permanent staff. He has been eight or nine years in the service, and we could not do without him at Wairoa. I recommended him for the special rise he got, and the same remark applies to the constable at Gisborne—Constable Pratt. I know one or two little things about him, but I would not condemn him for that.

31. I saw some correspondence in connection with the constable that did not impress me?—Perhaps I know what you are referring to. He was then trying to save a fellow-constable.

32. He has no right to do that at the expense of truth?—I thought at the time he was telling an untruth.

33. What about Constable Torr? Apparently he has a clean record, but I would not say that about the other man?—The latter simply said a thing he had no right to say, but he is a very useful man, and a very intelligent constable.

34. If a constable does not tell the truth he places his Inspector and the Commissioner in a very difficult position, and prevents abuses being dealt with frequently?—That is all that has happened to him.

35. Otherwise you think he is a good man?—Yes. He has been there over twelve months, and he does a lot of good work. Perhaps you would like to ask Sergeant Hutton about him.

Sergeant Hutton: His character is most exemplary, and he is one of the best constables I have got. I only wish the pakehas were as good as the half-castes.

36. *The Commissioner.*] You think he is entitled to promotion as well as Torr?—I do.

37. It strikes me that Constable Torr's case is rather a strong one for consideration?—Yes; I think the same way

38. But would a man like Pratt be fit to be placed in charge of a station?—Yes; he is intelligent and honest in his work. Torr has had charge of a station for four or five years, but it was closed and another station opened; and then Torr was brought into Wairoa to assist the constable there, who is Clerk of the Court.

39. What arrangement has been made at Wairoa for the Clerk of the Court?—The constable is appointed Clerk, and Torr is acting for the one who is ill.

40. *Mr. Dinnie.*] And untruthfulness is a very serious matter as regards police duties, especially as regards giving evidence in Court?—I would view it as a lot more serious than the matter we have been discussing. I would have no consideration for a man who told an untruth in Court.

41. Is he a half-caste?—A quarter-caste. When he was asked to give evidence he said he did not see the horse-racing at all.

42. After considerable investigation we were misled for a considerable time?—Yes, and we might have been misled now if we had not gone into it again.

43. With regard to promotions, I suppose you believe in seniority and merit combined being considered?—I do, and I believe in merit first.

44. Supposing you had two men—one with fourteen years' service and another with twenty years', both being forty-five years of age: the man with the fourteen years' service is the best qualified: would you not promote him, although the senior man may be fit for sergeant?—I would promote the man best qualified, but when doing so I would not again look at the man who was passed over.

45. Not even if he were qualified for sergeant?—No; if a man is qualified to-day he is qualified in six months' time, and should be promoted.

46. I agree with you, but supposing he has not been promoted and you are put in that position, and he is fit for promotion?—I would promote him, and leave the junior man to wait a little longer.

47. Even if the latter was specially qualified?—I would so.

48. That would not be studying merit?—It would, because he is getting his turn later on. You are doing an injustice to the man passed over, and he will always keep that in mind.

49. But that man who is promoted is fit for sergeant and nothing more, while the junior man may be fit for something more?—That may be so.

50. So that there is something to be said on both sides?—I would stick to the rule, and once a man is passed over I would not look at him again.

51. But supposing that man has been passed over before I came here?—I am not speaking from that point of view at all.

52. But that is the difficulty in dealing fairly with these men?—That is the difficulty, but I think it could be overcome by sticking to the list of seniority men recommended by the Inspectors.

53. Once we get a start in that way we can continue?—Yes.

54. But, still, there always will be dissatisfaction notwithstanding?—Yes, and always has been during the whole time I have been in the service.

55. You know the Inspectors send in recommendations for men fit to be sergeants, and to be in charge of stations, and to be clerks, and men fit for plain-clothes duty, and mounted work?—Yes.

56. And it is on these recommendations that the selections are made probably?—Yes.

57. You do not know of any deviation from them?—I cannot speak of that well.

58. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service caused by the present control?—There will always be discontented individuals in the Police Force. I have found them all along the line. I have found men who were discontented from the time they joined.

59. But I mean general dissatisfaction as regards the control. I did not mean about promotions and other little matters?—I do not know of any.

60. Do you know of any case where influence has obtained?—I have heard a lot about it, but I cannot say I have ever met it.

61. It is said there are a number of men in the service now who have been promoted, but who could not pass the Fourth Standard. You know the requirements of candidates now?—Yes. About twenty-four have passed through my hands during the last twelve months, and the inquiries into the characters of these men have been exhaustive. In the olden days all that was wanted was a recommendation from a member of Parliament, or from some other respectable member of the community, and the man was appointed without any further inquiries.

62. You say the duties of station sergeants have not yet been defined?—No.

63. Do you know that the Inspectors sent in recommendations as to what the station sergeants should do?—I think that was done some time after your appointment. I asked for the duties of station sergeants when one was sent to me, and I was told that the regulations were soon to be issued.

64. Do you know that they were told to follow out their recommendations for the time being until the regulations were framed?—There was some understanding to that effect, but it was not definite enough for me.

65. It was rather difficult to define every little duty they had to perform?—The general duties should be defined.

66. You know the station sergeant prosecutes in several cases?—Yes.

67. You suggest that the clerk should be put there: would it do for the clerk to prosecute?—I did not say he should occupy the position of station sergeant. The Sub-Inspector should be relieved of all the clerical work, and he would be more about with the men; and the clerk could take messages to the sergeant in charge of that station, for instance.

68. Do I understand that the Sub-Inspector is greatly relieved by the station sergeant at the present time—at least, in some cities?—It must be so. What I complained about most was the circumlocution of correspondence.

69. I am afraid we cannot prevent a good deal of that?—The station sergeant is a very useful man, and does a lot of useful work in the cities; but there is a lot of useless correspondence.

70. You approve of the detectives having the opportunity of going into uniform if they are qualified for promotion?—I do. I think the channels of promotion should be open to all by merit, but I view with disapproval the suggestion that Chief Detectives should be made Sub-Inspectors. I think the detective staff is too small.

71. And if they were made Sub-Inspectors they would want promotion to Inspectors straight away?—Yes.

72. You do not believe in the clerks going out to perform outside duty?—I do not.

73. It would interfere with their clerical work?—I think so.

74. You know there is a regulation providing that men should be in at 11 o'clock at night?—I am in favour of that, unless on some special occasions. If a man applied for midnight leave he would always get it. I do not believe in a man remaining out after 11 o'clock, because he is doing no good.

75. As regards the efficiency of the service, is it equally as good as it has been?—I think it is as good now as it has been in years gone by.

76. *The Commissioner.*] When a man commits small breaches of discipline, and gets the reputation of not being as efficient as he should be, would you keep him in the locality and deal with him, or would you transfer him?—If he were a useless man I would certainly take some steps to remove him from the service altogether.

77. Here are the names of two men who seem to be a considerable trouble at times. Do you know them [names handed to witness]?—I know them well.

78. What would you do with those men?—It is hard to say. If you shift them on to another station they would be the same block there.

79. Is it not better to keep them in the same place, but under control?—They are both given to drink.

80. What would you do with them?—After giving them two or three cautions, if they did not show amendment, I would certainly remove them.

81. How many cautions do you suppose they have had?—Each of them received several cautions when I was in Christchurch.

82. Do you think it acts as a good example to keep men like those in the Force?—It tends to affect all the other men, because they see that these men can do things with impunity, and still be retained in the service.

83. Do you know Constable Leahy?—I have known him many years. I think I knew his family in the Old Country, too.

84. Apparently in some way or another he has been overlooked. What would you do with a man like that?—Now he has turned fifty.

85. Fifty-three?—He has gone beyond the age-limit. Is he anxious to get promotion?

86. I think so. He feels it very acutely?—To make amends for what has been done, I would give him a station.

87. You know nothing to disqualify him?—I have a high opinion of him, and have wondered why he was not promoted. I would give him charge of a station in the same way as Sergeant Smart.

88. You think there was no ground for questioning Constable Leahy's qualifications?—None whatever. He is a very decent man, a capable man, and one who looked after himself. He is a good stamp of a man, too.

89. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When do you consider he should have been promoted if he had taken his turn?—I suppose, years ago.

90. And probably one or two other heads of the Department have overlooked him?—Yes.

91. If he had felt it so very much, do you not think he would have reported it?—Leahy is a different tempered man to that. He is quite unassuming.

92. You do not want quiet men in charge of other men, but energetic and active men?—I know that, quite well; but he has said to me himself, "If the Department does not see that I am deserving of promotion, I am not going to bother them."

93. Is it not usual in such cases for application to be made to the Department?—Yes.

94. *Detective Hill:* Do you think the time has arrived to revise the Police Regulations?

Mr. Dinnie: They are being revised.

Detective Hill: At present they are obsolete, and there are a number of circulars that are out of date.

95. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think you have a copy, Mr. Dwyer?—I have not seen it yet.

96. *Sergeant Folley.*] Do you not think that many duties are thrown on the police in respect to work for other Departments that really do not pertain to our work?—I do not see how we can get out of it.

97. There is the Education Department, which has been referred to by Sub-Inspector Phair. I refer to inquiries in respect to ex-inmates of the schools?—That is another duty we cannot get rid of. We have now duties imposed on us by Departments that were not imposed on us in years gone by.

98. *The Commissioner.*] You think that the Departments should properly credit the Police Department for the work done for them?—Yes, as the work of other Departments takes up a lot of our time.

DAVID DEARLOVE HUTTON, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 165.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] With regard to Constable Pratt: his application is on the same lines as Constable Torr's: what sort of a man is he?—He is an exceedingly well-behaved man, steady and sure; one of the best men I have.

2. Is he a man of principle?—Of excellent principle.

3. How do you account for a man telling lies?—I took him to task about the matter, and he said, "Actually, sergeant, I was speaking the truth; I did not see the horse-racing": and, to my mind, his story was correct.

4. You think he would have an equal claim with Constable Torr for special consideration?—I do.

5. Would he be able to take charge?—I think, if he were put in charge of one of the country stations, where a large percentage of the population were Maoris, he would make an excellent man. I think he is now forty-three.

Mr. Dinnie: These two district constables are very good men, and they are specially treated because they are very good men. As soon as the pension scheme is arranged I dare say they could be transferred.

Sergeant Smart: The remark I made about the district clerks seems to have created a wrong impression, and I wish to remove it. I did not make any complaint. The Commissioner mentioned his own clerk, but that gentleman has been in the service a very long time, and has gained experience; but when you have a man who has been in the service only three or four years, and he goes into the district office and starts writing memos, I think that should be stopped. The memos should be written by the senior sergeant in charge.

JOSEPH ALDOUS RAYNES examined on oath. (No. 166.)

Witness: I am a bailiff at the Stipendiary Magistrate's Court, Napier. I have been in the Police Force. I was transferred from the Permanent Militia to the police in 1897. I resigned in July, 1903, and rejoined again in November, 1904. I was transferred to the Justice Department last year. I have a few suggestions to make, as the result of my experience in the Force, that might prove of benefit, and I have written them down under different headings. My statement is as follows:—

Regulations.—The regulations are in urgent need of being brought up to date.

Police Guide.—This book, which is part of a constable's appointment, and a very necessary part of it, is practically useless as far as the service in this Dominion is concerned. It should be a local production, applying entirely to hints for the guidance of constables, and a reproduction of those statutes which come almost in daily use by the police; and on similar lines to Shortland's Guide, giving quoted cases.

Wanted on Warrant.—All police officers from the rank of sergeant should be supplied with a book, properly ruled and printed off, with columns representing those in the *Police Gazette*, so that each constable would practically have a *Police Gazette* in his pocket. Such a book would tend to greater efficiency and a higher percentage of arrest of those persons required on warrant. I make bold and say that not 25 per cent. of the whole Police Force could tell their superiors the names and descriptions of persons wanted on warrant. Such a condition of things must reflect on the organization of the service. Further, such a condition is manifestly unfair to the public generally, as a very high percentage of persons are wanted on warrant for maintenance; and any neglect regarding speedy arrest does cause untold hardship on women and children, who are mostly the sufferers. I had such a book as I suggest printed and bound in Napier, which cost 17s. 6d. The price seems excessive, but it must be understood that only one copy was required, and the setting-up of same was as troublesome as if set up for five thousand. A book of this description could be produced for a trifle, and the results would be enormous.

Standard of Education.—The standard of education cannot, in my opinion, be too high. I am of opinion that something higher than the Fifth Standard is necessary. This is an age when the service should and the public do expect something more than main strength and stupidity. When it is considered that a very high percentage of the service are in charge of out-stations, and the officers in charge of such out-stations are saddled with all the responsible positions pertaining to out-stations, having to prosecute cases against learned counsel, I maintain that a high standard of education is absolutely essential; and, moreover, if the standard was higher I do not think the service would be confronted with episodes which have taken place of recent years, such episodes being a disgrace to any service. I do not expect that a high standard of education will be advocated by many of the officers, as if there is a higher standard of education among the rank and file of the service, it necessarily follows that the officers will require a still higher standard of education to command the respect of the rank and file. No subordinate can possibly respect an officer of inferior ability and education to himself. My experience has convinced me that some officers do not command the respect of the men, and for the very reason stated. The only way, in my opinion, to obviate such a possibility is that all officers should qualify by examination, and that every man with a service of ten years and over should be allowed to sit for such examination. Then only the most fitted would survive, and the seniority bogey would find a suitable grave. Seniority by all means when all other things are equal. In other branches of the public service examination is compulsory for advancement. Why not the police? All credit is due to Commissioner Dinnie for introducing the examinations as regards the rank and file; but I am of opinion that it should be compulsory. As it is at present, few avail themselves of the opportunity. The benefits to be derived from preparation for such examinations are helpful in a high degree. It compels reading up the statutes, and at the same time gives the men confidence in themselves, and better fits them for the responsible position in life they have chosen—namely, a police officer.

I feel assured that if the examination affected a man's pay there would be but few who would not present themselves. I think the key to an intelligent Police Force is education, and education as high as you can get it.

Inoperative Officers.—By inoperative officers, I refer to the officers holding the rank of Sub-Inspectors and clerks, and district clerks holding the rank of sergeants. To take the clerks in the Commissioner's office first, I am of opinion that not one in the Commissioner's office should be a member of the Police Force. Or, I would go further, and say that not a member of the Commissioner's staff should ever have had any connection with the Police Force. The staff, in my opinion, should be composed entirely of disinterested men. The Commissioner's office should be above suspicion; and so long as it is filled with police officers, they have the opportunity of trying, when opportunity offers, of endeavouring to influence the Commissioner in matters that may be detrimental to some person. The Sub-Inspector in that office takes too much upon himself with regard to minuting correspondence during the Commissioner's absence from Wellington. I am of opinion that during the Commissioner's absence from Wellington the Inspector having charge of the district should take temporary control. The district clerks should have some special grade, with pay equal to that of a sergeant.

Formation of a Board.—I am of opinion that a Board is an imperative adjunct to the police, such Board to consist of at least one Supreme Court Judge. To place the destiny of nearly a thousand men in the hands of one man—namely, the Commissioner of Police—who is an ever-changing quantity, is something appalling, and cannot possibly tend to the efficiency of the service. Constable Leahy's neglected promotion would appear to bear out this contention in a very marked degree.

Promotion.—Promotions should be by examination, and examination only, to produce men that would be an ornament to any service. In a conversation with the late Commissioner Tunbridge on the vexed question of promotion, he said that if he had his way and a man was not promoted with fifteen years' service he never would be. In this I concur. For instance, say a man is promoted at thirty-one years of age: he is promoted to a sergeant with fifteen years' service: he is then forty-six years of age, almost past the prime of life—at any rate, past the prime of life to go back and do street duty, especially the strenuousness of night duty—and what hope has that man of ever reaching any higher position? He cannot, for the simple reason that age will bar him. I hold that every man in the service should have the opportunity of holding the highest position in the service; and, further, I hold that the Commissioner of Police should be made from a member of the service, some of whom are, in my opinion, as capable as any person that can be imported (Scotland Yard included). I do not cast any reflection on imported officers, but the conditions of Home and colonial service are as different as night is from day. It would be a fitting recompense to our own officers, after devoting their whole life to the service. It is only fair that they should be allowed to occupy the highest position that the service can bestow.

Pay.—The pay is too low, and out of all proportion to the cost of living. More especially is this so in the remote out-stations, where the cost of transit of goods is so high. A man with a family under such conditions is on the verge of insolvency all the time. I regret to say that I have experienced this condition of things myself, and then not in a remote out-station; so what must it be for those who are so situated? The pay should be at the very lowest estimate that of a labourer; and I may inform the Commission that the local borough employees receive 9s. a day for an eight-hour day, while 50 per cent. of the Police Force would average fourteen hours a day. Something more than a living-wage should be paid; and there should be a more liberal issue of uniform. By that I refer to boots.

Holidays.—The number of yearly holidays should be increased to at least twenty-one days, with a railway concession—say, half excursion rate. It is absurd to expect a free pass when all other branches of the public service would clamour for the same privilege. Saloon passages should be given when travelling by steamer on transfer.

Prohibition Areas.—After considerable experience in charge of a prohibited area, I am in a position to know the disabilities a constable works under compared with those men doing duty in the city or licensed areas. I would suggest that a special rate of pay should obtain to men in charge of such areas, and I concur with Inspector O'Brien that the Inspector should have the right of selection of officers for those particular areas. That was precisely the position the late Inspector Pardy took up with regard to my appointment to Balclutha.

Sly-grog Detection.—I would suggest that the Chairman of this Commission, in his findings, should weigh carefully the system of detecting sly-grog sellers, more particularly that which refers to a constable just transferred permanently to a town, and who is immediately set to detect local sly-grog sellers. In consequence of the position he is in the constable is a marked man, his life in that particular district being almost unbearable. And his wife and family also suffer. In my opinion, no person on permanent transfer should be sent to do such work. A stranger should be sent, who would, of course, leave immediately his work was completed. When a man is sent to do this work, and remains a constable in the town afterwards, his usefulness is impaired to a very great extent, and his life is made a misery.

Delays of Correspondence.—There is much delay caused through having to send correspondence through a sergeant. As an example, take Waipawa, thirty-nine miles from Napier: all correspondence from that station has to pass through the sergeant in charge at Hastings, causing unnecessary delay; and the procedure seems absurd.

Renumbering the Police.—The Force requires renumbering, this not having been done for years.

Unattractive.—Little or no interest seems to be taken in the men. The library books are old, and not the class of books the men require. They are practically debarred from all forms of sport. They certainly have a billiard-table in some of the centres, but something more attractive is

required. Lectures might with advantage be given on law. The time is ripe when the service should have a monthly paper of its own. All forms of healthy out-door sports should be encouraged. Recreation taken in moderation would be conducive to the best interests of the service.

I would like to add that I think a better form of discharge should be given to men leaving the service. The present form that is given is worthless—is absolutely of no use as a reference. I think in form it should be similar to an ordinary business reference.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is there anything else you wish to say?—I would like you to peruse the correspondence in reference to my case. I do not consider that I received justice. If you peruse the papers, that will satisfy me. A perusal of the correspondence will support my suggestion that Sub-Inspector Wright's power in minuting correspondence should be curtailed. Such matters should be left over till the Commissioner's return to Wellington, or be dealt with by the Inspector.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are the views you have put forward your own?—Yes.

3. You are quite sure?—Yes.

4. You have had no communication with any one with respect to any of the points?—No.

5. They coincide with the views of another party?—No one but myself had anything to do with them.

6. When did you join the service?—March, 1896.

7. I mean, join the police service?—February, 1897.

8. When did you leave?—1903.

9. When did you join again?—November, 1904.

10. And leave?—Twelve months last June I joined the Court.

11. You made a convenience of the service?—Not exactly.

12. You did not stay long in it?—I spent ten or eleven years in it altogether.

13. You were treated all right: you were placed in charge of a station?—I do not complain about that at all. In fact, I have no complaints whatever. The only complaint I have is that I do not consider that I had justice with regard to the matter I have referred to.

14. How is it that you take such an interest in the Department?—Because I devoted all my time to it, and all my interest was put into it.

15. Even when you left it?—I do not take any interest in it now.

16. You take very great interest as regards giving evidence?—I am giving the benefit of my experience.

17. Your experience is very short?—Ten or eleven years.

18. Ten or eleven years only, and as a constable?—And as an acting-detective.

19. You did not turn out very well at detective work?—I never had a chance.

20. Why?—I was sent to detect sly-grog selling.

21. Did the Inspector recommend you for detective work?—I do not know.

22. Do you think he would have recommended you, seeing how you carried out your duties?—I do not think any fault could be found with the way I carried out my duties.

23. The files will show, no doubt. You consider the pay should be raised?—If it can be, I think it should.

24. *The Commissioner.*] At present we are faced with the difficulty of getting any men at all?—I maintain that if you pay the men better you will get better men.

25. There would be a wider selection?—Yes.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If we raised the standard to the Sixth or Seventh we would not get the men?—I think you would.

The Commissioner: There is no use raising it too high.

Mr. Dinnie: We think of reducing it, really.

27. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You are quite sure these are all your own opinions?—I am positive.

Detective Hill: Do you consider the pay of an acting-detective sufficient?—No. Every branch of the service is underpaid, and underpaid shockingly.

GEORGE PRATT, Native Constable. (No. 167.)

This statement was accepted by the Commission as evidence, and is referred to in Constable Torr's evidence:—

Police Station, Gisborne, 14th August, 1909.

REPORT of Native Constable George Pratt, relative to the Police Commission, to be held at Napier.

I respectfully report that I joined the Police Force as Native constable in December, 1899, and was stationed in Rotorua until June, 1907, when I was transferred to Gisborne. From 1902 or 1903 I have been doing the same duties of an ordinary constable, in addition to which I interpret in police cases and also Native inquiries. As I am given to understand that Native constables cannot be given charge of country stations, I would respectfully ask that the Department could see their way to give me a number, and place me on the strength as a registered constable, with that object in view. In support of the above, I quote Constable F. Woods, half-caste, registered constable in charge of Foxton; Constable McAllister, registered constable doing duty at Napier; and Constable W. Niell, registered constable doing duty at Rotorua. I would also respectfully ask that Sergeant Hutton be allowed, on my behalf, to bring the above matter before the Royal Commission at Napier.

Sergeant Hutton, Gisborne.

GEORGE PRATT, Native Constable.

AUCKLAND, TUESDAY, 24TH AUGUST, 1909.

SAMUEL THOMPSON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 168.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Dargaville, and appear as a delegate for the constables of the Auckland District. I was enrolled in January, 1898, and appointed to the charge of a station eight years ago. The first matter I wish to bring before the Commission is the question of the pay of the men. We are unanimously of opinion that the pay on joining should be at least 8s. a day, rising by increments of 6d. a day at three-yearly periods to 10s. We also think that the house-allowance for married constables is too small, as house-rent is very high. The allowance should be raised to 1s. 6d. a day. It is now 1s. The average rental in Auckland paid by married constables ranges from 12s. to 15s. a week, and in some cases it is as high as 17s. 6d. a week. We are of opinion that constables when on transfer should be granted saloon passages. Many feel travelling in the steerage so unpleasant that they pay the difference themselves and go saloon. We also think that the annual leave is not sufficient; it should be at least eighteen days a year, and should be allowed to accumulate for three years, to give time for men to visit friends in Australia or in the far parts of the Dominion.

1. *The Commissioner.*] It would strengthen your case if you could cite any difference in the leave granted in the Police Force and in the case of other large bodies of the public service, such as the gaol warders?—I have not got that information.

2. You ought to have it: it would strengthen your case very much?—Probably some of the other constables will have it. We also ask that we should be granted one day per month leave from duty. That is the system followed in the Australian Forces. We would like it on Sunday for preference. We also ask for free uniforms. At present we are supplied with the cloth, but have to pay for the making of it up.

3. What is the average cost of making-up in this district?—About £2 10s.

4. Do you include boots in the uniform?—Yes; we ask for two pairs a year, or an allowance in lieu thereof. We also wish to call attention to the difference in the shades of cloth. One month a dark cloth will come out, and perhaps six months later you will see a uniform of a different shade.

5. You think the shade should be uniform?—Something should be done to keep to the one shade of colour of the cloth. In country stations constables very often have to do a lot of clerical work at night, and in the case of those stations, and also of suburban ones, there should be an allowance for kerosene. In some stations it is granted, but in others I believe it is not.

6. Do you say, as a fact, that it is not granted?—I say in my case it is not, but I have heard men say here that they get it. I am not complaining that it is not granted, because I did not apply for it, believing that it was not obtainable. When on leave the police here consider that they should be granted a free pass on the railways, as they are often required to give assistance when on leave, or if they notice anything wrong taking place, they are expected to do their duty. Taking this fact into consideration, some concession of the kind should be granted when on leave. At my station there is a large river—the Wairoa—and there are many drowning cases, but we are not provided with proper equipment for handling dead bodies. Rubber gloves and disinfectants should be provided.

7. In certain special cases, of course?—In Auckland they would also be required.

Inspector Cullen: They are provided.

8. *The Commissioner.*] Is there anything else you wish to mention?—Yes, the question of the supply of meals to prisoners in country places. We are allowed 6d. a meal, but it means a loss to us.

9. What do you consider the average meal costs?—About 1s. in the country. Until a man is convicted he can hardly be treated as a criminal, and they receive the same food as we have ourselves. As to promotion, the men are of opinion that there is something wrong in the system of promotion, as during the past few years junior men have been promoted, and a large number of senior and apparently capable men have been overlooked. Of course, merit must always prevail, but other things being equal, the senior men should receive preference.

10. You had better give instances, so that they can be put on record, to support the principle you are advocating?—I refer particularly to the case of Constable Muggeridge and of Constable Cummings, who were promoted recently.

11. The former is in charge of the stores, and Cummings is district clerk at Napier?—Yes. It has also been suggested by some members of the detective branch that they should have the right of promotion to the higher ranks in the Police Force. We have no objection to that, so long as they are appointed in proportion to their numbers, and allowing that they have the other necessary qualifications, such as service. We also ask that cards of identification should be supplied to police officers to enable them to disclose their identity when in plain clothes. They are then sometimes called on to act, and are liable to assault. People object to being brought to book, and say, "Well, we do not know the police; any man may pose as a constable; where is your uniform?" We think it would be a very good thing if a card of some description were supplied to enable a constable to prove his title. I also wish to bring up a matter that the men in this station are particularly exercised over—the medical officer. The men are very dissatisfied with the present medical officer, Dr. Sharman, and they are anxious that a change should be made. They have no confidence in him, and do not regard him as at all a suitable man. In one or two cases they have applied to be allowed to call in another doctor, and I know that many of them have consulted another doctor because they have no confidence in Dr. Sharman.

12. In what is he lacking, speaking from the standpoint of the police?—Knowledge of his profession.

13. He is a qualified man?—He may be qualified, but the men are satisfied that they can get better treatment from other medical men.

14. What is his age?

Inspector Cullen: From forty to forty-two.

15. *The Commissioner.*] You say that the opinion you mention is generally held?—Yes, it was held when I was in the station here eleven years ago, and it is getting stronger.

16. Have any representations been made to the Inspector on the subject by the men?—I understand that representations have been made, and that an inquiry was held, in fact. I think those are all the matters the men wish to represent, as far as I remember.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] With regard to the supply of kerosene, there are some stations I dare say you will admit where kerosene is not required?—Well, I scarcely think so. I can hardly imagine a station of that kind.

18. You do not know that it is allowed in certain cases where it is required?—I believe it is allowed in some cases, but I have not applied for it myself, as I did not know that it was obtainable.

19. And a representation has not been made that it is required at your station?—No.

20. As regards free passes on the railways, do you know that I have made a representation to the Railway Department on the subject?—No.

21. I have made representations, and they do not see their way to grant the concession at the present time. As regards gloves for handling dead bodies, has any representation been made on this subject as regards your station?—No.

22. You say that the allowance for meals for prisoners should be 1s., instead of 6d.?—I think so.

23. Have you made a representation to that effect?—No, I have not, simply because there is a rule laid down that it should be 6d.

24. Do you not know that in all cases actual expenses are allowed?—I was not aware of that.

25. You say that there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction with regard to promotions: do you know that merit and seniority are considered in all cases of promotion?—Perhaps the question of merit does not appeal to the man who has no excessive ability.

26. No; I suppose they all think that they should be promoted?—No; they do not all think that they should be promoted, but they certainly do not think that the best men are promoted in all cases.

27. Do you know of the system that prevails whereby the Inspectors recommend annually the names of officers they consider fitted for promotion?—I believe the Inspectors are required to submit the names of men.

28. Do you consider that they are in a position to recommend men for promotion?—I think they are the most suitable persons to do it.

29. Is there any other system you can mention which you think would be better?—Not if that system were followed out.

30. As regards detectives being promoted into the uniform branch, do you not think they ought to be promoted according to qualifications and merits?—Yes, I have said so.

31. But you say that a certain number only should be promoted?—In proportion to their numbers. In the first case, they receive much higher pay than the constables. It is quite a different calling altogether.

32. But supposing you have a Chief Detective who is specially qualified for promotion to Sub-Inspector: if you have a uniform man of the same service and equally as efficient, I suppose you would take the uniform man first?—Equally efficient?

33. Yes, and the same qualifications?—If they have the same qualifications, I should then take the senior first.

34. Say the same service, and the same qualifications, which man would you take?—I should take the uniform man.

35. Supposing the uniform man was not so well qualified as the detective, would you still take him first?—The higher offices in particular must be filled by the most capable men.

36. Then, you would take the best qualified man?—Yes.

37. I think you will find that that is what has been done. As regards the medical officer, do you know that an inquiry has been held by Mr. Brabant into the matter, and it has been referred to the Government?—Yes.

38. And that is how it stands at the present time. It has not gone any further. No decision has been arrived at?

The Commissioner: I will call for the papers and look into the matter, and if I make a definite recommendation it ought to be carried out.

39. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Beyond the question of promotion there is little dissatisfaction. I suppose you know there always has been dissatisfaction?—There is always dissatisfaction.

40. As regards promotion?—Yes, it always has existed, and always will.

41. Beyond that, is there any general dissatisfaction as to the control of the service?—No, I think not.

42. What do you say as regards the efficiency of the service? I suppose you have been out of the city for a long time?—Yes, eight years.

43. You think that the discipline is maintained as well as ever?—I think so.

44. It has been stated down south that I have a "special" man. Have you heard anything about him?—A "special" man?

45. Yes, a "special" man that I have placed in each district, with a view to obtaining information?

46. *The Commissioner.*] He was referred to down south as a "useful" man that was placed in each district for the purpose of conveying information to Headquarters with regard to such district?—I have never heard of such a man.

47. It has been referred to from the extreme south to the north?—It has not reached me.

48. *Inspector Cullen.*] With reference to steamer fares, you know that on the Northern Company's steamers constables travelling by those steamers are always invited into the saloon by the stewards or purser?—I believe that is so.

The Commissioner. Is that so?

Inspector Cullen. That is so; therefore the police have to rely on the generosity of the company for that concession.

The Commissioner. Then it is done under instructions from the principal officers of the company?

Inspector Cullen. That is so. I do not think it is the same in the Union Company?

Witness. It is not the case in the Union Company.

Mr. Dinnie. The new regulations provide for saloon fares.

49. *Inspector Cullen.*] You have had a considerable number of inquiries to make in reference to candidates for the Police Force?—I have.

50. Does not that entail a considerable loss of time and considerable expense to the Department?—Yes.

51. You know that very often after these inquiries are made the men, on being medically examined, are found to be unfit for the service?—I have not seen any record of their being taken on.

52. Do you not think that the first step with regard to recruits should be to undergo a medical examination?—Yes. I think the applicants should apply to the Inspector in person, and his experience would enable him to judge whether they are likely men. That would save a lot of expense to the country.

53. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think the applicant's character should be inquired into first, because if his character is unsatisfactory there is no need to medically examine him?—A man must expect to go to some trouble when he is seeking an occupation.

54. Do you know that the men are all seen before being taken on?—Yes.

55. And do you know that immediately they are taken on they are put through another examination—an educational examination?—Yes.

56. *Chief Detective Marsack.*] Speaking as a delegate from the men, you say they consider that the detectives should only come into line or be given promotion in proportion to their numbers compared with the rest of the Force?—Yes.

57. Roughly speaking, the number of detectives is thirty, and the number of uniform men is about six hundred: you consider that for each detective who attains commissioned rank, twenty constables should?—It would work out, I believe, something like that.

58. That is, irrespective of what their capabilities are?—No; I say that no man should be promoted without proper qualifications. I wish also to draw the attention of the Commission to this point: constables on night duty have often to attend the Court in the morning, and have to remain there perhaps for hours.

59. *The Commissioner.*] But they generally get time off if they apply for it?—There is no system laid down.

60. But that whittles away the gravamen of your complaint if they are allowed time off if they apply for it?—Yes.

The Commissioner. That is so, Inspector Cullen, is it not?

Inspector Cullen. Yes, they are allowed time off.

JOHN FREDERICK HAMMERLY, Mounted Constable, examined on oath. (No. 169.)

Witness. I am a police constable, stationed at Auckland. I am a mounted constable, and have been doing duty here since January in the present year. I was enrolled in July, 1905, and have had a little over four years' service. I appear as a delegate on behalf of the local men.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are there any general remarks you would like to make?—Yes. The first thing we consider most important is with respect to the pay. I have listened very carefully to what the other delegate has said, and I do not think I can improve very much on his statement. However, as I have been appointed a delegate, I shall go through the different subjects, and shall explain what the men wish, to the best of my ability. Regarding the pay, it was unanimously agreed, as Constable Thompson has said, that the pay is too small. It should start at 8s. a day, and rise to 10s. a day by increments of 6d. per day every three years. We argued it at our meeting in this way. Take other occupations in which apprentices take five years to learn a trade. At the end of five years they are considered to be qualified journeymen, and receive the wages awarded by the Arbitration Court. The present regulations controlling the rates of pay of the Police Force mean this: that a constable may remain in that position for sixteen years before he reaches the limit of pay for that rank. Regarding house-allowance, 7s. per week is allowed. I have made inquiries amongst the married men in Auckland, and in no case did I find a man paying less than 14s. a week. Some of them are paying 17s. and £1 a week. Constables on transfer are only allowed steamer fares. I myself have been transferred, and I paid the difference and travelled saloon. We think that twelve days' annual leave is not sufficient—that it should be increased to eighteen days. I think the leave should be allowed to accumulate to fifty-four days. Thirty-six days is not sufficient to pay a visit to Australia to see one's relatives and friends. In our opinion the members of the Force should also receive a railway pass when on leave. That point was argued at our meeting in this way: in the seasons of the year when excursion fares are allowed it is always a busy time for the police, and they are required in the towns. Leave is granted to the police when they have to pay the ordinary travelling fares. This also happens sometimes: I have been travelling by train, and I have been asked by the railway guard to interfere in the case of a drunken man on the train who was creating trouble, and I have sometimes interfered without being

asked—that is, in cases of drunkenness, rows, &c. I thought it my duty to interfere in such cases. When I was stationed in Otago I knew a constable when on leave, and when paying his own fare, and a case occurred in the railway carriage in which he was travelling. It was a case where a drunken man was behaving in a disgraceful manner. The guard appealed to the constable, and the man was placed under arrest and was brought before the Court, and was fined £10. The constable applied to have his fare refunded, but the application was not considered or approved by the Inspector. Regarding promotion, I have very little to say about that. I do not consider that I am qualified to speak about it because I have been very few years in the service. But I know that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists amongst the men regarding promotion. A resolution was moved at our meeting that two pairs of boots a year should be asked for. I may add that a number of the men cannot wear the boots that are supplied to them, and they desire that £2 a year should be allowed to them in lieu of the boots—the equivalent of the boots. With regard to uniforms, they asked that, in addition to supplying the material, it should be made up by the tailor at the expense of the Department. The tailor who makes my uniform states that the material is very much inferior now to what it was in the past. The cost of the making-up of the material is, I understand, from £2 5s. to £2 10s. a suit. Then, as to time off for attending Court. This, I might say also, is a great grievance to the men doing city duty. A constable who arrests a prisoner even on a charge of drunkenness has to appear at the Court, and has to wait there until the prisoner is dealt with. He has to wait until the Court rises, and return the prisoner to the station. There is something I would like to say, but I do not know whether it is in order: it is with respect to our Magistrate. What I wish to say is that a great deal of time is lost at the Court by our Magistrate in adjudicating on trifling charges.

The Commissioner: I am afraid I cannot allow any reflection upon the administration of the Court, or anything reflecting upon the manner in which justice is administered in the Court. That is a matter I am afraid that is somewhat outside the scope of this inquiry.

Witness: A resolution on the subject was moved at the meeting, and I was requested to bring the matter before the Commission. It is a very great grievance with the men on the station. Then, with regard to a distinguishing card or badge for the police when in plain clothes: I think it rather important that a member of the Force should have some card or authority showing his name and rank. Cases arise in the city where a member of the Force may after hours be strolling down the street, and he may consider it his duty to interfere in some case. I may say that I have interfered in such cases, and I have had nothing to show that I was a police constable, and have had some difficulty in convincing the parties concerned that I was a constable. I think it would be a good thing if we were provided with a card which we could produce in such cases when required.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Would not some sort of badge be better, which could be worn under the lapel of your coat?

Mr. Dinnie: Warrant-cards are used in some Forces—cards enclosed in a little leather case.

The Commissioner: I will make a note of that point.

Witness: There is another little grievance that the men at the station here have, but it is possible that it may also be out of order. The men on beat work in reliefs—four hours on and four hours off. There is a considerable amount of time taken up by the men marching on duty and marching off duty. Altogether it amounts to eight and a half to eight and three-quarters hours a day. I do not know whether that could be remedied. The street duty here is particularly strenuous, especially in the summer time. With reference to the Police Surgeon here, that is a matter that requires some immediate attention. There was an inquiry on the subject about twelve months ago, and evidence was taken then; and the doctor's inefficiency was proved beyond doubt. There was overwhelming evidence against him, yet he is still our Police Surgeon. The men think the result of that inquiry should have been made known.

The Commissioner: All I can tell you is that I shall call for the papers with regard to the Police Surgeon, and I shall make definite recommendations one way or the other, and I think it is probable those recommendations will be carried out. I cannot, of course, at present say in which way those recommendations will be.

Witness: There is a feeling amongst the constables that almost with the exception of Wellington most inefficient doctors are acting as Police Surgeons. They regard it as a joke to call Dr. Sharman in. For instance, a man goes to see the doctor, and he is naturally asked afterwards what the doctor said, and the reply has been, "He told me to take a sun-bath."

3. What does he do: examine your tongue and feel your pulse?—Yes.

4. And then gives you something to take, I suppose?—Yes.

5. What would you expect him to do? Is it the personality of the man you object to, or what is it?—No; it is his inefficiency as a doctor.

The Commissioner: It is rather a difficult position, to test the qualifications of a doctor.

Mr. Dinnie: Should not the doctor be here? Allegations are being made against him.

The Commissioner: All I am prepared to do is what I have said. I shall call for the file and go through the papers very carefully myself, and then perhaps make a recommendation to the Minister of Justice in regard to the matter. I think that is the most satisfactory way of dealing with the question. Even if I do not agree with the men in the complaints they have made, I might still deem it a proper thing to make representations, if it is the case that the men as a body object to a particular medical man. Personally I do not see why if the men as a general body have not confidence in a particular medical man he should be forced upon them.

Witness: I know of cases where men, after Dr. Sharman has been consulted, have consulted other doctors.

The Commissioner: I quite agree with Mr. Dinnie that it is not advisable to go into specific cases.

Witness: There is another matter I wish to bring before the Commission. The men consider that they should be allowed one day per month off. Sunday is the most suitable day.

6. *The Commissioner.*] Do the men get a Sunday off?—Yes, but not one day per month.

7. How often, on the average?—I would say, once in six or seven weeks.

8. It is a question of men, is it not?—Yes.

9. You think the Force generally ought to have a Sunday off a month?—Yes, particularly the men in the city.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You mentioned the inefficiency of the Police Surgeon: was not his inattention to the men greatly spoken of recently?—Yes.

11. As regards pay, you say that a man reaches the maximum in sixteen years?—Yes.

12. You forget that a man may get charge of a station?—There are several very senior constables in charge of suburban stations in this city.

13. Taking the general run of the Force, when a man has five or six years' service, is he not entitled to get charge of a station if his conduct is satisfactory?—Yes.

14. And then he gets a free house?—Yes.

15. That makes a difference in his pay before he gets to the sixteen years?—Yes.

The Commissioner: I understood that in Constable Thompson's case he got charge in three years.

Inspector Cullen: He was an exceptional man.

Mr. Dinnie: Five years is about the average.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you compared the pay of the Force here with that of the police in other places?—No.

17. Do you know what they are allowed in the way of concessions on the railways?—No.

18. You know there is a difficulty in getting a Sunday off every month, because of the number of men on duty?—Yes.

19. It is not an easy matter to arrange for a regular day off?—That is so.

20. Beyond some dissatisfaction as regards promotion, which will always exist, is there any general dissatisfaction as regards the control of the Force at the present time?—No.

21. What service have you had?—A little over four years.

22. The discipline is good here?—Yes.

23. And the efficiency of the Force you consider good?—Yes.

24. Have you heard anything about this "special" man?—Never.

25. *Inspector Cullen.*] What you refer to as a grievance amongst the constables on beat duty here in connection with the relieving of the beat duty men amounts to this: they are paraded at a quarter to 9, are they not?—Yes.

26. They are marched down to their beats, and are dropped each on his beat by the sergeant going out. What the men want to do is this: that they should all assemble in Wellesley Street, below the City Council Chambers?—Yes.

27. Would not that mean that Queen Street and the streets running off Queen Street would be left completely without a constable for half an hour?—I do not know that it would be so long as that.

28. Those streets would be left without police for a certain time?—Yes.

29. Do you consider that that would be a proper thing?—No.

30. Supposing a thief were to steal from a shop, or a man were to kill another during that time, do you think that would be an efficient way of carrying on police work?—Those things occur in the country, where there are no police on hand.

31. How many men are there in Auckland doing beat duty who have been over twelve months in the service: do you think, half a dozen?—I should think there would be more than that; but if you extended the time to eighteen months I think you could well say there are not more than half a dozen.

32. The men have not been doing duty for more than eighteen months, and many of them have been here less than six months?—Yes.

33. So that these men cannot know very much of the hardships they complain of?—They feel the strain directly.

34. They think they should stick to the eight hours sharp?—They want it to be as near the eight hours as possible.

35. Do you know that there is no such thing in the Police Regulations as eight hours?—Yes, that is so.

36. *The Commissioner.*] I think it would be a great assistance to your case if you obtained information in regard to leave and uniform in other branches of the service?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: Perhaps if I got that information in Wellington it would satisfy the Commission.

The Commissioner: Yes; that would be quite sufficient.

PATRICK CARMODY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 120.)

Witness: My name is Patrick Carmody. I am a police constable, stationed at Whangaroa. I have been four years there. I was enrolled in the Force in 1875. I served between seven and eight years, and then left the Force. I rejoined in 1886, and have seen twenty-three years' continuous service.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to say?—I feel aggrieved at having been passed over in the matter of promotion.

2. Have you ever been recommended?—Not that I know of.

3. Have you ever applied for promotion?—I spoke to the Commissioner on my way to the North Island from the Dunedin district. I was in charge of a station in Otago for ten or eleven years.

The Commissioner asked me my age, and I told him I was fifty-two, and he said that my age was a bar to my promotion. He said he wanted active young men as sergeants; but he said he would consider the matter. However, nothing has transpired since.

4. Why do you imagine that you have been passed over in all those years?—I do not know; I have fulfilled my duties.

5. Have you got a good record?—I think so.

6. Why were you shifted up from Roslyn?—I was not getting the best of health in the South Island, and was obliged to try the North. I have had over thirty years' experience in the Police Force.

7. Do you want promotion now?—I am too old now; but I wish to state my grievance.

8. When did you first think you were entitled to promotion?—When I was stationed at Otaram, in Otago. I was about forty-four years of age when I first went there. I do not think the pay is sufficient for constables when they first join the service.

9. What is the current rate of wages in your district?—From 8s. to 10s. a day.

10. Is there anything else you wish to say?—I indorse what Constable Thompson said with respect to travelling steerage on the steamers when on transfer. I think the Department ought to provide saloon passages.

11. Yes; that will be remedied probably to some extent. Is there anything else you wish to say?—No.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If you had received promotion in your turn, when would that have been?—I have not studied it out.

13. Not in my time, anyhow?—No, probably not; but it might be about the beginning of your time.

14. If you had received your turn of promotion, you ought to have been promoted ten or twelve years ago, and that was prior to my arrival here?—Yes.

15. As regards your pay, what are you drawing?—9s. 6d. a day.

16. You have a free house?—Yes.

17. What other emoluments have you?—I am Clerk of the Court.

18. How much do you get for that?—£10 a year.

19. Anything else?—I am Ranger of the Whangaroa County Council.

20. What do you get for that?—From £10 to £12 a year.

21. Are there any other appointments that you hold?—No, sir.

22. Then you are drawing £20 a year more than your police pay?—I do not complain.

23. And you have a free house?—Yes.

24. What does that make your pay equal to?—A free house is worth 10s. a week.

25. That makes your pay a good deal better than that of a labouring man?—Yes.

26. How long were you on street duty before you were appointed to a station?—Not very long; I never did much street duty.

Mr. Dinnie: You were very fortunate then.

ANDREW McDONNELL, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 171.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Aratapu. I was enrolled in February, 1897.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before the Commission?—What I have to say is very much on the lines of the evidence given by Constables Thompson and Hammerly. I may add that there are a number of men working in the sawmills in my district who are getting 8s. a day, and they get a day and a half off a week. That shows the rate of pay for such work there. I have been asked to suggest that there should be a Police Code, showing the general outlines of police duty in New Zealand—a book similar to the Police Guide printed in England by Snowden—Snowden's "Police Guide." That would be an extremely useful work for the police to have. I think there should be a better system of promoting the men from the rank of constable to sergeant. I suggest that a man should be promoted according to his seniority and ability, together with a recommendation from the Inspector. I would suggest that eighteen days a year should be allowed in the way of leave, and that the leave should be allowed, if desired, to accumulate for three years, making a total of fifty-four days' leave in the third year. That would enable a constable to pay a visit to Australia if he desired to do so. The present leave, even if allowed to accumulate for three years, is hardly sufficient to enable that to be done. I would also suggest that country stations should be supplied with disinfectants and rubber gloves, for the purpose of enabling the police to handle dead bodies properly, especially decomposed bodies. In my district I have had a lot of that to do. I think that 1s. a meal should be allowed in the case of prisoners, instead of 6d. a meal. Sixpence a meal may do in the towns, but it is not sufficient in the country.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say that promotion should be by seniority, merit, and the recommendation of the Inspector?—I do.

3. Do you know that that is the system that prevails now?—I do not know that.

4. *The Commissioner.*] You say the pay is too small?—Yes.

5. You say that a labourer in your district gets 8s. a day, and a day and a half off a week: is he paid for the time he is off?—He is paid for six days a week, and is not paid for the Sunday.

6. He does not get a free house like you, does he?—No; but the rents are very small—from 2s. to 7s. a week.

7. What is your house worth for rent?—From 7s. to 8s. at the outside.

8. That would be in addition to your pay, so that you are a little better paid than an ordinary labouring man?—Yes, I am better paid than most ordinary labouring men.

9. Have you made representations to the Department with respect to disinfectants and rubber gloves?—No.

10. Nor as regards the meals of prisoners?—No.
11. You should do that when you wish such matters to receive attention?—Yes.
12. You have been away from the cities for a long time?—Yes.
13. Do you know anything as to the efficiency of the Force in the cities?—From my knowledge, it is very good.
14. And that beyond the question of promotion, in regard to which there is a little dissatisfaction, the administration is satisfactory?—Yes.
15. Have you heard anything of this “special” man who has been mentioned?—No.

PATRICK JOHN DUNNE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 172.)

Witness: My name is Patrick John Dunne. I am a police constable, stationed at Ponsonby. I have had thirty-six years' service, having been enrolled in the Force in 1873.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make?—In 1890 a system of examination existed in the Police Force. I presented myself, amongst some three hundred others, for the second examination. Thirty-four of us passed, and I was amongst them. I have been in charge of several stations during my service, amongst them being Surrey Hills, Mercury Bay, Newmarket, Mangonui, and Ponsonby. I was Clerk of the Court at Mercury Bay. I was also Clerk of the Court at Mangonui, Kaitaia, and Ahipara, and was Bailiff for three Courts. I also held numerous other appointments under the local authorities, and under the General Government. My grievance is in regard to promotion. I applied for promotion in consequence of a statement made by Dr. Findlay, Minister of Justice, when inspecting the parade at Auckland in February last. His statement was this: that in future promotions would go by seniority, providing all things were equal. Immediately after the parade I interviewed the Commissioner of Police, and stated my case to him. I told him that I considered that I had been harshly dealt with: that I did not know why I should have been overlooked. His reply was this: “Unfortunately you are over age; that is the only objection I have to you. But you may apply to the Minister. I won't promise that I will recommend you, but you may apply.”

2. How old are you now?—Fifty-eight. I made the following application:—

“Police-station, Ponsonby, February, 1909.—Application of Constable P. J. Dunne for promotion to the rank of sergeant.—In consequence of the remarks made by the Hon. the Minister for Justice when addressing the police at the central station on the 2nd February, 1909—namely, that promotions would in future be made from the senior members of the Force, providing efficiency was equal—in consequence of these remarks I beg to put forward my claim for promotion to the rank of sergeant. I may state that immediately after the parade I interviewed the Commissioner, and explained my case to him. After hearing what I had to say, he informed me that he had made it a rule to promote none but young men to the rank of sergeant. I drew his attention to the age of one constable—namely, M. Donovan—a much older man than myself, and respectfully submitted that my case should receive consideration. I am sorry to say that the Commissioner remarked that he could not see his way to break the rule he had just referred to. In addition to the constable I have just named, I wish to point out that during the past five years eleven constables, all of whom are about my own age, and junior in the service, have been promoted to the rank of sergeant. Their names are as follows: Bird, Ryan, Watts, Hastie, Morgan, Brooks, Murphy, Black, Foster, Baskville, and McKeefry. In support of my application, I wish to say that I joined the New Zealand police on the 14th October, 1873. Since then I have been in charge of some very important stations—namely, Surrey Hills, Mercury Bay, Newmarket, Mangonui, and Ponsonby. At Mercury Bay, in conjunction with my other duties, I was Clerk and Bailiff of the Magistrate's Court. At Mangonui I was nine years stationed there, and was Clerk and Bailiff of three Courts in that district—namely, Mangonui, Kaitaia, and Ahipara. As a further proof of my attention to duty and anxiety for advancement in the service, I desire to draw the attention of the Hon. the Minister of Justice to the fact that in 1890, amongst some three hundred constables who presented themselves for an examination in law and Police Regulations, and out of that number only thirty-four passed, I am glad to say that my name is included amongst those who met with success on that occasion. For the result of the examination referred to, please see *Police Gazette*, 1890, page 134. I may further point out that my defaulter sheet is practically clean, which goes to show that I was always attentive to my duties, and had the interests of the service at heart. Should the Hon. the Minister of Justice give this application his favourable consideration, I would respectfully ask to be allowed to remain at this station. And in support of this request, I wish to draw his attention to the fact that of the eighty-five sergeants now in the Force, only four of them are senior to me in service. Had I been promoted when my turn came I would most assuredly have been in charge of a station before now, and receiving full pay; and as Ponsonby has at present three constables stationed there, and it is a very important and prosperous suburb, with a fast-increasing population, it must be only a matter of a very short time when an increase in the Force will be imperative. For the foregoing reasons I earnestly ask that my request will be favourably considered. I sincerely trust that the Hon. the Minister of Justice will not misunderstand me, and consider that I am writing in an envious spirit when I referred to the junior members of the Force who have been promoted. This is not so. I simply referred to them to show how unjustly I have been treated, and that my claim is a just one.—P. J. DUNNE, Constable 127.—To the Hon. the Minister of Justice.”

“Forwarded to the Inspector.—C.W.H., Sub-Inspector.

“Forwarded to the Commissioner.—J. CULLEN, Inspector.

“Inspector Cullen.—Please report on the application of Constable Dunne for promotion. He does not appear to have been recommended at any time.—W. DINNIE.

“Inspector Cullen's report.—Subject: Qualifications of Constable Dunne for promotion.—I have to report that I am of the opinion that, owing to Constable Dunne's advancing years, he

is not qualified for promotion, as no man of his age could efficiently carry out the duties of a sectional sergeant for a number of years without a breakdown in health, which would be sure to be followed by an early retirement on superannuation. I have not recommended Constable Dunne for promotion; neither did my predecessor.—J. CULLEN, Inspector, 17/2/09.

“The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—Constable Dunne is a good steady and reliable constable, but on account of his age he does not possess the energy and activity required for promotion, and I cannot recommend his application. He is fifty-seven and a half years old.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 20/2/09.

“Inspector Cullen.—Please have Constable Dunne informed that the Hon. the Minister of Justice has carefully considered his application for promotion, but regrets he cannot accede to it under the circumstances.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 23/2/09.”

On the margin appears the words “No action, J. G. F.,” and that is the only indication that my application was laid before the Minister. There is also the following reference to certain constables, giving their names, dates of birth, and dates of promotions, as follows: Constable Bird, born 16th September, 1856; promoted 1st October, 1904. Constable Ryan, born 30th December, 1856; promoted 1st December, 1904. Constable Watt, born 11th February, 1853; promoted 1st December, 1904. Constable Hastie, born 20th March, 1857; promoted 1st January, 1905. Constable Morgan, born 30th June, 1854; promoted 1st July, 1905. Constable Brooks, born 26th September, 1859; promoted 1st February, 1906. Constable Murphy, born 8th August, 1858; promoted 1st March, 1906. Constable Black, born 2nd May, 1859; promoted 1st March, 1906; Constable Foster, born 24th June, 1858; promoted 1st June, 1906. Constable Baskiville, born 1st November, 1857; promoted 15th June, 1906. Constable McKeefry, born 25th March, 1859; promoted 1st February, 1908. Constable Donovan, born 21st June, 1846; promoted 1st January, 1904. Constable Dunne, born 22nd May, 1851. In my case there has been no promotion at all. When I went before Mr. Dinnie in his office I mentioned Donovan’s case, and he replied that Donovan’s appointment was practically granted before he came here, but I have ascertained that he was not promoted for some six months after Mr. Dinnie arrived here; so that the promotion was a long time getting confirmed. I was stationed for eight years on the Thames, and for about eighteen months was acting-sergeant there, and in charge of a section. It was not a large section. There was one man on one section and two on another; and I would respectfully suggest that on no occasion should one constable be placed in charge of another permanently. I have been most fortunate since I went to Ponsonby in regard to the men with me, never having a quarrel sufficient to warrant my calling the Inspector’s attention to it. With reference to political influence, it is my honest belief that political influence is rampant in the Force. My reason for making this very bold statement is as follows, and I also wish to refer the Commissioner to the *Police Gazette* for 1909, No. 283, where the last list of promotions is given (I am only going back for the last five years, since Mr. Dinnie came here): Donovan was promoted on the 1st January, 1904; Bird was promoted on the 1st October, 1904; and Ryan, who was two or three years his senior, was promoted two months afterwards. Therefore he lost his seniority. Hastie was promoted on the 1st January, 1905. He is a junior to me, but he has been promoted before me, while men like Watt, Rutledge, and Mullany have lost a considerable amount of seniority, and would have to submit to be placed under the charge of these junior men who are now senior to them. Sergeant Ramsay, whose number is 488, was promoted over Morgan, whose number is 374. Ramsay was promoted on the 1st March, 1905, and Morgan on the 1st July, 1905. Ramsay joined in 1886 and Morgan in 1881. Wohlmann is a district clerk, and I think all district clerks are entitled to more pay than the long-beat-duty man, because they require special qualifications; but I am strongly of opinion that they should not be promoted to the rank of sergeants, for the following reasons: When a district clerk is promoted he remains in the office for from six to ten years. He may probably quarrel with his Inspector, or get careless over his duties, with the result that he might have to go out on the streets; but he would know as much about police duty as the man coming out of the depot, and he would have to depend on the men he would be in charge of for instructions. Dart, Emerson, Foster, Wohlmann, McGuire, Black, Hutton, Brooks, Murphy, Oliver, Beattie, Moore, Morgan, and Mathieson are all junior to Baskiville; and the promotion of junior men over the heads of senior men is the cause of my discontent and the discontent of the service generally. What qualifications had these ten or fifteen men over Sergeant Baskiville? If they were qualified for promotion on the 15th June, 1906, surely they were qualified on the 1st February, 1906, when Mathieson was promoted. Day joined in 1881, and was promoted on the 1st December, 1906. Harvey was promoted on the 10th June, 1908, and I am well aware that he passed an examination which qualified him in going ahead of Sergeant Keep; but Stewart and Simpson are each junior to him, and yet they are promoted. The station sergeants were promoted some three years ago, while there are fourteen sergeants senior to the senior station sergeant. There are sixteen sergeants senior to the next man promoted, thirty were senior to the third man, and forty were senior to the fourth man appointed. Three of them were made Sub-Inspectors—Phair, Norwood, and Hendry—and three men—Johnston, Darby, and Treanor—were promoted to their places; and though Darby is senior to Johnston, the latter was promoted first. Surely Darby should have been qualified for promotion before Johnston, as he was also senior to King, who is now the senior station sergeant in the Force. As to the scale of pay, my grievance is the same as that of other men: it is not sufficient. I was better off when I was receiving 7s. 6d. a day, with six small children to keep, and paying 10s. a week rent in Auckland, in 1889–90. The first scale of pay, gazetted in 1898, provided for sergeants receiving from 9s. 6d. to 11s. a day, and constables from 7s. to 9s. The second scale, gazetted in 1906, provided that sergeants were to receive from 10s. to 11s. 6d., and constables from 7s. to 9s. The constable got no rise, while the sergeant did. The third scale of pay, published in 1907, provided for sergeants commencing at 10s. 6d., and going up to 12s. a day; while constables were to commence at 7s. 6d., and go to 9s. 6d. I have already stated that I have had eighteen months’ sergeant’s duty at Thames, and I have been

practically doing sergeant's duty in Ponsonby, with two men under me most of the time, and on some occasions I would have three or four men, and the Sub-Inspector has no fault to find with my conduct. According to the *Auckland Star* of the 2nd December, 1905, the population of City West electorate was then 11,938; City East, 11,889; and City Central, 11,860. So that the Ponsonby district is larger than the other two, equally as important, and the police district practically embraces nineteen-twentieths of it. I was on a parade in 1906 in Auckland when Commissioner Dinnie addressed the men, and he made use of the following words: "I have heard that some discontent exists in the Force with reference to the pay, and I have just returned from the other States, meaning Australia. I have inquired there, and I think your position is very favourable compared with the men on the 'other side.'" About two months afterwards the sergeants received 6d. a day rise, and the constables nothing. This was a sore point amongst the men, and caused a good deal of discontent. On account of the increased cost of living, the pay is insufficient to enable a police constable or sergeant to keep up the position he is supposed to maintain. There is another subject that Constable Thompson referred to, but he only went a certain distance, and if you will permit me I will go a little further. He recommended, I think, that fuel and light should be allowed to country stations and suburban stations. Now, in 1888 Commissioner Gudgeon was in charge, and all stations were then allowed 4 cords of wood, or 2 tons of coal, and 14 lb. of candles. This system was then discontinued, and certain stations only were allowed fuel and light. Mangonui and Mercury Bay were included in the list; but not, I think, Dargaville or Aratapu. I suggest that suburban stations should be allowed fuel and light, because a member of the constable's family has to remain practically within doors continually for the purpose of answering the telephone. And if we have prisoners we must give them food, and the State might very well restore the allowance we had in 1888 of a small quantity of fuel and light to each station. I am decidedly of opinion that clerks and storekeepers should not be promoted to the rank of sergeant. Sergeant Muggeridge is a storekeeper, and was seven years in the Force when promoted, and no one knows what his qualifications were. He may have received a college education, and I did not. O'Connell, who is about my own age, had nineteen years' service when he was promoted, and he was quite fifty years old. Two wrongs never make a right, and if I have been overlooked in the past I do not understand why I should be overlooked now. If a sergeant is to go to Ponsonby I think I am as well qualified as any sergeant in the city to take charge of that post, and, in view of the way I have been neglected, it would be only generous and fair treatment of my case. I cannot say anything about my merit sheet, as I do not know how those sheets are filled in, and never saw one. If it is in Court, I would like to see my position.

3. I have it in my possession at the present time. It may be a blank. I suppose you know when you get a reward, do you not?—No. I know nothing about it. Occasionally, since the record of merit was instituted, I think five or six cases have been published in the *New Zealand Gazette*.

The Commissioner: Every time a man is paid a reward it appears on the merit sheet, I understand.

Mr. Dinnie: It is published in the *Gazette*.

Witness: I have received two rewards—one of £5 and one of £10—and nothing went into the *Gazette*, and I took those rewards with the permission of the Commissioner and Inspector.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] That was a gratuity?—It was a reward.

5. Who from?—From the City Council.

6. It was not a record of merit, but a gratuity?—In many cases they are published.

Mr. Dinnie: There is a difference?—

7. *The Commissioner.*] What was the £10 paid for?—For obtaining the conviction of persons breaking the alarm glasses, and causing the fire brigade to turn out. It was soon after the alarm circuit was instituted, and I believe I am the only constable who got a conviction. I think we got three convictions.

The Commissioner: What are published?

Mr. Dinnie: The departmental records of merit. A gratuity given in this way would not be a reward of merit.

The Commissioner: It could not be accepted without your permission, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Quite so. They are allowed to receive gratuities in many cases.

The Commissioner: What is the difference between a matter of that sort and a gratuity paid for the arrest of a runaway sailor?

Mr. Dinnie: It is a similar matter.

8. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Does that go on the list, Constable Dunne?—They are always put on the list.

Mr. Dinnie: They are scarcely records of merit.

The Commissioner: Well, what is the difference between £10 paid to the police for services in connection with the breaking of fire-alarms and the £10 paid for the arrest of a runaway sailor?

Mr. Dinnie: I think if one appeared, the other ought to also. Both should appear.

9. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Is there anything further you wish to say?—Then, we were led to believe that even when a man is promoted to sergeant he gets his turn in being appointed to a station. But in some cases the Department does not do that.

10. Can you give me an instance within the last few years?—The very men I have to refer to are personal friends of mine. One is Sergeant Moore. He was promoted when he was brought here to Auckland, and I am certain that he was not six months on the streets when he got a station at Newmarket. Then, when a better station was vacant, he was sent on to that in the country.

11. Where is he now?—Whangarei. Another instance is that of Sergeant Watt. He also is a personal friend of my own. He was a short time in Karangahake Road. I believe he was sick half the time, and when he was on duty it was painful to be with him; he complained so much

about sickness. He was that way when he was promoted, and was sent for a short time to Rotorua, and is now in charge of the station there. Sergeant Williams said Watt had been sent away out of his turn, and he was going to make a noise about it; but a vacancy was made for Williams at Gisborne. Another peculiar coincidence I think will go to show that political influence exists. I refer to the Bay of Islands now. Every constable who has lived in that electorate for many years has been promoted sergeant excepting myself and another, who I am informed would not accept the position.

12. Who is the man?—Constable Sutton. He is at Kaitaia. Four men were promoted there, all of them from constable—Sergeants Sheehan, Pardy—

13. Was not he at Whangarei when he was promoted?—No, Kawakawa. Moore, Russell, Crean.

14. You and Sutton, you say, were the only ones not promoted?—Yes.

15. What do you deduce from that?—The only inference I can draw is that there was a move made politically. I can only believe that Mr. Houston, being a good kind-hearted man, moved in the direction of getting these men promoted.

16. Why did not he get you promoted? You were more in touch with him than the others?—He spoke to me many times when he was going to Wellington, and said, "Can I do anything for you when I go to Wellington?" I said, "No, Mr. Houston, thank you very much." This conversation took place when I was saying good-bye to him on the wharf. He never offered me anything direct, but he very kindly suggested it.

17. Now, if you had said to him, "Will you kindly do something for me?" you might have got promoted to sergeant?—I think I would have had a very good chance of it.

18. The inference is, of course, that these men asked him to do something for them?—It would be hard to say if it were so, and it is scarcely right to suggest it. I was going on a remark made to me with reference to one of those men.

19. What was it?—A man met me in Jervois Road, and said, "Look here, Dunne; we have managed that." I said, "What." He said, "We have got Pardy promoted." "Nonsense," I said.

20. Well, we will call for Sergeant Pardy's papers. What inference did you draw from that remark?—I could not tell you.

21. Was the present Inspector in charge here when he was promoted?—Yes. The question might be many times asked from Wellington of an Inspector, "Is Constable So-and-so fit to be made sergeant?"

22. You say the question might be asked?—Yes; and Mr. Cullen might recommend a man in the style I am laying before you.

23. I understand that periodical inquiries are made with a view to ascertaining the names of those constables who the Inspectors consider worthy of promotion. What do you suggest outside that?—I never knew that.

24. That is the fact. What do you suggest outside of that?—I suggest that Ministers have been "got at."

25. It might afford a fair subject for comment and inquiry in a certain Inspector's district if a constable, although not recommended by him, has been promoted?—Yes.

26. But if a man has been promoted on the recommendation of an Inspector, then you see it must be assumed that he was promoted on his merits, even if he had political influence?—Of course, I am giving you my opinion.

27. In this case I will call for the papers, and see if there is anything to show to that effect, and I will also ask the Inspector, when he gives evidence, as to whether he recommended the promotion?—Very good.

Mr. Dinnie: I suppose that political influence would have the same effect on the Inspector as on the Commissioner.

The Commissioner: Presumably.

Mr. Dinnie: In fact, in this instance of Pardy's it was one of those cases in which the constable was not recommended by the Inspector. There are two constables in the Force I promoted without a recommendation, on my own responsibility, and on what my predecessor had said about them; two only, and Pardy is one of them.

28. *The Commissioner:* I shall have to ask the Inspector what their qualifications were. (To witness): Who is the other?—Donovan.

Mr. Dinnie: No. He was promised promotion and recommended before I came here. The other is a man down south, I think.

29. *The Commissioner:* You would not suggest that influence is used upon the Inspector, or what do you suggest?—I would not suggest that any influence is used on Inspector Cullen at all.

30. How would you suggest that influence is brought to bear?—I suggest that influence is used by members of Parliament on Ministers, and the Commissioner of Police takes his orders from the Minister.

31. I understand the Commissioner to say that he recommends the sergeants, and the Minister approves of them?—Yes; but there is such a thing as this: The Minister asks Mr. Dinnie, "Is Constable Dunne qualified for sergeant? Is there anything against him?" And naturally he would refer to Inspector Cullen; and the latter would say, "He is too old"; and so my application would be hopeless.

32. Harking back to your suggestion that the member for the district would be able to secure your promotion if, when you were doing this leave-taking, you had said, "Yes, you can do something for me," how do you suggest he would have gone about it?—There is only one way, to go and see the Premier, who was an intimate friend of his.

33. And the Premier would then do what?—Simply order the Commissioner to promote him. Probably it would be referred back to the Inspector, who would say, "I have nothing to say against Dunne; he has been a good constable."

34. By-and-by I shall have to ask the Commissioner to what extent political influence is brought to bear, and, of course, he would deny the existence of any political influence?—I cannot add other facts, but only answer the questions.

35. You can give certain facts, and ask me to draw a certain inference?—I am giving circumstantial evidence as to the way these promotions have been made.

36. In other words, that is the only way you can account for them?—Yes. If there were a system of examination, and one sergeant went up and passed a better examination than another, although his junior, I would say, "Let him have it."

37. What would you suggest that that examination should consist of?—I consider it should consist of the law of evidence principally, and the Police Regulations. I consider that when a sergeant is made he should be in a position to instruct the constables under him.

38. You would suggest a physical examination of every man before promotion?—Certainly not. I think that would be very wrong, because after a constable has done from ten to fifteen years' service on the streets he might have varicose veins, and that would prevent his promotion to sergeant.

39. But the duties, surely, of a sergeant in the city are very heavy, and naturally throw a considerable physical strain on him?—I consider that the duty of a long-beat constable is far more severe, as a sergeant can go about where he likes, and do pretty well as he likes; he can stand and talk to anybody, but no notice is taken of him; he is not tied down to the same irksome duty as a constable; in fact, he is more of a free agent.

40. Then, you think there is no necessity for a physical examination?—I am strongly of opinion there is not.

41. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think that, because a constable can pass an examination, he ought to be promoted?—Yes, if he is qualified in other respects.

42. You would not promote him on examination alone?—Certainly not; but I do say that he should have a very strong claim.

43. As far as the question of influence is concerned, you have no real information, but simply hearsay?—None whatever.

44. Now, do you not think that, if you had got your promotion in your turn, that would have been some twenty years ago?—Yes.

45. Then, there are a good many officers responsible for your being kept back?—There was practically no promotion going on in those times—perhaps a sergeant a year, or one in two years. There were only twenty-three in the Force some twenty-five years ago; but in 1898 Commissioner Tunbridge made a number of appointments to sergeantships, and the Force was thoroughly satisfied.

46. How was it you were not promoted amongst those? You had plenty of service?—My Inspector probably did not recommend me.

47. You are much senior to the majority of those sergeants?—To them all.

48. Then, you had more occasion for complaint then than you have now?—I do not believe I would have complained now only for what the Minister said on the 2nd February last, when he held this promise out in front of me, and it caused me to come straight before you.

49. He said, "Provided they were efficient"?—Exactly so.

50. And, "Unless you are recommended": you know you have not been recommended?—You say I am a good constable.

51. Quite so?—What better proof do you want of the makings of a good sergeant than a good constable?

52. We have a great many good constables who would not make good sergeants?—I would like to see them.

53. As regards district clerks, do you not think that a clerical training is of service to a man after he is promoted subsequently?—Yes, undoubtedly.

54. Or a watch-house training?—Undoubtedly.

55. And you admit that a clerk is selected from the Force because of his qualifications?—Yes; and I also say that a man on a country station has equal, if not better, qualifications for promotion, because he gets a better insight into the laws and their administration.

56. When I came here, what age were you?—Fifty-two. Donovan was fifty-eight or fifty-seven when he was promoted.

57. I came here six years ago, and you were over fifty years of age then. Donovan was recommended before I came here, and, although he was not actually promoted, he got the next vacancy?—But you did not promote him for six months.

58. That may be so; but all the sergeants have an opportunity of coming forward and complaining?—All the sergeants.

59. Yes?—I think every member in the Force has an opportunity of complaining.

60. Did you ever mention it? You know that every member of the Force has an opportunity of explaining his views if he desires to?—Undoubtedly; but many of them would not do it, for various reasons. They simply think somebody had a down on them.

61. Do you think that is really true?—There is a guarantee given here that anything a person says, as long as he is respectful and is speaking the truth, will not be used against him.

62. I think your assumption that somebody had a down on them is mere imagination. Do you really think anybody will have a down on you because you have come forward? Would you suggest that at all?—I do not know. I have a guarantee that the Department will not have a down on me.

63. *The Commissioner.*] Is there anything more you wish to say?—There are two men stationed at Ponsonby with me. We received notice to attend the Commission. The two constables with me stated that they had nothing to say further than the points raised by Constable Thompson and myself—namely, as to increased pay, boots, free passes for the railway when on leave, attend-

ing Court when on night duty. If there is any doubt as to my conduct while in the Force, Mr. Blomfield, ex Stipendiary Magistrate, has kindly offered to come here and state what he knows about me.

64. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long have you been at Ponsonby?—A little over eight years.

65. You were previously at Mangonui?—Yes.

66. How long?—Nine years.

67. You had a free house?—Yes.

68. What did you have in addition to your police pay there?—I could not tell you.

69. You have some idea?—£10 as Clerk of the Court, and the Bailiff's fees.

70. How much additional pay did you draw?—I dare say my whole perquisites would be about £1 a week.

71. It was when the station was reduced to a smaller station that you asked for a transfer?—The last time Commissioner Tunbridge visited the district I told him that I had heard that the constable at Ponsonby had died, and I would be very glad to get that station, as my family was growing up. He said that Inspector Cullen intended to put a sergeant there. I received a wire from Inspector Cullen appointing me to Ponsonby. I wished to get to the city, to get employment for my children.

72. But seeing that you were earning so much additional money, would you have accepted promotion?—Yes.

73. But you were not recommended?—No.

74. Did you not apply for promotion in Mr. Tunbridge's time?—No. On one occasion I spoke to Inspector Hickson about promotion, and he said, "Apply for nothing; your Inspector will recommend you when the time comes." I acted on that principle until the Minister of Justice made the statement I have referred to.

75. You suggest political influence in the case of Sergeants Moore and Watt?—I mentioned those as cases in which it might reasonably be inferred.

76. Do you know from what source the political influence might come?—Not the remotest.

77. There is no evidence of it?—I do not think there is.

FREDERICK AUGUSTUS MOORE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 173.)

Witness: My name is Frederick Augustus Moore. I am a police sergeant, in charge of the Whangarei sub-district. I was enrolled in the Armed Constabulary in 1879, during the Parihaka Native trouble. I served in the Constabulary for seven years—until 1886. I then left the service to go to the Kimberley rush. The greater portion of my time I was in the Armed Constabulary, and the latter part I was in the Permanent Artillery. I received a satisfactory discharge. I returned to New Zealand in about twelve months' time, and put in an application for the Permanent Artillery, and was taken back. I then served about eighteen months in that force. I was then transferred at my own request to the Police Department, and have served in it ever since.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Where were you stationed after you were appointed a sergeant?—The first six months I did street duty in Auckland. I was then senior sergeant. I was then ordered to Newmarket, and after about two years was sent to Whangarei.

2. Have you any general remarks to make?—Yes. I think the present rate of pay for men joining the Force is too small, and suggest that another 1s. a day be offered, chiefly with the object of obtaining a better class of recruits. The pay, I think, should be increased from 7s. 6d. to 8s. 6d. per day, with increments of 6d. a day every six years up to 10s. I think we should have free uniforms. At present we have to pay the cost of making up the stuff, the average cost being about £2 10s. a suit. I suggest that two pairs of boots should be given to the police yearly. Warders are allowed two pairs of boots a year. I suggest that increased leave should be granted. Twelve days a year is very little. I am a native of Victoria, and would very much like to visit my relatives there. Even if the leave is allowed to accumulate for three years, thirty-six days is too little to allow one to visit Australia. I would suggest that the annual leave should be sixteen or eighteen days, and that it should be allowed, if desired, to accumulate for three years. I would also suggest free railway travelling when on leave. Saloon steamer fares should be allowed to married men travelling with their families on transfer. At present they are only granted steerage passages, and if they travel steerage they have to mix with a lot of low-down people, and sometimes with people with whom the police have been dealing. It is not right that they should have to associate with these people. In the cities I would like to see an increase in the house-allowance. One shilling a day house-allowance for constables is insufficient. I had to pay house-rent myself, and the rents ran from 14s. up to 17s. and £1—that is, for a decent house. I think there should be a definite ruling that the rank of sergeant is higher than the rank of detective. It happens, too, sometimes, that the sergeant in charge of a station may be travelling with a detective, and the detective is provided with a first-class fare, whereas the sergeant is only given a second-class fare. I think that the out-stations in some districts should be graded, and have a rate of pay in accordance with the grade. A man might start in one grade, and get an increase of pay of 6d. per day every two years up to 13s.; and in another grade they might receive 13s. 6d. up to 15s. 6d. I would certainly suggest that first-class fares on railways should be allowed and saloon passages on steamers when police officers are travelling on duty. The Northern Steamship Company kindly allow the police to travel saloon at steerage rates. There have been great complaints during my time amongst the men as to the inefficiency of the medical man here.

The Commissioner: I have called for the papers on that subject, and when they reach me I will go carefully through them.

Witness: With respect to selecting recruits, I would like to see the Department try the suggestions thrown out by Constable Thompson. I think it would be a good thing if the candidates were first examined by the Inspector, to see if, in his opinion, they are likely to be suitable men.

for the Force. At the present time great expense is incurred by the police in going round the country ascertaining the previous history of the candidates. I think it would be better if there was a preliminary examination by the Inspector. The medical examination should also be made first.

3. What have you to say with regard to the recruits?—Suitable men, like farmers' sons, do not think the inducements are sufficient for them to join the Force.

4. Do you notice any difference in the physique of the men coming forward at the present day?—They are not up to the old standard.

5. To what do you attribute that?—I do not know whether it is that the pay is not sufficient.

6. What have you to say with respect to education?—I think the Fifth Standard is quite sufficient, because a man can improve himself.

7. But is it too high?—I do not think so. A man after a few years on a station, having to conduct his own cases, only wants to know a little, and read a little law, &c., and he has an opportunity of doing that in the country.

8. Do you think it would be advisable to have the men undergo a period of probation after passing through the training depot, and before being finally admitted into the Force?—I do.

9. What would you make the probation?—I think, about six months.

10. That is six months actual active police duty?—Yes.

11. When you were in Auckland City was there any difficulty about giving the men Sundays off occasionally?—They got a Sunday off about once in every six weeks. The men could not be spared.

12. It is only a question of men?—Yes.

13. Was it felt to be a grievance?—Some of the men growled, while others took it as a matter of course.

14. What about time off to attend the Court?—I have known a man get a case, perhaps an indictable case, and be kept at the Court the whole of the following day, and then have to go on duty. In those cases they were usually allowed off a couple of hours sooner in the morning.

15. Have you any views on promotion?—No; I never applied for promotion. I was promoted on the recommendation of my Inspector. It was a loss of £130 a year to be promoted from Rawene. I was making £130 a year outside my police pay.

16. How did you manage it?—Bailiff's fees, pay for Clerk of Court, Deputy Registrar of Old-age Pensions, and about four other appointments.

17. You gave that up to be a sergeant?—Yes; because my Inspector recommended me.

18. I should think your case, receiving £130 a year in addition to your police pay, is an exceptional one?—I think Constable Dunne's station at Mangonui was a better one than mine.

19. The district has been cut up since?—Yes.

20. It has been urged that if a man is considered by the Commissioner to be deserving of promotion, having regard to the efficiency of the Force, he should not have the right of refusing it—that the interests of the Force should be paramount?—I think that should be so.

21. Every man considered fit for promotion is naturally a loss to the Force if he is not promoted?—Certainly.

22. You agree with that view?—I do, certainly.

23. Have you any views on the differentiation of treatment between the uniform branch and the plain-clothes branch with regard to promotion?—I do not think the plain clothes branch should come in for Sub-Inspectorships or higher rank without a due amount of service.

24. We will assume that they are not likely to get it without service and merit. There has been only one Chief Detective appointed Sub-Inspector within a good many years—Sub-Inspector McGrath: assuming that promotion has to be made from the ranks of either one or the other branch of the service, surely merit and seniority should be taken into account?—Yes.

25. A great deal has been said in other places with regard to the headgear of the police—whether the shako or helmet should be worn?—I have no fault to find with the shako.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you think that promotion should be by merit and seniority, no matter what branch of the service the officer belongs to?—Yes.

27. You think promotion should be compulsory?—I do.

28. Do you think there are many possessing the necessary qualifications who have refused promotion?—Yes, there are many. I have mentioned one already.

29. How many more do you know?—I do not think Constable Dunne would have accepted promotion.

30. He was not recommended. Let us know some men who have been offered promotion and who have refused?—I could not mention any, but I know there are some cases.

31. But do not say that unless you know of particular cases?—It is a general rule that if a man has a real good station that he would rather remain there than be promoted to be sergeant.

32. *The Commissioner.*] The question is whether, as a matter of principle, the man should be given the option—whether he should be allowed to refuse, or be given the option?—I should say not. I say he is better out of the service.

33. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There may be a number with equal qualifications for promotion, and this man being offered promotion may refuse: would it affect the efficiency of the Force if the next man, with equal qualifications, were promoted?—I think so. If a man refused his turn for promotion, later on he might get shifted from that station and come to town. He might then apply for promotion, and think he had a grievance.

34. Do you think a man would possess sufficient energy and activity if he refuses promotion? You believe in six months' probation?—Yes.

35. Three months on the drill ground and three months on the street?—Yes.

36. Six months in all?—Yes, before being appointed officially a constable. By that time you would know what a man was like.

37. You have made inquiries as regards candidates very frequently?—I have.
38. Do you know that they are carried out more strictly now than ever before?—No doubt it is very strict.
39. And have not reports come in which are unsatisfactory, which are sent back immediately for further inquiry?—Yes.
40. So that all his lifetime, between the date he left school and the time he applies for admission, is covered?—Every day from the time he left school is gone over, so that it would be impossible for him to have been in gaol or elsewhere without the fact being discovered.
41. You say the Fifth Standard is not too high?—I do not think so.
42. Do you not think that we might sometimes enlist some young men from the farming districts who have not passed the Fifth Standard?—Yes.
43. But who may have passed the Fourth?—That is so.
44. You understand that it was raised to the Fifth Standard after the last Commission, as it was thought we might get a better class of men; but now we cannot get a sufficient number. Do you think, if we reduced it to the Fourth Standard, we might get a better field of selection?—You might do; but would they be capable men? Now a man has only a few years to put in in the city before he is sent away into the country. In years gone by a man would have to do duty for from ten to fourteen years before he went into the country.
45. But with a Fourth Standard certificate and with the attention he gets on the drill-ground, would not he be equal to the Fifth Standard before he left?—Yes, perhaps so.
46. As regards recruits being medically examined, is there not a form sent out showing the measurements of the men in every way?—Yes, the sergeant takes the measurements.
47. That gives you a pretty good idea as to whether the recruit is physically fit, does it not?—It does in a sense, but he may be suffering from some disease.
48. But you judge pretty well from appearance what he is like?—Yes.
49. Have you a great objection to travelling second class on the railway?—I do not think it is the thing. The policeman is supposed to keep himself respectable.
50. It is not like a steerage passage?—It is not as bad, but you meet a good many roughs in the second class.
51. So that you would not raise a strong objection to that?—No; but I think the first is better.
52. As regards the grading of stations, to my mind that would be rather a difficult thing to do, because at some stations the emoluments are greater than at others?—That is so.
53. It would be a rather difficult matter to carry out satisfactorily?—Is that in the sub-districts?
54. Yes, and out-stations for sergeants or constables. Would it not be a rather difficult matter, because of the emoluments and mileages?—They could be graded. A small unimportant station could be graded as a "B" station.
55. Would it not be better to grade them in accordance with emoluments received in addition to the pay?—That would be the matter to be taken into consideration.
56. You think sergeants ought to be placed in a higher position than detectives?—I do.
57. If a detective is sent up to your district to carry out an inquiry, is he not under you?—If a detective was sent down to the sub-district I am in now—Whangarei—he would be really drawing more pay than I do, and would be travelling first class, while I would have to travel second.
58. The position is what I am talking about: would not he be placed under you, and be subordinate to you?—Yes.
59. Of course he would. Have you ever at any time sought political influence?—Never.
60. It is suggested, you know, by Constable Dunne that influence was the cause of your advancement in each case?—I think my Inspector knows better than that. It is he who recommended me. I never asked for it. In fact, when the Inspector told me that he had recommended me for promotion I said, "Well, sir, it is no promotion to go to town and do street duty, and leave the station I am on."
61. You are quite satisfied that it was never used in your case?—It never was.
62. In neither of your appointments?—Anything I have got is by my own merit, and upon my Inspector's recommendation. I would not stoop to it in any case.
63. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction as regards the control of the Force at the present time?—No. As far as the Auckland District is concerned, I consider that in respect to discipline it is about as good as any part of New Zealand.
64. Everything is satisfactory?—It is now.
65. There is no general dissatisfaction amongst the men?—Not that I am aware of.
66. And you know of no dissatisfaction amongst the public as regards the police?—I cannot say I do. I do not know of any complaints against the police coming before this Commission. That speaks for itself, and speaks well.
67. *The Commissioner.*] Is there any objection, in your opinion, to the physical examination of a man before he is appointed sergeant?—Not at all.
68. I suggested it to one man, and he seemed to take strong objection to it?—I do not see much objection to it, because you might promote a man, and send him out to do street duty, and he might break down a week afterwards.
- Mr. Dinnie:* I am very much in favour of a medical inspection before promotion.
69. *The Commissioner.*] So am I, and I shall probably make a recommendation in that direction. (To witness): You agree with it, sergeant?—Yes, sir. There are lots of sergeants who have broken down.
70. There are some, I see, in different places, who, if they have not broken down, ought to soon do so, judging by the look of them. Is there anything you wish to add?—No.

WEDNESDAY, 25TH AUGUST, 1909.

EDWARD CLARE BLOMFIELD, Barrister, examined on oath. (No. 174.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You are a barrister of the Supreme Court, practising in Auckland?—Yes.

2. At one time you were Stipendiary Magistrate of the Bay of Islands district?—Yes.

3. *Constable Dunne.*] You know the far north pretty well—the Mangonui Country?—Yes.

4. You knew me as a constable there, and you had knowledge of my capacity?—Yes, I was practising as a solicitor when you came there as constable and Clerk of the Court at Mangonui, Kaitaia, and Ahipara.

5. Will you kindly tell the Commission how, in your opinion, I performed my duties as Clerk of the Court and as constable?—They were performed satisfactorily.

6. In your capacity as Stipendiary Magistrate, did any complaints ever reach you as to my capacity or neglect of duty?—I do not think so. The district was a very big one. Being Clerk of the three Courts necessitated, in my opinion, long hard work, riding about and keeping in touch with the work of the different Courts. Immediately you left the district was divided into two, and two constables were appointed to do the work.

7. From your experience in the north, do you consider that any one but an active, energetic constable could have performed the duties?—No.

8. Do you remember any serious indictable cases which were brought before the Court by me, and how were they conducted?—The cases were properly brought, and the evidence was properly placed before me.

9. Do you remember an old-age pensioner whom I detected misleading the Court with a forged document?—Yes; and the constable was able to prove that the documents were forgeries.

10. *The Commissioner.*] Would you call it an exceptionally capable act on the part of the constable?—I think it was a smart piece of work. The man was prosecuted and convicted.

11. *Constable Dunne.*] Will you tell the Commission how long you have lived in Ponsonby, and how, in your opinion, I have carried out my police duties there?—I have been five years there, but I have not come very much in touch with the police. The district is certainly very quiet. I have seen Constable Dunne on duty from time to time.

12. *Constable A. McGilp.*] I would like to ask Mr. Blomfield a question. (To witness): You have known me in the Bay of Islands?

The Commissioner. Has Mr. Blomfield known you as long as I have?

13. *Constable McGilp.* No. (To witness): You knew me as Clerk of the Court both at the Bay of Islands and at Hokianga?—Yes.

14. How many years were you practising in the north?—I was about fourteen years there.

15. I have conducted cases before you when you were Stipendiary Magistrate?—Yes.

16. Some very difficult and important cases?—Yes.

17. Can you speak generally as to how you found me, both as to ability and otherwise?—Your cases were brought carefully before the Court. I do not think you ever missed calling a witness who should have been called. If you erred at all it was in the other direction.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you can speak of other constables in similar terms?—Yes, practically every constable I have had to do with.

PATRICK JOHN DUNNE, Constable, further examined. (No. 175.)

Witness: I would like to supplement my evidence given yesterday. It would appear from my evidence given yesterday that I was seeking promotion to go on sectional duty; but that is not the case. I stated in my application of last February, and I repeat it now, that, considering the way I have been overlooked, I would not be asking too much promotion to be left where I am, or left in a suburban station. I have a large family. It would not suit me to go on street duty.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You would like to be promoted to the rank of sergeant, but only on the understanding that you would be allowed to remain in charge of a suburban station?—That is so; in consequence of the way I have been overlooked. If I had been promoted in my proper turn, I would have been receiving the full pay, and had a station by this time.

2. Your promotion now would be merely helping forward your superannuation?—I look on it that it is a reflection on myself and family to remain in the Force thirty-six years and then to go out on a pension as a constable.

3. Assuming you have been qualified for all time for promotion?—I did everything possible to qualify myself.

4. I understand from the Commissioner that you have never been recommended?—I never asked for it.

5. It should not be a question of asking for it. I should regard it as very poor administration if a man's promotion were dependent on his own application; and the Police Force—I say it advisedly—would not be worth a brass farthing if every man depended for promotion on his own application. You say you never applied for it: why should you apply for it?—Inspectors are only men, and constables who are under their notice constantly have a better show of coming into favour, and of being recommended.

6. I should not think they would be fit for Inspectors in that case. You have merely been overlooked for some extraordinary reason. You cannot assign any reason?—No. I believe if I had had a push as other men had I would have been promoted, but I do not believe in it on principle. I should not have been here to-day only for what the Hon. Dr. Findlay stated on parade last February.

7. By-and-by I shall have to ask the Inspector here his opinion about Constable Dunne, and if he at any time recommended him for promotion. If not, why not. Of course, it would be open

to you to ask the Inspector any question. Is there any other point you wish to mention?—Yes. I made rather a sweeping statement yesterday with reference to political and other influence, but I omitted one man who was promoted—Eccles. He was made a sergeant. He was sent to a city, and was subsequently promoted to a station at Devonport. It is a well-known fact that he applied for promotion, and it was refused. He then sent in his resignation, but was allowed to withdraw it, and was promoted immediately afterwards. That caused a lot of discontent and heart-burning in the Force. Another further statement I wish to make is about the rents in Ponsonby. There is a constable there, and I know he is paying £1 2s. 6d. a week.

8. Why does he pay that?—He cannot possibly get a house at a more reasonable amount.

9. Do you mean to say you cannot get a house in Ponsonby under £1 2s. 6d. a week?—I know that he was travelling about for a month and making inquiries, but he could not get a house.

10. What size is his family?—Two babies.

11. You do not want a very big house for that?—He cannot get a small one under £1 2s. 6d. I refer to Constable O'Neill.

12. It is a good thing for the landlords?—Yes. All the houses are about the same rents round about there.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Could he not get rooms?—People will not take in a married couple with two babies.

14. *The Commissioner.*] Are you satisfied that that would represent a fair average rental?—I could not get a house in Ponsonby fit for a constable to live in under 15s. a week.

15. *Inspector Cullen.*] Is it the fact that there is another constable occupying the same house, and renting it with him?—He was there for about three weeks or a month. He could not get another house.

16. You should represent things as they are?—That is exactly the position. He cannot get a house. He has been living there a month because he cannot get a house.

GEORGE FOREMAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 176.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Otahuhu, and am in charge of the district. I was enrolled on the 29th March, 1873, and am the senior constable in the New Zealand Force. There are only three men that have longer service than I have as far as I know—Ellison, Bernard, and Higgins.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What about Inspector Wilson?—He may have more, but I only know of those three.

2. What do you wish to bring before the Commission?—I have no complaint to make and no grievance to air, and had it not been for your remarks on parade I would not have come here to-day. Before joining the Force I served in the Colonial Forces in the war, having been born in Taranaki. I have had thirty-seven years in the police, and during the last twenty-six years I have been in charge of stations. I have been a Clerk of Court for over twenty years, Bailiff, and Inspector of Factories. During all that time I have got up my own cases, and have prosecuted them. I have always had charge of licensing districts, where I had to conduct the licensing meetings.

3. You mean, put forward the police reports. The meeting is conducted by the Chairman as a rule?—Yes. I believe that during all that time I have given satisfaction to everybody—Magistrates, police officers, Justices of the Peace, and the public. I have no complaint to make, only that I think a lot of unfairness and injustice is done in respect of promotions. Men here have been promoted over more than a hundred of their seniors.

4. What are the names?—I do not want promotion myself, and I am not looking for it. I know that in coming here I am not doing myself any good.

5. You will not do yourself any harm. How old are you?—Fifty-nine next December. These men when they are promoted in that way must owe their promotion to something behind the scenes.

6. Give me the names?—I have not bothered my head about them, but there are four I know perfectly well, and with one or two I am the best of friends. But I say, if they were promoted, they were not promoted through merit. They are Hodgson, Keep, O'Grady, and Eccles. There are also Crean and Cummings. The latter was promoted over 230 of his seniors, and if I had the promotion of this man I would want to know something about the other 230 men before promoting him over them. An inquiry should be made into these promotions, and if it cannot be proved that they were promoted by merit they should be reduced to the ranks, and wait their turn. It is very disheartening to a constable who wants to rise to find juniors being put over his head when he does his work well, and I am speaking the truth straight out when I say that there are sergeants I have to take orders from who were not born when I was doing street duty. I do not blame the officers altogether, because I do not think they can help it.

7. Who do you blame?—I think it is influence. The officers are like the men—subordinate to others. I do not blame the Inspectors, because if they had their way I am satisfied that some of these promotions would not be made, and it must be just as hard on them to have to put these men in charge of other men who are two or three hundred their seniors. It is very degrading to men of such long service to be ordered about by these juniors. I have nothing to say against the men in respect of character or anything else, but they should take their turn for promotion, unless it can be clearly shown that they are much better men than their seniors. I have had a long experience of the Force, and consider I am in a position to judge. The stations I have taken over have been, as a rule, in a very bad state, but I have always left them in good order, and I have been picked out very often for hard jobs where there was a lot of work to do. As to the men joining the Force, when possible recruits find men leaving the Force because they are disheartened at the way things are carried on they will not come forward. Not long ago an eligible young man would not join when he heard of what happened, and he was a fine young fellow too. I was Registrar of Old-age Pensions for seven years, and gave every satisfaction, although I had a very large district, which included six sub-districts besides my own.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Is it merely from the fact that junior men are promoted over seniors that you suggest influence?—Yes, to a great extent, but not altogether.

9. What other cause?—When a man is promoted over two or three hundred seniors there must be something working behind that.

10. Supposing I told you that I was promoted over fourteen thousand men would you believe that?—I could not dispute it.

11. Would you suggest influence in that case?—Perhaps in one case it may not be so, but when you see it occurring in connection with every promotion there must be something behind that.

12. Do you know anything about other Police Forces?—No; I was born amongst the Maoris in Taranaki, and have never been in other countries.

13. You said that junior men are promoted over hundreds of senior men?—That is what I say, and in this Force there are a lot of men promoted who ought not to be promoted.

14. That is your opinion?—That is my opinion.

15. But not quite the opinion of your Inspectors?—I do not know about that.

16. You know the system of recommending men?—Yes.

17. Do you believe in that?—I do not believe in it. If the Inspector here recommended men, and there were a lot of seniors in other districts, I would inquire into their claims before I promoted those recommended here.

18. But the Inspector in each district recommends?—Yet there may be better men in other districts who want promotion first.

19. The Inspectors recommend those that they get from the other districts at the same time?—I do not know whether they do so or not.

20. Do you think the Inspector is not in the better position to recommend a man for promotion?—Some of them are.

21. Do you know that they consult with their sergeants in respect to the qualifications of the men?—Some sergeants, in my opinion, would not be capable of judging.

22. But the Inspectors can judge from their own knowledge and that of the sergeants also?—The Inspector?

23. Yes?—Some of them could. I am speaking straight out with respect to some Inspectors.

24. Do you suggest that the Inspectors are not qualified for their position?—Some of them are not any more qualified than I am to judge.

25. Perhaps you will give the names of those you think not qualified?—I do not wish to speak of men who are not here to do them any harm. I know of three.

26. And they made promotions?—No, sir. I do not wish to say anything about them at all.

27. Do you not think it is foolish to suggest influence for the simple reason that junior men are promoted over senior men?—I believe that influence is at the bottom of this matter.

28. Why do you say that?—I have seen the promotions, and I know the men.

29. Do you not think you should give the proof by offering some evidence?—You cannot always get the proof of these things. A policeman very often knows a crime has been committed, but he cannot get any proof of it. And it is the same with influence in regard to promotions—you cannot always prove it.

30. But seeing that the Inspectors recommend, surely they would know. I know, and I do not suggest to you that influence is not tried, because it is tried; but the question is, is it now obtaining?—It is causing a great deal of discontent.

31. I should be very glad if you could prove it?—I cannot prove it.

Mr. Dinnie: Nor can I, unfortunately.

32. *Inspector Cullen.*] How long have you been at Otahuhu?—Nearly nine years.

33. You are Clerk of the Court there?—I have been a Clerk of the Court for twenty-six years.

34. You remember surely why you were transferred to Otahuhu? I suggested that I should recommend that you should be put in charge of Newton Station?—Yes.

35. Did not I suggest to you then that if that were carried out it would mean promotion?—Yes; I am not complaining. I am not wanting promotion.

Inspector Cullen: It might be misunderstood, and might be said that I did not recommend Constable Foreman, and that I was not prepared to do so or say why. I wish to say that I was prepared to recommend him, but he did not want it.

Witness: As far as Inspector Cullen is concerned, I believe I have been given every chance of getting fair play. I have no grievance against any officer in the Police Force, or against any constable.

36. *Inspector Cullen.*] You mentioned the name of Constable Hodgson, recently promoted. I suppose you think I recommended him?—I did not think anything of the sort.

Inspector Cullen: I did not recommend him, and would not have promoted him.

The Commissioner: Then, he must have been promoted on another Inspector's recommendation, Mr. Cullen.

Inspector Cullen: I would not recommend him.

The Commissioner: You do not think him competent?

Inspector Cullen: I do not think him a suitable man, and that is straight.

The Commissioner: By whom was he recommended?

Mr. Dinnie: By Inspector Ellison.

FREDERICK AUGUSTUS MOORE, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 177.)

Witness: I omitted to say something about back service. I had seven years' back service in the Auckland Constabulary Force, which does not count at the present time for superannuation, and Constable Carmody is in the same position. Is it within the scope of the Commission to deal with this matter?

The Commissioner: I will ask Mr. Dinnie to explain the position.

Mr. Dinnie: The whole of the facts have been submitted to the Minister of Justice, with a view to a conference being held by the men, and the papers were marked to stand over for three months. That is the present position.

The Commissioner: Mr. Dinnie agrees with me that it is a matter that should be dealt with, and the men ought to have the back service allowed.

BARTHOLOMEW SHEEHAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 178.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Newton, and was enrolled in 1879, and promoted sergeant in 1901.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How long was it before you were put in charge of a station?—I did sectional duty in Christchurch for two years and four months, and from there I was transferred to Waihi.

2. I understand you are a delegate from the sergeants of the Auckland District?—Yes. I have suggestions to put before the Commission that the non-commissioned officers came to after giving the matter very mature consideration. They recommend that recruits be put on probation for twelve months, and if found qualified, the Inspector in charge of the district to appoint them constables at any time during that twelve months.

3. That is to say, that the twelve months should not be compulsory?—No; they could knock off any part of that twelve months. We also suggest that the pay of probationers be 7s. 6d. a day for the whole of the twelve months they are on probation, and on appointment permanently to constable to receive 8s. a day, rising by three-yearly-period increments of 6d. a day to 10s. We ask for saloon fares for married constables travelling on transfer with their wives and families, and a house-allowance of 1s. 6d. a day for constables and 2s. a day for detectives and sergeants. The standard of education not to be reduced but to remain at the Fifth Standard. Free uniforms for sergeants and constables, to consist of a jumper and two pairs of trousers yearly, the cost of making-up to be defrayed by the Department. All stations in grade "A" would receive that supply of uniform. Those are the men who are constantly wearing the uniform every day in the year. The leave should be increased from twelve to sixteen days for all constables and non-commissioned officers, and it should be allowed to accumulate as at present for three years. I wish to mention the difference in the pay of the plain-clothes men and the men of the uniform branch. This question has also been considered by a number of sergeants, of whom there are about seventeen in the Auckland District. It is more than regrettable that circumstances have arisen encouraging the use of the word *versus* as applicable to the relationship of men who should be comrades, but when members of the service read in the Press the following words as the considered opinion of an officer, great uneasiness was occasioned here, as the rights of all members of the service appear to be threatened. These words are: "He" (Sub-Inspector McGrath) "regards the detective branch as the right arm of the service. In classifying detectives he would have a Chief Detective in each centre classified as a Sub-Inspector . . . then the Sub-Inspector and Chief Detective would have the same claim on a vacant Inspectorship." The sergeants of this district have fully discussed the position, and are unanimous in the opinion that such a suggestion is not reform, but revolution. The sergeants heartily support the right of each man in the service to aspire to the highest rank. We are unanimously of the opinion that every man, whether he wears uniform or not, should have the limit of promotion in the service open to him. But most strongly, most emphatically, are we of opinion that the only basis for a healthy and desirable competition is that of equal opportunities for all—competition on fair and equal terms, and no privileged classes. Now, the total number of detectives, including the plain-clothes constables, is fifty (approximately), representing 6½ per cent. of the Police Force. It is apparent, therefore, that many men in the service, no matter how able, educated, or qualified they may be, cannot get into the detective branch because of its number being strictly limited. If Chief Detectives are to be eligible for the rank of Sub-Inspector (and that means Inspector in charge of a district three or four years afterwards) in accordance with their seniority as Chief Detectives, and not by length of service, it is clear that in the near future a preponderance of the commissioned officers will be men of detective experience and training only. There are five Chief Detectives and but four station sergeants. Taking the appointments to both ranks made during the past five years, what do we find? The rank of Chief Detective is reached on an average of fifteen years' service; the rank of station sergeant is reached on an average of thirty-one years' service. If the rank of Chief Detective can be reached in half the time the rank of station sergeant can be reached, and there being one-fifth more detectives than station sergeants, it follows that the promotion of men in the administrative service (represented by 93½ per cent. of the total service) must, in the future, be greatly restricted, and that almost all future promotions will be from the detective branch, representing but 6½ per cent. of the members of the Force. The uniform branch here does not wish to see any of the privileges in the way of higher pay and allowance at present granted to the detectives taken away or lessened. We do not think that they get too much; but when they complained of being badly treated in regard to commissions, we look at these facts. There are in all sixteen commissioned officers in the service. Of these, two are from the detective branch (Inspector O'Brien and Sub-Inspector McGrath), the balance—fourteen—go to the administrative branch. It will thus be seen that the proportion of commissions in the uniform branch is but 2 per cent., while the proportion of commissions in the detective branch is 8 per cent. In other words, under the existing conditions a man has a four times better chance of reaching commissioned rank by the detective channel than he has by following through the uniform branch. While the uniform man is going round the circumference of the circle the plain-clothes man cuts across the diameter, and during the latter's comparatively short service the detective receives 20 per cent. higher salary

and 33 per cent. higher travelling-allowance than does his comrade of equal service, and probably equal qualifications, who holds the rank of sergeant. We therefore ask that no preferential treatment be allowed to any one section of the service, but that if the same goal is to be open to all, then the race should be run on fair and equal terms; all to start from the same mark, and obtain successful promotion, after equal periods of service in the Force. To condense, we ask that detectives be placed on precisely the same footing as sergeants, in that, if sergeants are not to be promoted until after ten years' service, then detectives should not be promoted until they have completed the same period of service. The Chief Detective is a non-commissioned officer, and should be subject to the same rule as regards service as is applied to the station sergeant. It has always been the rule in this service that the sergeant in charge of a station or a sub-district in which a detective is also stationed (such as Gisborne, New Plymouth, and Timaru), the sergeant is in charge, and is the detective's superior officer. The whole service would like to see the position of Chief Detective clearly defined, so that all ranks might know where they stand. The detectives claim, because a Chief Detective draws pay approximately equal to a Sub-Inspector, that he is of equal rank. It is said that comparisons are always odious, and it is with reluctance that this matter is now mentioned; but it has been forced on us by what appears to us to be the extravagant claim now made by the detective branch for a privileged status. Presumably the relative positions of the Sub-Inspector and Chief Detective at Auckland will be applicable, in varying degrees, to the other centres. The Sub-Inspector here is continuously in charge of, and directly responsible for, a sub-district of sixteen suburban stations, and the City of Auckland, containing a population of some eighty-five thousand. Under him is one station sergeant, fourteen sergeants, and eighty-six constables, or a total of 101 men. For the apportionment of the duties, the maintenance of discipline, and the efficient control of these 101 men, he is, of course, responsible. The correspondence incidental to these seventeen stations, and the policing of his large and important sub-district, is, of course, very large. The quantity of Police Court work in this city, with its extensive shipping, will be readily appreciated by your Worship. In the absence of the Inspector, the Sub-Inspector, in addition to his own work, takes over charge of the whole police district, with its sixty-two stations and 172 men, including the detective staff. Under the Chief Detective there are six detectives and four acting-detectives—a total of ten men. He and his staff have a large amount of work to do, and, we believe, do it very well. We regard the Chief Detective here as a very capable and efficient officer, and we may here testify that the relationship between the detective branch and the uniform service is of a most cordial nature. But having said that, we respectfully submit that the importance and the responsibilities of the position of a Sub-Inspector in a centre such as this is—what the position was meant to be—only second to that of the Inspector himself. We submit there can be no parallel between the relative positions of Sub-Inspector and Chief Detective in this or any of the other three centres. If the position of the Chief Detective is not on the same plane as that of the Sub-Inspector, we would like to see those ranks so defined. We would comment, in passing, on the incongruity of the salary of a subordinate non-commissioned officer exceeding that of his superior commissioned officer, which appears to be subversive of discipline, a cause for legitimate dissatisfaction, and an anomaly that should not be permitted to exist. We do not think that Chief Detectives are too well paid. We consider the present pay of a Sub-Inspector incommensurate with the responsibilities of his position. We consider his minimum salary should exceed the maximum of a Chief Detective, so that not only an orderly sequence as regards the relative salaries of the different grades may be preserved, but the promotion of a Chief Detective to the superior rank of a Sub-Inspector will be something more than a promotion in name, and not as at present, a reduction in salary. The indefiniteness and uncertainty that exists in regard to the relative positions of Sub-Inspector, station sergeant, and Chief Detective is equally apparent in the relative positions of sergeant and detective. We have sergeants of unquestionable ability in charge of important stations and sub-districts, with a number of men, including detectives, under their control, and who are actually receiving less pay than the subordinate detective, while having twice or three times his service. Here are a few instances: New Plymouth Station, No. 109, Sergeant Haddrell, with thirty-seven years' service and eleven years a sergeant, in charge of an important town and sub-district, with several constables and a detective under him; the sergeant's pay is 12s. per day; his detective's is 13s. per day; the latter has been a detective less than ten years, and his total service is but little over half that of his sergeant's. Another instance: Gisborne, No. 570, Sergeant Hutton; service, nineteen years; sergeant for three years and a half; pay, 11s. per diem. Under his control is a large sub-district, several constables, and a detective; latter has nine and a half years' service; his appointment to rank of detective was nine months subsequent to date of promotion of his sergeant; his salary at present is 1s. per diem under that of the sergeant in charge, but will equal his in four months, and in twelve years from now will be drawing 2s. 6d. per day more than his sergeant. Other instances can be given. We propose to quote but one more, which still further emphasizes this peculiar anomaly: Newton Station, No. 276, Sergeant Sheehan, is in charge of a large section of the City of Auckland; he has under him three junior sergeants, ten constables, and two detectives; he has thirty years' service, and has been a sergeant just on eight years; his salary is 12s. per diem; his senior detective has fourteen and a half years' service, has been a detective for ten years and three-quarters, and draws 1s. per diem more than the sergeant in charge. We again respectfully submit that this is a very undesirable state of affairs, for the reasons already given, in regarding the pay of the Sub-Inspector and Chief Detective. We submit the following as a fair, practicable, and logical solution of the difficulty: (1.) That in future the rule governing the promotion of sergeants be applied to the promotion of detectives—viz., the ten years' minimum limit. (2.) That the promotion of detectives to the rank of Chief Detective be governed by the same rule (or condition) as regards length of service as is applied to the promotion of station sergeants, so long as the latter rank is allowed to exist, and so long as the rule

is maintained that uniform police must pass through the office of station sergeant to become eligible for promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector. (3.) In view of the apparent breakdown of the station sergeant system, it is suggested in lieu thereof that a grade of sergeant, to be called "senior sergeant," be made; that sergeants by reason of exceptional ability and seniority be called "senior sergeants." (4.) That all stations be graded into two classes, "A" and "B." "A" station to be all headquarter stations, and such other stations as are of most importance, and at which a sergeant is in charge. "B" station to be all stations other than "A." (5.) Senior sergeants only to be in charge of "A" stations. (6.) Pay of senior sergeants to commence at 13s. 6d. per diem, and advance to 15s. 6d. by annual increments of 6d. per diem. (7.) The pay of all other sergeants to commence at 11s. per diem, and advance to 13s. by increment of 6d. every two years. (8.) Senior sergeants wear four chevrons. (9.) That all sergeants and detectives travelling on duty be allowed first class on railways and saloon on steamers. We understand the saloon on steamers has been practically arranged for, so nothing more need be said on that point. As regards first-class fares for sergeants on trains, we would draw attention to the fact that this would not involve one penny additional cost to the Department, and, as the sergeant would almost invariably be in plain clothes, no inconvenience or obtrusiveness would be experienced by the travelling public. No extra cost to the Railway Department would result, as the cost of haulage would not vary with the passenger's position in the train. Further, it would benefit the Railway Department in that second-class carriages are usually more crowded than are first class. Also, the sergeant would have right of entry to all parts of the train, which in certain cases might prove of great assistance not only to the guard in charge of the train, but also be of benefit to the Police Department and the cause of justice. Furthermore, detectives have this privilege, and their rank is no higher than that of a sergeant. When it is pointed out that Sergeant Haddrell and his detective, or Sergeant Sheehan and one of his, had occasion to go by train on the same duty, the detective would enter a first-class carriage, while his superior officer would have to travel second class. This, again, is subversive of discipline, a cause of friction, and therefore against the best interests of the service. This is another of those anomalies which has been a cause of dissatisfaction in the service: A constable of a week's service is allowed the same travelling-allowance as a sergeant or station sergeant of thirty years' service. A detective of seven years' service is allowed 8s. per diem, while a sergeant is granted only 6s. Again, taking the liberty of using Sergeant Haddrell or Sergeant Hutton to illustrate the point: One of these officers and his subordinate detective travel by the same conveyance to the same place on the same duty, perhaps at the same hotel, incur the same out-of-pocket expenses, and on return to their station together the senior officer is allowed 6s. per day, his subordinate 8s. If the conditions of promotion in both branches are made equal as regards length of service in the Force, and a man in the detective branch proves himself to be more fitted for the duty of a uniform sergeant, I cannot see why he should not transfer to the uniform branch as a sergeant without loss of seniority. So, also, if a uniform sergeant proved himself qualified for detective work, he also should be allowed to transfer to the plain-clothes branch without loss of seniority.

4. You refer to what you term the breakdown of the system of station sergeants: what do you mean?—We saw in the Press during the proceedings of the Commission where, with regard to a certain station sergeant in a certain place, the Commissioner said it was not considered that he was qualified for promotion. It was generally understood by the whole of the police when station sergeants were instituted that they would be eligible for the higher ranks.

5. I should not think you would be likely to have a young man promoted to the position of station sergeant unless he was qualified to go to the higher rank?—Quite so.

The Commissioner: You are quite correct in your statement with regard to a particular station sergeant, with regard to whom it was stated that he was not fit for promotion on his then qualifications.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not think it was quite that. It was said that the other officers were superior to that man.

The Commissioner: At that particular time. I should qualify it in that way.

Mr. Dinnie: If you please, sir.

6. *The Commissioner:* I think you are on somewhat unsafe ground in referring to this as a breakdown of the system?—With respect to promotions, I think that has been the whole trouble. Three station sergeants have recently been promoted. Most of them were senior sergeants when they were promoted. Our argument is this: that if they were fitted to be station sergeants, then seven, eight, or nine years ago they were very much better fitted than when they were promoted a few months or years ago, as the case may be. That is how the sergeants look at it. It was considered when station sergeants were created that they were men who could be advanced to a higher rank.

7. I suppose you take it that there are station sergeants who will never be advanced?—I do.

8. Is there anything else you wish to say?—Yes; the matter that has been referred to as the "handy" or "useful" man. Some two years ago I was in charge of the same station as I am now, and there was evidently some disloyal man there. The first thing I got was a telegram, through my Inspector, asking me to report as to the conduct and supervision of the station, as the present Commissioner Dinnie thought that a change should be made. I was on my trial. I had to defend myself; and the result I leave the Commission to peruse in this file of papers. I applied to have the file produced to the Commission. I think you will see from the file that there was not one word of truth in what was alleged, and I can only come to the conclusion that there was a "handy" man at the station, and that certain information was sent to the Commissioner's office, and that the information was sent through some channel other than the Inspector or Sub-Inspector in charge of the station, through whom the information should have gone if there was anything wrong at the station.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Is there anything in the file to show how the information came?—No, nothing but a newspaper clipping.

Mr. Dinnie: A clipping! That shows where it came from.

The Commissioner: This is apparently a clipping from a newspaper. What newspaper is this?

Inspector Cullen: *Saturday Night*. It is a weekly paper.

The Commissioner: Who is responsible for it? It is addressed, apparently, to the Commissioner of Police, and was sent to him.

Mr. Dinnie: Probably sent by *Saturday Night*.

The Commissioner: It is evidently addressed to you, Mr. Dinnie—to “The Commissioner of Police, Wellington.” And there is your memo.: “Inspector Cullen.—For your information and attention.” And then there are remarks I will not refer to, but evidently implying that the Commissioner had some previous knowledge.

Witness: I do not know where the information came from.

10. *The Commissioner:* It says, “Inspector Cullen.—For your information and attention. I trust there is no truth in the allegations contained herein, but I must admit that I have had occasion to consider whether a change in the supervision of that station (Newton) is desirable. Can you make a recommendation to that effect?—W. DINNIE, Com., 21/8/07.” (To witness:) That is what you refer to?—Yes.

11. This you produce as evidence?—Yes, of a “useful” man.

The Commissioner: What paper is this in pink?

Inspector Cullen: That is a paper called *Sport*.

The Commissioner: Oh! There is another paper called *Sport*?

Inspector Cullen: Yes.

The Commissioner: Is this published weekly here?

Inspector Cullen: Yes.

12. *The Commissioner:* There is a reference to “Sheehan’s Physic,” I see. (To witness:) You put in this file?—Yes. I have never been reprimanded by any officer under whom I served, and never by the Commissioner, certainly.

13. If you say that somebody was getting behind you in connection with this matter, have you any suspicion as to whom that person is?—Yes, undoubtedly I have a suspicion. I do not care about referring to it, but I cannot help it.

14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Will you give the name to the Commission?—Yes.

15. *The Commissioner:* Is it the name of a man in the Force?—Yes.

The Commissioner: Well, write down the name.

[Witness wrote the name, and handed it to the Commissioner.]

Witness: I might state that no less than within a month the proprietor of *Saturday Night* met me in the street, and told me where he got the allegation from.

Mr. Dinnie: That will clear the matter up, I should think.

16. *The Commissioner.*] How did *Saturday Night* get the information, according to his statement to you?—I met him in the street, and he said he knew he had done me a grievous wrong. That was all I knew about it. He told me that is what happened.

17. Is that all you have to say of a general nature?—I would like to add that the system of appointing constables and sergeants is obsolete. Something should be done to improve the system. I think that the batons are very much too large and heavy, and I think a change should be made in regard to them.

18. Have you anything to say about promotion generally?—With regard to promotions, it is a fact that the men are dissatisfied with the way they are made. For instance, a man is eligible for promotion, and is passed over for several years; then he is promoted after a lapse of a number of years; but he then becomes junior to a man to whom he would have been senior if he had been promoted in his proper turn. There is no doubt that causes a great deal of friction in the service.

19. But you recognise that there will always be a certain amount of dissatisfaction with respect to promotion. Every man wants to be judged according to his own estimate of himself rather than on the estimate of others?—But the feeling is general about it; there is no doubt about it.

20. You think that is the main source of dissatisfaction?—That is a great source of dissatisfaction. A matter was referred to yesterday which I would like to refer to. It is about promotions in a certain district in the north. I was promoted at Kawakawa, and an ex-member of Parliament was referred to as being a large-hearted man. I can assure you that as far as that ex-member was concerned he would have been the last man in New Zealand I would have gone to if I had wanted promotion.

21. Why?—Because any little experience I had with him was very unsatisfactory. And that was in this way: He indicated a certain man to me as being wanted in Mangonui. I went to the station and sent a telegraphic message to the constable then in charge—

22. If you are going to refer to anything particular between yourself and this ex-member of Parliament, I think you had better not. It is quite sufficient for your case if you deny upon oath that you ever approached that particular member of Parliament with regard to promotion, or that you ever received anything at his hands?—I certainly deny that on oath, and I will go further, and say that he is the last man in New Zealand whom I would approach for such a purpose, or get anybody else to approach.

23. The inference is that he is the last man who would be likely to recommend you?—Yes.

24. You referred to the line of cleavage between the plain-clothes branch and the uniform branch, and the fact that the plain-clothes men are much better off than the uniform branch?—Yes.

25. A detective gave evidence before me the other day who said he was a sergeant, and considered he took a step down when he became a detective—I refer to Detective Siddells?—Probably he might have been better off if he had remained where he was, but that was his lookout. He thought he was improving his position, and he had to lose his seniority.

26. As a matter of fact, are not detectives put to considerably extra expense in connection with their duties?—I do not know. Take a man who is stationed in the country: he has to do his own detective work. I have had to do it for many years, and yet I was not put to extra expense.

27. What is your opinion on this point: When a constable is considered fit for promotion by the Department, is it in the best interests of the efficiency of the service that such a man should be given the option of saying whether he will accept promotion or not?—I think he should be compelled to accept it; he should not be given the option.

28. You know it is the practice?—I did not know it until I saw it stated in the papers, and I was very much astonished.

29. About this vexed question of the promotion of district clerks, have you any opinions upon that?—I think it is wrong, and causes a lot of trouble in the Force.

30. You think there should be a separate clerical branch?—No; I think if a man chooses to remain in the office he should get promotion in his turn. There should be no short-cut.

31. You recognise the fact that the district clerk should get some slight extra remuneration?—Yes.

32. He receives an extra 1s. a day, but it is in consideration of his not getting an allowance for his uniform. I understand that you think that if he is entitled to extra remuneration he should get it for the extra work he does, and not through the medium of higher rank?—Yes.

33. Do you think that creates any dissatisfaction in the Force?—Yes, it causes friction in the case of senior men looking out for promotion. These clerks are promoted after ten years' service.

34. You think that is not in the interests of the service?—I am certain of it.

35. There have been several recent promotions of district clerks: what about Sergeant Mugeridge's promotion?—I consider it is wrong, and it is so considered throughout the service. Every member of the Force entitled to promotion must consider it a grievance.

36. Do you say that it has caused dissatisfaction throughout the Force?—Yes; in this district it has been repeatedly mentioned to me.

37. Do you think it would help matters between the uniform and plain-clothes branches if there was a separate class for detectives?—Yes; I think it would be a very good thing if it could be done.

38. That means shutting the door to their promotion to the highest ranks?—They can have a rank of their own.

39. But look how small the detective force is proportionately?—Evidently the promotions are much higher, or that branch is more attractive.

40. You have had to do with station sergeants in the centres?—Yes, I have acted myself for five months.

41. What is your opinion with respect to the creation of that office?—I think the system of appointing senior sergeants, as I have suggested, would be very much better.

42. You know that the duties have never been defined?—I suggested to the present Commissioner that they should be defined.

43. Do you notice any falling-off in the physique of the men?—At one time—I think for a period of some three years—we had a very inferior class of men—nothing but what you might call a great number of “wasters”—men who were not suitable for the service; and they could not be got out of it so long as they conducted themselves well.

44. What do you attribute that to?—In addition to that, we had a great number of men from the other colonies and other places who were not suitable for the Police Force. It was found that they disorganized and contaminated the service—affecting prejudicially those who were willing to do their work.

45. Do you think there are the men available now?—Yes; but while the pay is as low as it is at present you will not get the better class to join. I should say the lack of recruits is owing to the low rate of pay; and then there is the fact that the colonial youth does not like discipline.

46. Is it a fact that the dissatisfaction with the Police Surgeon here is general?—Yes.

47. Do you know of instances of members of the Force consulting other medical men?—Yes.

48. *Mr. Dinnie.*] We will first deal with the “handy” man. I am glad you have produced the file, because it will prove conclusively what took place. My minute to Inspector Cullen has been read. The matter was sent to him for inquiry?—Yes.

49. But prior to that there had been dissatisfaction?—None that I knew of.

50. Are you not aware that Sergeant Abbott had tendered his resignation, and said he could not perform his duty under your supervision?—Yes; but I am also aware that he did not tender his resignation until he received a sum of money on the death of his mother.

51. Would not his resignation lead me to believe that there was something wrong?—I do not think so.

52. Did not Constable Blackwell resign under similar circumstances?—He did when the ex-sergeant told him to.

53. Would not these two resignations lead me to form an opinion that something was not right?—I should not think so when you had the Inspector, Sub-Inspector, and other officers in Auckland City.

54. But would it not be for me to cause an inquiry to be made, especially on this *Saturday Night* article coming immediately after?—If it came from the Inspector or Sub-Inspector, then I think it would be a matter for inquiry.

55. These two resignations came through the Inspector?—Yes.

56. And they were prior to this article appearing in *Saturday Night*?—Just about the time; I think it was in the same week.

57. Inquiry was made?—Yes.

58. This is my minute on the case after inquiry was made: "Inspector Cullen.—I am perfectly satisfied with the reports hereto annexed, and am now prepared to furnish my Minister with an answer should any question on the subject arise. I regret we cannot prevent information of this description reaching the Press, but it is deplorable that any member of the Department should associate himself with such a rag as *Saturday Night*. Further investigation is altogether unnecessary.—W. DINNIE, Com., 30/8/07." Was not that satisfactory?—It was satisfactory to me.

59. In what way does that show that I had some "handy" man there?—I cannot say anything at present except that I felt that there was somebody behind my back trying to do me an injury, and failed.

60. I quite agree with you there. You have handed in two names—names of those whom you suspect. The first name is that of a private individual, whom I never spoke to, and do not know. Do you believe that?—Yes.

61. As to the second man, was he not recommended for promotion by the Inspector?—I have no idea.

62. And was he not reduced by me from detective to uniform duty?—Yes, when inquiries had been made.

63. Would I reduce a "handy" man in that way?—I do not know.

64. Are those the only persons you put forward as "handy" men?—There was a disloyal sergeant who tried to undermine the working of the station.

65. Perhaps you are justified in what you say as to that, but I had no knowledge of it?—I do not blame you at all, Mr. Dinnie; I never did blame you.

66. Do you suggest that either of those two men whose names you have written down were "handy" men for me?—I suggest that they were "handy" men for somebody.

Mr. Dinnie: One man I did not know at all, and the other I reduced for misconduct.

67. *The Commissioner.*] Do you mean that information filtered through somebody else to the Commissioner of Police?—Yes.

68. You mean that it filters through another person in contact with the Commissioner of Police?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I am in the dark still on this matter. Perhaps you can give us some more information. I am in the dark still as to the "handy" man.

69. *The Commissioner.*] I suppose you suggest that the person who forwarded the information was trying to curry favour with the Commissioner?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: The writing ought to show who forwarded it.

Inspector Cullen: The writing appears to be that of Acting-Detective Abbott, who was sergeant at Newton at the time.

Mr. Dinnie: If I had been made aware of this beforehand I should have had an opportunity of looking into it, and dealing with it.

The Commissioner: You will have an opportunity of clearing it up later on.

Mr. Dinnie: I should like to have had an opportunity of clearing it up now.

70. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Are there any other remarks you would like to make? Have you had to make inquiries with respect to applicants for the Police Force?—Yes.

71. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think any stricter inquiry is necessary?—No.

72. They are more strictly made than they were years ago—much more strict, I should say?—I think in Mr. Tunbridge's time they were just as strict.

73. Do you know that Mr. Tunbridge did not go back beyond five years?—I could not speak about that.

74. You know that district clerks are selected from the uniform branch?—Yes.

75. Because of their qualifications?—Yes; but I do not know that their qualifications are any better than those who are left out.

76. Do you not think that certain qualifications are required for a district clerk?—Yes.

77. He requires to have a certain education to go into the office?—Yes.

78. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish me to understand with respect to the men selected as district clerks?—I think they are men fitted for the position, but there are a great number equally qualified who remain outside.

79. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that the Inspectors are asked once a year to recommend men for office-work?—No.

80. That is the case. Do you think that is a proper system?—Yes, I should think so.

81. It is the same in regard to promotion, mounted duty, and plain clothes: do you think that ought to be the case—that the Inspector ought to recommend in each case the men he considers qualified for the positions?—I do.

82. I suppose you cannot suggest a system of promotions that will give satisfaction to every one?—Not more than this: that if a man were fitted for promotion to-day, and it came his turn in three or four years, he ought to get promotion when it comes to his turn.

83. You know we have a certain number of men who are qualified to be constables only?—I suppose there are.

84. There are a certain number qualified to be sergeants only?—Yes.

85. In the case of constables promoted to be sergeants, if I am going to take all the senior men who are qualified for sergeants only, where am I to get men for promotion to the highest positions? Must I not go down the list and get junior men promoted?—Certainly; but I think that any system of promotion which jumps here and there and everywhere does not give satisfaction, and never will,

86. Do you believe in seniority and merit combined?—Yes.
 87. What better system can you have?—No better system.
 88. Is not that the system now in force?—I do not know.
 89. The men are recommended by the Inspectors?—Yes.
 90. Is not that the proper system?—Yes.
 91. If they are promoted in accordance with those recommendations, you would be satisfied?
 —Yes. When it comes to a man's turn for promotion and he is promoted I think there would be no complaints.

The Commissioner: I would like to know, in reference to the periodical recommendations that are sent forward, whether the men who are recommended one year and who are not promoted are included in the next year's list?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, that is so.

92. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When Sub-Inspector Norwood was promoted, do you know that the Chief Detective applied at the same time?—I do not know.

93. And that Sub-Inspector Norwood had seniority by some six months?—Yes.

94. And that I recommended Norwood for promotion instead of McGrath for the simple reason that I believed his qualifications were equal, and he was the senior man?—Yes.

95. Do you suggest anything against the promotion of McGrath?—No.

96. Do you think it was a right promotion?—I am not prepared to say whether it was right or wrong. I know it has caused great dissatisfaction in the Force.

97. Do you suggest that he was not qualified?—No. I think for Court work he is a very capable man, but I do not see how he can be qualified for the work of a Sub-Inspector.

98. Have you read what he said as to his qualifications, and as to his detective work being of great assistance to him in his present position?—Yes.

99. Are you against detectives being promoted by merit into the uniform branch?—I am against that, unless it is done by seniority.

100. Not by merit at all?—No; because they go by a short cut.

101. It does not follow that each Chief Detective is qualified for higher rank, or is going to be promoted?—I do not know that; we have to wait and see.

102. As regards promotion from constable to sergeant, I want you clearly to understand that seniority and merit is considered at the present time?—If a senior man is qualified to become a sergeant he should be promoted when his turn comes.

103. Supposing we continue to promote the senior men, where are we to get our men for the higher ranks?—From among the senior men.

104. Do you know that fresh regulations have been sent out to the Inspectors for their suggestions?—I saw it mentioned in the Press.

105. I think it would be a wise plan for you to submit your proposals to the Inspector: it might assist him in making suggestions?—I would be only too pleased, if it would be of assistance.

106. You think that recruits should be on probation for twelve months?—Yes; twelve months from the time they join, including the time they are in the depot.

107. Do you not think six months would be sufficient?—Some men take a considerable time to develop before you know what they are going to become; and some of them become very capable men after they grasp their work.

108. And you find young men who sometimes have misconducted themselves who turn out very good men?—Occasionally.

109. The defaulters' sheets show that?—Yes, they may.

110. You have to be very careful in dealing with young men?—Yes.

111. We may dismiss men who may turn out good men eventually?—That has not been my experience. As to those who have been dismissed, I think it is a good thing for the service.

112. Some of them, undoubtedly. It depends on the nature of the misconduct?—I mean for general misconduct.

113. As regards the general efficiency of the Force, what do you say as to that?—At present in the Auckland District there is no cause to complain—none that I am aware of.

114. Do you think the public feel any unrest with respect to the police in Auckland?—I have never known of it. It is well known from the north to the south that the discipline in the Auckland Province is much more strict than in any other province. Young men tell us that when they come from the south.

115. I am afraid the south will not be pleased to hear it?—That is a fact.

The Commissioner: We will hear what they have to say in Wellington.

116. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Of course, you think we would get more recruits if the pay were raised?
 —Yes.

117. It would encourage more men to apply?—Yes.

118. And we would have a better selection?—Yes.

119. In regard to candidates for the Force, you do not suggest that the inquiries are not sufficient as regards character?—The inquiries are thoroughly made.

120. You know that files are sometimes sent back when the inquiries are not considered satisfactory?—Yes; files have been sent back.

121. *Inspector Cullen.*] You have been asked about the resignation of Constable Blackwell and Sergeant Abbott?—Yes.

122. What was Blackwell worth as a constable?—Worthless. Every sergeant on the station would tell you that, and has reported to that effect, I think.

123. How long was he in the Force?—I think, about twelve months, but I would not swear to it.

124. After your promotion, was his uselessness particularly shown?—He was a man who if he went out on the street with his sergeant would see nothing, and do nothing; in fact, the man should never have been in the service.

Mr. Dinnie: Here are Sub-Inspector Gordon's remarks in respect to this particular man: "Constable Blackwell is a very respectable young man, and I had hoped he would, in time, make a fairly good constable, but he is lacking in force of character, and from what I have heard from the sergeants who were over him I have come to the conclusion he is unsuitable for the service."

The Commissioner: Would you have any papers relative to his admission? Would he be reported on to you at the time of his admission?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes. Mr. Gordon says he is a very respectable young man. He came from the probation class the same as the others, so that the probation instructor would know.

125. *Inspector Cullen* (to witness).] You have also been asked about Sergeant Abbott, who complained that he would not serve under you, on account of your attitude towards him?—Yes, sir.

126. That went on to the Commissioner, did it not?—Yes.

127. And no inquiry was made or exception taken to it by the Commissioner?—None whatever that I know of.

128. Do you know the time he was up there with you?—I remember it.

129. Did he exhibit a spirit of hostility to you?—Very marked.

130. *The Commissioner.*] What did that arise from?—Nothing that I know of.

131. You did not quarrel, as a rule?—We never had a quarrel.

132. How long had he been a sergeant when he came into contact with you?—On promotion.

133. *Inspector Cullen.*] He came from Wellington?—Yes.

134. Was it not the fact that he was trying to subvert discipline all the time?—Yes, he did it to a certain extent.

135. Was it not alleged that he tried to get up a petition amongst the residents with a view to having you removed from there?—I would not say that, but I heard that a petition was got up, but I never heard that he was at the bottom of it, although I suspected he would be.

136. *The Commissioner.*] Where was he promoted from?—Wellington, sir.

137. *Inspector Cullen.*] Is it not at Wellington that he has a very intimate friend in the Sub-Inspector in the Commissioner's office?—He told me himself.

138. You suggest that if there was any communication about you that it would go through him to the Sub-Inspector?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: This is a report of late Sub-Inspector Gordon in respect to that matter: "I have known Sergeant Abbott for nearly six years as a thoroughly decent, efficient officer, and I should be very sorry to learn that he had been obliged to resign under a sense of injustice."

Witness: You might read the remainder of that report, for the Commissioner's information.

Mr. Dinnie: I have read it.

Witness: There is another paragraph there.

Mr. Dinnie: That is about Blackwell. I read that before.

Witness: What he says about myself.

Mr. Dinnie: I will read it. "The case he refers to in his reasons for resigning was inquired into by the Inspector, and proved. Sergeant Sheehan is a painstaking, energetic officer, who does his duty to the best of his ability. The facts as to the fracas that almost occurred at the Newton Station are fully explained in Sergeant Sheehan's reply to Constable Blackwell's statement of his reasons for resigning, and speak for themselves." The sergeant's report is here, and my minute I have already referred to.

Witness: May I ask that Sergeant Ramsay's report attached to that file be also read?

Inspector Cullen: And my minute might be read too.

The Commissioner: Yes. They are as follows:—

"Queen Street Wharf Station, Auckland, 23rd August, 1907.—Report by Sergeant William Ramsay, No. 488, *re* friction at Newton Station (*vide* cutting, *Saturday Night*).—I respectfully report that I know nothing whatever about the friction at the Newton Station. I have done duty at Newton Station under Sergeant Sheehan some eighteen months ago, and, although the sergeant and I had a few words when I was under him, I must say, in fairness to Sergeant Sheehan, that he always done his duty in a straightforward manner, and was always willing to teach and instruct the constables under him. I have never at any time seen or heard Sergeant Sheehan speak disrespectful to any of the men under him.—WILLIAM RAMSAY, Sergeant, No. 488.—The Sub-Inspector of Police, Auckland.—Forwarded to the Inspector.—D. GORDON, Sub-Inspector, 23/8/07.

"Police Station, Auckland, 21st August, 1907.—The Inspector.—*Re* article in *Saturday Night* of the 17th instant on friction amongst police at Newton Station.—I beg to report that I know absolutely nothing of the alleged harassing of members of the Force at Newton. I am aware that when Sergeant Ramsay was stationed at Newton there was considerable friction between Sergeant Sheehan and him, but that was inquired into and settled, Sergeant Ramsay being afterwards brought into the city for duty. There was also trouble between Acting-Detective Macartney and Detective McIlveney, but that also was inquired into and settled. Since then I was under the impression that the work at Newton was going on fairly smoothly, and it was only when Sergeant Abbott and Constable Blackwell were called on to furnish reasons for their resignations that I learned there still existed a serious disagreement amongst the staff. Whether Sergeant Abbott and Constable Blackwell have any just grounds for their complaints I know not, and whether they have or not can only be discovered by a thorough investigation. If there were any just grounds for complaint, they are both aware that the regulations afford the fullest remedy. Neither have made any previous complaint, so that it was only reasonable to suppose that there was none. I have known Sergeant Abbott for nearly six years as a thoroughly decent, efficient

officer, and I should be sorry to learn that he had been obliged to resign under a sense of injustice. Constable Blackwell is a very respectable young man, and I had hoped he would, in time, make a fairly good constable, but he is lacking in force of character, and from what I have heard from the sergeants who were over him, I have come to the conclusion he is unsuitable for the service. The case he refers to in his reasons for resigning was inquired into by the Inspector, and proved. Sergeant Sheehan is a painstaking, energetic officer, who does his duty to the best of his ability. The facts as to the fracas that almost occurred at the Newton Station are fully explained in Sergeant Sheehan's reply to Constable Blackwell's statement of his reasons for resigning, and speak for themselves.—D. GORDON, Sub-Inspector.

"New Zealand Police, District Office, Auckland, 27th August, 1907.—Memorandum from the Inspector of Police, Auckland, to the Commissioner of Police, Wellington.—Subject: Alleged Friction at Newton.—The attached reports from sergeants who have had ample opportunities of seeing and judging for themselves how duties at Newton Station have been carried out will show you that the supervision at that station is quite satisfactory. If Sergeant Abbott had a grievance he could have made representations through the usual channel and got redress; but when he makes no such representation to either the Sub-Inspector or myself, it is obvious he could have little to complain of. Even when asked by you to state his grounds for resigning he replies that it is because he will not serve under Sergeant Sheehan, but makes no specific complaint or charge against Sheehan. Now, everybody connected with the Force here knows that Abbott is resigning because he has inherited sufficient money to enable him to retire from the service to enter into the motor and cycle business, which he believes will be more remunerative than police work. This sergeant has been in a chronic state of bad health ever since he came here, and I feel sure the condition of his health has a good deal to do with his imaginary grievances. Had there been anything wrong with the supervision or the regulation of duties at Newton, the Sub-Inspector who exercises immediate supervision over that station, and myself, must have heard of it, and, as both of us have more interest in the service and regard for our own reputations than that gutter-rag *Saturday Night*, I think you can take it for granted that we are not likely to allow abuses to exist at any station under us. However, if you think things are not as they should be at Newton, I would be obliged if you could find it convenient to come here as early as possible, and hold an inquiry into the working of Newton Station. From my point of view, the supervision exercised there is as good as it is at any station in New Zealand; and, holding such views, I cannot see my way to do a capable officer an injustice by recommending his transfer. If Sergeant Sheehan were transferred from there at the present time, every member of the Force here would feel that it was done as a salve to Sergeant Abbott's feelings, and to placate *Saturday Night*. Insubordination would then become rampant, and disorganization must follow once the men knew they had only to ventilate their grievances through the gutter-rag. I am pursuing inquiries *re* the channel through which police information is being conveyed to *Saturday Night*, and will report fully later on if I am successful in my inquiries.—J. CULLEN, Inspector of Police."

The Commissioner: That is followed by the Commissioner's minute.

Mr. Dinnie: That I was perfectly satisfied. Knowing the good work Sergeant Sheehan has done at Waihi, I am quite satisfied with the matter.

139. *Inspector Cullen* (to witness).] Regarding Abbott: This man resigned from the service, did he not, and went into the cycle business; but after a time he found that the cycle business did not pay him?—He and his partner dissolved, because the business did not turn out a success.

140. Then he went to Wellington?—Yes.

141. And got reappointed?—Yes.

142. Do you know his age when he went there?—He told me himself he was forty-two.

143. That is above the prohibited age?—Yes; two years above it.

144. And is it not reputed that he has done no uniform duty since he joined?—I understand that is so.

Mr. Dinnie: That is so.

145. *Mr. Cullen.*] It is a matter of report that he has done no uniform duty?—I have heard it repeatedly by members of the Force.

146. You have been asked about the inquiries made before men are appointed. So far as you know, was any inquiry made as to how he had conducted himself during the time he was out of the service here?—None that I am aware of.

147. *The Commissioner.*] I think you said that in your opinion forty-five should be the age?—I said that at the last Commission, and I still hold that view.

148. Do you think it is a good thing that a man should do sectional duty in a town before he is put in charge of a sub-district?—I certainly think that it is a good thing. Respecting men being given charge of stations, some of the sergeants who have been doing duty in the city fear that the claims of certain men to stations might be overlooked in favour of men who had not gone through their apprenticeship on the streets as the former have done.

149. You refer to the case of a man, say, who has thirty years of exemplary service?—Yes.

150. And who may be admitted on all hands to have been passed over in respect to promotion?—I admit there are such cases, myself.

151. You admit you know of no reason why this particular man should have been passed over?—I think I know the man you refer to, and I have always been astonished that he was passed over.

152. He is now, after having been passed over, about fifty-three years of age. What would you do with that man?—Of course, men of that age cannot do the sectional duty at present.

153. This man has not many years to go, you know. You would not remedy an injustice in a case of that sort if it is to be done at the expense of men who have been from two to three years in town?—I am just telling the Commission what the feeling is.

154. What is your own feeling?—My own opinion is that the man should not suffer, and if he has been looked over, I think he should take his place amongst the men who have been promoted. Other men over that age have been promoted, and are doing sectional duty on the streets.

Mr. Dinnie: As regards that constable, I wish it to be clearly understood that I am not the Commissioner responsible for his non-promotion.

The Commissioner: I have said so on every occasion, Mr. Dinnie, in the south.

Mr. Dinnie: As regards Abbott, it has been suggested that he was forty-two years of age. That is not the case, and the suggestion should not have been made. He is only forty at the present time.

The Commissioner: How long has he been reinstated, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Over a year ago.

155. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Would you be in favour of an examination as to medical fitness before a man is promoted?—I think it is very important.

156. Before he is offered promotion to sergeant?—Yes.

157. You have had a long experience, and have served in all sorts of stations: have you any views as to the length of time a man should remain in a station, having regard to the complete efficiency of the Force?—Eight years was the longest I was in one station. There should be transfers occasionally.

158. You cannot differentiate. If you make the rule you must fix the time?—Of course, there are numbers of men in whose cases more frequent changes might be required than in others.

159. But that does not answer my question?—I consider six years is a fair time for any man to remain in one station, a country station particularly.

160. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Then, do you think you were too long there, and that therefore you were not performing your duties satisfactorily?—I do not think so. I was in Waihi eight years, and I performed my duty as well the day I left as the day I went there; but I know of others who could not do it.

161. It depends entirely on the man?—Entirely.

162. So that it would not do to make a fixed rule?—The man who does his duty I would be the last to have removed. But I think there should be a system of changing.

163. Of course, you know that men are changed for misconduct or when it is found necessary?—Yes.

The Commissioner: I was referring generally to all-round inefficiency: in a small place a man soon becomes inefficient.

Mr. Dinnie: And the information very soon comes to me from one source or another.

The Commissioner: From what we have heard to-day I have no doubt it would.

164. *Detective Marsack.*] You have given us some figures as to the time it takes a man to rise to Chief Detective and the time it takes to rise to station sergeants?—Yes.

165. How far back have you gone in making up your figures?—To the commencement of the instituting of the station sergeantship.

166. Station sergeants were first appointed in 1906. I know now, of course, that Mr. Hendrey was not then thirty-one years in the service. Seven station sergeants have been appointed, and the average time they served as constables before becoming station sergeants works out at 29½ years. You told us that it was thirty-one. There is a difference, although it is not much; but I wish the figures to be correctly given?—Yes.

167. Taking the Chief Detectives, I find the average is 16·9 years. There your figures are a little bit wrong again?—I quoted mine for the past five years.

168. Then, with regard to the last batch of Sub-Inspectors who have been appointed, I think you can take my figures for it that they have served on an average 25·9 years?—I did not go into that, but I will take them as correct.

169. And, again, taking the last seven Inspectors who have been appointed to that rank, their average service is twenty-seven years?—Yes.

170. So that really in quoting against the detective branch, that it takes a man thirty-one years to become station sergeant, you overlook the fact that a man might become an Inspector in twenty-seven years, and has done so?—In days gone by.

171. No, in the present day. Now, during the past twenty years I think there has only been one detective promoted to the rank of Inspector, and he has served from 1874 to 1900, or a total of thirty-six years, which is considerably longer than the average service of the last seven Inspectors?—Yes.

172. Do you consider that that detective was wrongly promoted, and that he was promoted out of his turn?—I do not say so.

173. Do you consider it to be so? You have said you do not believe in the detectives being promoted to the commissioned ranks at all?—I do not.

174. I may be wrong, but is it your opinion?—No; it is not my opinion, but I think they should not be promoted more than in a fair ratio to the number of your men.

175. Then, we come back to the fact that we are only a small number of men, and that for each detective who may stand a chance of being promoted some fifty constables have a chance. You spoke in rather a complaining way as to the difference in the remuneration accorded to a detective and to a sergeant?—I did.

176. Do you not think that the difference in favour of the detective is rather more apparent than real? How much a day more is the detective getting than yourself?—One shilling a day, and in the course of a year or two he will get more.

177. That is the apparent larger pay he is getting than you. But at any rate you are getting a free house?—Yes.

178. Also free uniform?—Yes.

179. Do you not think those privileges wipe out the difference the detective is getting in the shape of extra pay, seeing that he has to pay rent and clothe himself?—What do I get for the responsibility I have to take? I am responsible for from sixteen to twenty-two men, and the detective only for himself.

180. Then, it is in respect to the principle, and not the money, you complain?—Yes.

181. You also complain that the detective receives a higher travelling-allowance than the sergeants?—Yes.

182. Do you not think it is reasonable, when a detective is sent far inland to inquire into some crime, that he should receive a larger travelling-allowance than the ordinary constable or sergeant?—Not more than the ordinary sergeant.

183. Why?—Because the sergeant has to pay the same expenses.

184. Do you know that the detective's hand is in his pocket all the time when he is making inquiries?—I do not.

185. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you any knowledge of what is done in other Forces with regard to the promotion of clerks?—No.

186. *Sergeant Wohlmann.*] You were present at the conference of sergeants?—Yes.

187. Is it not the fact that the sergeants did not object to the promotion of district clerks to the rank of sergeant if it was their turn?—Oh, yes; that is so. As to the clerks in the office, it was considered that they should not be interfered with—that they should be office clerks solely. That is what the sergeants thought.

188. *The Commissioner.*] Do you mean that if a man were promoted as district clerk to the rank of sergeant that he should remain a district clerk?—No; but the staff in the district office should not be asked to do any duties—on Sundays, for instance—excepting on special occasions.

The Commissioner. I had practically abandoned that question, because after hearing what was said in other centres I formed a certain opinion, and thought it would be an unfair interference with the assistant clerks. I am quite satisfied with the position. You understand that, *Mr. Dinnie*?

Mr. Dinnie. Yes, sir.

THURSDAY, 26TH AUGUST, 1909.

EDWARD CLAUDE BUDD examined on oath. (No. 179.)

Witness. I am a clergyman of the Church of England, and am chaplain to the Gaol, Hospital, and Asylum.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to say?—I wish to make a statement in connection with the treatment by the police and detectives of men discharged from prison. Men who have served time in gaol make frequent complaints of being interfered with when they are trying to live honestly and respectably. The committee of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society have had this matter under consideration, and we believe there are cases of unnecessary and improper interference by members of the Police Force—*e.g.*, a discharged prisoner may have obtained a situation, he may have worked in that situation for days or weeks, and an overzealous constable or detective has gone to the employer and said, "Do you know that man? Do you know his character? He is ——. He only left prison on ——" with the result that the man has been turned adrift, and, in anger and bitterness, has again taken to evil courses. I believe this sort of thing has happened again and again. The question of police supervision of discharged prisoners is admittedly difficult and delicate. The professional criminal needs close watching, but if he shows a desire to lead an honest life he should be helped rather than hindered. In this connection perhaps I may be allowed to say that the Habitual Criminal Offenders Act is exercising a wholesome influence over a number of offenders. They see the risks they run; the time to be served is unknown. They call it the "Kathleen Mavourneen" Act—"It may be for years, or it may be for ever"; and if some of the "hard cases" attempt to lead a respectable and useful life, let us give them credit for sincerity, and try and help them. I do not forget that ex-prisoners' statements are *ex parte*; at the same time I am convinced they are not always groundless. There are two men in the Auckland Gaol to-day, serving long sentences, who declare it was the daily following about, and at last open interference by the police, that drove them to the committal of the offence. In one case a young man—a first offender—was refused a driver's license because he had been to prison for a short term. In that case I saw the Chief Inspector, who explained the circumstances. The parents wrote to me about it, and the young man—about nineteen—had to leave home. Another man whom I assisted several times complained bitterly of being dogged by the police, and committed suicide at Tamaki. My opinion is that the majority of the police do their duty faithfully and well, and in many cases go out of their way to help men—as do many prison warders—but some members of the Force are indiscreet.

2. You refer to an overzealous constable or detective having gone to the employer of a discharged prisoner and told him his antecedents and record: that is a very much wider allegation than in regard to the police or detectives keeping criminals under surveillance. That is very necessary, but I should regard it as a very wrong thing indeed that the police should go to the employer about the man: just read that passage again?—It is not quite as you put it.

3. I am open to correction?—"The committee of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society have had this matter under consideration. We believe there are cases of unnecessary and improper interference by members of the Police Force."

4. It is the next passage I am referring to?—For instance, I can give you an example, but it does not refer to the action of the society.

5. At any rate, it is a fact made by you in your statement. What is that founded on?—Several instances.

6. You can see the difference between the ordinary surveillance of the police and the going direct to a prisoner's employer. It seems to me a very serious thing?—That is what we complain of mostly.

7. Do you mean to say that a constable or detective would deliberately go to the employer of a man who has been in trouble and inform him voluntarily that a man in his employ was an ex-prisoner?—Let me cite a case like this: I think it is a fact. I know a young man who has served several sentences. He came out, and obtained a situation at a leading hotel in Auckland, and I was informed that, in consequence of what the police stated to the licensee, it was thought desirable that that young man should be discharged. That may have been perfectly justifiable, because in this case the young man was in a position of trust. So that from the police point of view it might have been justifiable.

8. I do not quite agree with you there?—I look at it from their point of view.

9. Can you give me any evidence of a case where a detective requiring to make certain inquiries about an alleged offence went to the place where the person he suspected was working, during working-hours, and made those inquiries, of course, naturally to the detriment of the men?—That is the nearest approach to anything of the kind I know of, but I know nothing certain.

Mr. Dinnie: In that case the employers knew his character beforehand.

10. *The Commissioner.*] Yes, that is correct; but that fact would not affect the principle of the undesirability of a detective or the police going to a place where a man was working, and in the presence of his comrades, because they cannot know personally about the record of their mate. I regard that as distinctly objectionable, and I have no hesitation in commenting in no unmeasured terms about it. But I do not believe it is the practice. Is it the practice, Mr. Budd?—I believe it is quite exceptional. I spoke to Inspector Cullen about this question of the police making such distinctions, and he said his officers had no desire to do it.

11. That is quite a different thing?—Inspector Cullen gave a perfectly satisfactory explanation of that case.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any definite case in which a detective has gone to the employer in the manner you mention?—I have often come across cases, and I have the names now; but as a rule, when men have been to me, they are very adverse to going on with it. You cannot sheet it home.

13. But would not the parties tell you who were the detectives who made the inquiry?—The parties complaining are usually the ex-prisoners.

14. Would they not tell you who the detective was who inquired?—Yes, they did sometimes.

15. Have you made the inquiries to ascertain whether it was true or not?—I am referring to two cases now where I can give all particulars.

16. Did you inquire of the police to see what happened?—I have the particulars from the men.

17. Do you think that that ought to be the proper procedure?—I think not in this case.

18. *The Commissioner.*] Does it not bring the men themselves again into conflict with the police?—Yes.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Of course you know, Mr. Budd, that criminals do not always speak the truth? What experience have you had of criminals?—Twenty-five years, here and in the Old Country.

20. *Inspector Cullen.*] When you saw me did I not tell you that I disapproved of detectives, or any one else, interfering between the discharged prisoners and their employers?—Yes.

WARD GEORGE WOHLMANN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 180.)

Witness: I am district clerk in the Auckland office, and a sergeant of police. After twelve months in the Permanent Artillery I joined the police on the 14th November, 1895. After some four or five years' uniform duty, when I did a good deal of relieving duty at country stations, I was put in the district office in Dunedin. On the 1st October, 1903, I was promoted to be district clerk, and transferred to Invercargill, the new Southland police district having been given its separate existence from that date. After three years and a quarter at Invercargill as district clerk I was transferred on the 28th February to fill a similar position at Auckland.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before me?—In conjunction with Sergeant Sheehan, I was appointed by the sergeants of this district one of their delegates. In reference to the suggestion to increase the pay of constables, we feel the service is not attracting men who are available, and that to enable it to do so the pay should be increased. Due to the relatively higher rate of pay obtainable in civilian employment, many desirable men, such as artisans' and farmers' sons, will not join the police. If we can get better men the status of the whole Force will be raised. We would like to see it considered an honour to belong to it. There are many New-Zealanders who might be induced to join, but when they are informed that they must commence at 7s. 6d. per day, that the men work seven days a week, are subject to strict discipline, and to the other limitations inseparable from service in such a Force, they prefer to remain in the independent position of civilians. We see no other way of inducing suitable men such as farmers' and mechanics' sons to join except by increasing the pay. We suggest a rise of 6d. a day, with a minimum of 8s. and a maximum of 10s., the increments to be at the rate of 6d. every three years, instead of four years as at present. At present most sergeants are promoted before they reach the maximum pay of a constable. We ask for saloon passages for married men travelling with their wives and children on transfer. I do not think it is necessary to point out the undesirability

of the wives and families of police officers being required to travel steerage, where they come into contact with a class it would be desirable to avoid. We suggest an increase of house-allowance to constables of 6d. a day in order to induce married men to join the service. They are more reliable and trustworthy, and sooner settle down to discipline.

2. It is more difficult to get married men?—I think so.

3. I should agree with you that married men would be the best if they could be obtained, which I am very doubtful about. But the married man does not care about starting a new walk of life?—No; it might induce the single men in the service who desire to settle down in life to start earlier. We consider that the standard of education should not be reduced. We find that under the present standard of education the reports of some of the recruits are no better than they should be. Spelling is bad, grammar and composition inferior, and if the standard is reduced to the Fourth, it would probably be worse. It is generally conceded that the educated man makes a better policeman than the illiterate one, therefore the standard of education should be maintained. With regard to leave, the present privilege of allowing it to accumulate to thirty-six days in three years is greatly prized, and it would be very much regretted if it were curtailed. We are now allowed twelve days per annum, but when a long distance has to be travelled it is not sufficient, so advantage is often taken of allowing it to accumulate for two or three years. It is easier to relieve a man for a short period than for a long one, and we suggest the annual leave be extended to sixteen days a year, which we think will induce more men to take their leave annually. In view of the long distances men are transferred from their homes, the Sunday duty, and no weekly half-holiday, we think the present annual leave should be extended to sixteen days. The reasons for our asking for free travelling on the railway when on leave have already been gone into exhaustively.

4. Some of you seem to think that it is not going to cost anything, and if the Railway Department will not grant it as a concession, then it can only be secured by the Police Department paying to the Railway Department a certain annual sum as a set-off against the concession. You understand?—I do. Could it not be arranged on a reciprocal basis, for the Railway Department carrying our men on leave free, the police doing—as they do now—a lot of important work for that Department in return?

5. Now you are touching on a very important matter. Other Departments do not work for nothing, and I fail to see why the Police Department should do their work for nothing?—Yes. We recommend an increase of pay in the case of police sergeants of 6d. per day, with the present rate of increment. If the pay of constables be increased, and pay of sergeants is not also increased proportionately, there would not be sufficient difference between the maximum pay of a constable and the minimum pay of a sergeant to maintain the relative difference between the two ranks. The present difference is 1s., and this should not be reduced. Some years ago, when the difference was only 6d., it was found that constables in country stations either refused promotion, or, if they accepted it, complained, with apparent good reason, that promotion was too great a loss financially, for it meant not only the loss of a free house and the other benefits of a country station, but they found, in the cities where they were required to do duty, high house-rent, costly living, &c. It was therefore found advisable to increase the difference in pay between a constable and a sergeant to 1s. We think that difference should be maintained. We think an increase of house-allowance from 1s. 6d. a day, as at present, to 2s. a day should be given to sergeants, on the broad principle that superior rank should carry superior allowances and pay. The large increase in house-rent since the house-allowance for sergeants and constables was fixed about nine years ago is an additional reason for asking for an increase now, when not only rents, but the whole cost of living has increased. With reference to sergeants travelling first class by train or steamer, the reasons for same have been given pretty fully by Sergeant Sheehan. It has been suggested that assistant clerks in the district offices should be called upon to do Sunday duty in order to enable Sundays off to be given to the uniform men. I look on it as almost impracticable, in the first place; but even if it were quite practicable—which is doubtful—it would be against the interests of the service, and the resulting benefit to the uniform men would fail to justify the innovation. It is almost impracticable, because it would—at least, in Auckland—seriously interfere with the work of the office. District office work is never absolutely regular in quantity, but comes in rushes, and is of such a nature that it cannot be put aside to wait a more favourable time. Criminals may be escaping justice; the interests of innocent people may suffer by even slight delay. The rule in my office is that no office-hours are recognisable if work demands attention. We are not overstaffed. My senior clerk, who is responsible for the recording and despatch of correspondence, is a good and quick worker, but is so fully occupied from 9 to 5 that it is his regular practice to enter up and despatch correspondence not put through by 5 p.m. later on in the evening. He is a single man, and lives in the barracks. As the bulk of the Dominion lies to the south, it follows that a preponderance of our correspondence is despatched by the south mail. No south mail leaves here between 9.15 p.m. on Friday nights and 9.15 p.m. on Sunday nights; consequently urgent matter coming in on Saturdays must be entered up and despatched on Sundays. Again, if the Inspector urgently requires files or information from the office, or to despatch wires on Saturday afternoons or on Sundays, one of the two single clerks must attend to it. As regards Saturday afternoons, one clerk is on duty till 5 p.m. to take telegrams, get the newspapers, &c. If my record clerk is to be required to perform Sunday duty, how can he be asked to work overtime on week evenings or on Sundays? Clerical work is of a sedentary nature, and to be cooped in an office during daylight, and when Sundays come to be confined in a watch-house, would, I submit, be injurious not only to the health, but to the mind also. My accountant is a married man, who has responsible work to perform. If he were required to do watch-house duty he would not have any time to himself, in daylight hours, during several months in the year. If clerks were given outside beat duty—where, of course, they would get fresh air—

they must do the duty of beat constables—effect arrests, attend to cases of sudden death or accident, and other similar matters of ordinary everyday police duty. Their services as clerks will be practically lost on the Monday following, as they must attend Court, inquests, or, as the case may be. Mondays, as a rule, are the heaviest days of the week for office-work. But even if these practical difficulties did not exist, it would be undesirable to require clerks to do uniform duty. To keep clerks loyal and reticent is essential for obvious departmental reasons. From the day they enter the office they are taught that their interests lie in the office—that they must preserve departmental information inviolate. To that end they are discouraged from forming intimacies with men outside the office—intimacies which might open the way to confidences that in all probability would tempt them to indiscreetly divulge official information of a confidential nature. It is the rule of the service that clerks are responsible only to the commissioned officers of their district and to the sergeant in charge of the office. If clerks are placed, even temporarily, on duty as comrades on even terms with uniform constables, and under the control of uniform sergeants, it will tend to weaken the control of the district clerk, weaken the interest of the clerks in the office and their work therein, and be a source of temptation to indiscretion. I would submit that if the foregoing objections did not exist, the benefits to those who ask for the change would be very much less than they anticipate. There are under the Sub-Inspector at Auckland fifty-three constables doing uniform duty. Even if my three clerks were put on duty every Sunday in the year, the increase of Sunday leave to the uniform constables would be only three Sundays per man per year. Regarding the alleged breakdown of the station-sergeant system, our reasons for thinking it has broken down are these: Mr. Dinnie is reported to have said that one of the four present station sergeants was not qualified for further promotion, and it is understood that one of the others has almost reached retiring age; therefore but two are left, and, presuming both are qualified for commissioned rank, it follows that the uniform service of some 750 men are represented by but two candidates for the next vacancy as Sub-Inspector, while the detective branch of some fifty men are represented by five candidates (the five Chief Detectives) for promotion. We do not think that a fair position. It has given much dissatisfaction to the uniform service. The senior-sergeant scheme has been formulated for the purpose of removing the cause for dissatisfaction by giving the uniform men, representing 96½ per cent. of the service, twenty or twenty-five of their best sergeants, as men available for selection for commissioned rank, in comparison to the five Chief Detectives, who represent but 6½ per cent. of the service. We consider the competition between the two branches, under existing conditions, unfair to the uniform men. If the same goal is to be open to all we ask that the conditions governing the competition be made the same for all, so that no man or class of men receive any unfair advantage over his comrades. The uniform men do not object to the competition of the detectives; we welcome it, only asking a fair field and no favour. If sergeants must have ten years' service before promotion to that rank, then detectives should be required to conform to the same condition, and, similarly, the rule as regards seniority of station sergeants (or senior sergeants) be applied to Chief Detectives. Another important advantage which would accrue to the Department if the suggested senior-sergeant scheme with grade "A" stations (Headquarters, and such other important stations as Hamilton, Gisborne, &c.) were adopted would be this: At present if one or more of the present station sergeants should be found to be unequal to the heavy work imposed on station sergeants at the four centres, he cannot be relieved except by reduction in rank. Under the new scheme he could be transferred to some of the less important grade "A" stations without loss of rank or pay, and the best of the twenty or twenty-five senior sergeants not stationed at a centre could be selected to replace him. By the scheme suggested senior sergeants could be shifted round until it was ascertained by actual experience who were the best men and most qualified for further promotion. Our reason for suggesting that the pay of senior sergeants commence at 13s. 6d. and advance to 15s. 6d. is to make it commensurate with the rank, preserving the same difference—1s.—between the maximum of a sergeant and the minimum of a senior sergeant as we have regarded as proper between the maximum of a constable and the minimum of a sergeant. Furthermore, as the rank of senior sergeant would be higher than that of detective, it follows the pay of the former should be higher than that of the latter. The suggested maximum of 15s. 6d. is 6d. per day higher than the present day of a detective. It is expected senior sergeants will have detectives under them, as the sergeants at Newton, New Plymouth, Gisborne, &c., now have; and if the pay of detectives is raised in the future, we think the pay of a senior sergeant should be correspondingly increased, so that it may not again happen that an officer of inferior rank receives higher pay than his superior. In reference to the travelling-expenses of sergeants and detectives, the Chief Detective sought to show that a detective should receive a higher allowance because the detective in the course of his inquiries would not follow a direct course, while the sergeant, who would probably be on such duty as inspecting his sub-stations, would travel direct to his destination, and therefore not incur so much expense. The objection to that argument is this: The sergeant might also be—and in country districts frequently is—travelling on detective duty, making his own inquiries into offences committed in his sub-district. Further, if a sergeant and a detective are on duty together at races, or a show-ground, or have to attend Court, and cannot get home for meals, or are on transfer, the detective receives an allowance of 8s. per day, while the sergeant receives only 6s. But we think the fact that constables are allowed 6s. a day should justify an increase to sergeants. We think the principle of pay and allowances being in relative proportion to rank should always be maintained. I would like to briefly refer to the Victorian system of promotion of detectives, because a southern detective officer has quoted that system, and he argued that because half of the superintendents in the Victorian service had been through the criminal investigation branch that was a reason for promotion of detectives in New Zealand to commissioned rank. I may say I am not acquainted with the Victorian service. I have received

my information from Detective Porter, of the Victorian Police. He has been here on duty, and returned to Melbourne only a couple of days ago, otherwise we would have asked your Worship's permission to call him to give evidence before you. I have here a copy of the *Victorian Police Gazette*, of the 14th of last January, from which I will quote. The southern detective officer referred to is reported in the Press to have said, when giving evidence before this Commission, "With regard to the detective force, he thought that the Victorian system might well be adopted here. . . . Half of the Superintendents in Victoria were men who had been detectives. That was an argument in support of a detective here having the right to enter any part of the uniform service." On examining the seniority list of the Victorian police I found that the officer's statement that half of the Superintendents in Victoria had been criminal investigation men was literally correct, but a further inspection does not appear to justify the impression the officer quoted apparently sought to produce—i.e., that the same proportion of detective officers existed in the other commissioned ranks there; and, further, that the detectives in Victoria were promoted under a system more favourable to them than was the case in New Zealand. From what Detective Porter told me, it appears the detectives in Victoria did, prior to about 1881, enjoy special treatment as regards promotion; but so much dissatisfaction was engendered in the rest of the Force that about 1881 a Royal Commission was set up, the result being that the system of preference to the criminal investigation men was swept away, and they were placed on precisely the same footing for promotion as their uniform comrades, and have remained so since. I have here a table prepared from the *Victorian Police Gazette*, No. 2, dated the 14th January, 1909, showing the number of officers and men who are in or have been in the criminal investigation branch, and the percentage of same to the rest of the service, and comparing the whole with the New Zealand service. It will be seen that the only Inspecting Superintendent in Victoria has never been in the criminal investigation branch. Of the ten Superintendents, four have been in the criminal investigation branch, and are now in charge of uniform police; but I understand from Detective Porter that these officers obtained their initial advantage over their uniform comrades prior to 1881. The fifth criminal investigation Superintendent is still a criminal investigation officer, and is not in charge of uniform men. Of the seven Inspectors, not one has been in the criminal investigation branch. Of the sixteen Sub-Inspectors, but one has been in the criminal investigation branch. Of the officers, therefore, six, or 17 per cent. approximately, have been criminal investigation men, and twenty-nine, or 83 per cent., have not. Of the first-class sergeants, two, or 4 per cent., are criminal investigation men; and forty-seven, or 96 per cent., are uniform men. Of the second-class sergeants, none are of the criminal investigation branch. Of first-class constables, five, or 3 per cent., are criminal investigation men, and 158, or 97 per cent., are uniform men. Of the ordinary constables, twenty-six, or 2 per cent., are criminal investigation men, and approximately 1,534, or 98 per cent., are uniform men. Of the total service, thirty-nine, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., are criminal investigation men, while 1,534, or $97\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., belong to the uniform service. In New Zealand, the proportion of officers who have been detectives is $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the proportion of detectives to the whole service is $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It is remarkable that in the Victorian Force, where the detectives are but $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole Force, they have 50 per cent. of the Superintendents. The reason given by Detective Porter has been already mentioned—that these gentlemen received their advantage prior to 1881, and have since gone up in accordance with seniority. We do not ask for a system of promotion based on absolute seniority, because we believe the principle is wrong which gives to the slothful time-server the same claim on promotion as the hardworking able man who gives the State good value for his pay. We only ask that the same conditions as regards service be applied to both the uniform and detective services—that is to say, that the rungs in the ladder to be climbed by the detectives be placed the same distance apart as the rungs in the ladder to be climbed by his uniform comrade. The most efficient man in his rank to receive preference, but, if qualifications are equal, seniority to carry the day.

6. What do you think would be the best method of selecting men for service as assistant clerks in the district office?—I think the present system is satisfactory. The system is that the Inspectors nominate the men for clerical work. They are asked to do so by the Commissioner, and a list is sent down of the men who should be promoted.

7. Do you often get men sent into your office from the local Force?—I cannot speak from my experience here, because the men in my office were here when I came here.

8. Something was said down south about the desirability of having a gymnasium or something answering to it in connection with the station at each large centre; and it was stated that where there is a gymnasium the men do not take much interest in it. What is your experience?—There is a good gymnasium here, and the men take a very great interest in it, and keep up their interest. The men attend the gymnasium well every evening, and practise handball and other exercises.

9. You think it is a valuable assistance?—Yes. It keeps the men from running down town to a great extent. They work off their animal spirits, and then perhaps settle down to a quiet evening. In the barracks we have a good billiard-table.

10. Are you generally present when inquiries are held by the Inspector?—No.

11. Who takes the evidence?—Occasionally, when the inquiry is a lengthy one, one of my clerks takes the evidence down in writing.

12. *Mr. Dinzie.*] You have not been long here?—About two and a half years.

13. With regard to the detectives in Melbourne, I suppose you know that Chief Detective Herbert was really speaking of many years ago?—I only know what I read in the newspapers.

14. He was in the Force there up to about 1880, and apparently was speaking of the Force at that time?—I merely gave my impression from what I saw in the papers.

15. As regards travelling-expenses, that is provided for in the new regulations?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: As to station sergeants, that is also provided for: they are to be called "senior sergeants," and it has been my intention for some time past to create more appointments in out-districts so that we should have a better selection for the higher ranks.

The Commissioner: I intend to deal with that in my report.

Mr. Dinnie: Our station-sergeant system was a new departure.

The Commissioner: Yes, experimental.

16. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I suppose you know that I made application to the Railway Department in respect to granting free passes, and that that Department could not see its way to grant the request. However, the matter will be considered?—Yes, I understand that is so.

17. As regards the Fifth Standard, I suppose you do not know that we send out a great many application forms, and they are not returned for the reason that the Fifth Standard is too high for many wishing to join?—I was not aware of that.

18. I have had many applicants who have come to my office who have not passed the Fifth Standard. Do you not think we could get some very good men in the Force if we reduced the standard?—Yes; but taking a broad view, if a man is anxious to get into the service, he could, with a few months' study, pass the Fifth Standard.

19. I quite agree, but from the training they get in the probation class they can pick up a good deal of their education?—I have no doubt.

20. So that we might get more applicants and a wider selection if the standard was reduced?—After they were three months in the depot they might be required to pass an educational examination.

21. I think the sergeant in charge would be quite capable of judging of their education?—I have no doubt of his ability.

22. You spoke of married men joining the Force in preference to single men?—Yes.

23. Married men, of course, would naturally be older?—There is a tendency to marry late in New Zealand.

24. Do you think they would be so easily trained as younger men?—I think they would be much more easily trained, and they would be more amenable to discipline, because they have a stake in the country. A young man can pick up his swag and go away; but a married man, having a stake in the country, is naturally desirous of earning the good opinion of his superiors. Of course, I think the same age-limit should apply to married men as to single men.

25. Do you not think it is desirable that there should be a large proportion of single men in the barracks in the cities, to be available at once in case of fires, &c.?—Yes.

26. In all large bodies of men there is bound to be a certain amount of dissatisfaction?—Yes.

27. You have been in the south as well as here: have you ever heard of this "handy" man?—I never heard of him.

28. *Inspector Cullen.*] You know that we are not allowed forms of application for candidates for the Force: do you think it important that we ought to be allowed to keep them?—Yes.

29. You know that young men come to the office as candidates for the Force, and we cannot supply them with these forms. Do you not think it would be well if we could supply them with these forms, and have the measurements and height of the candidates taken, and also have them medically examined?—Yes, and for another reason: the officers could see them.

30. Do you know why these forms were withdrawn from the Inspector's office?—No.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know when they were withdrawn?—No.

32. It was before I came here. I see no objection to sending these forms to the district offices. It would be much more convenient, I think. I will inquire into the matter.

Inspector Cullen: It is years back since they were withdrawn.

The Commissioner (to witness): You have given me some very valuable suggestions, and I am very much obliged to you.

GEORGE HASTIE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 181.)

Witness: My name is George Hastie. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Hamilton, and am in charge of that sub-district. I joined the Armed Constabulary in 1879, and served five years and three months in that Force. I then joined the Police Force. I was promoted sergeant in January, 1905. I was on street duty for about two years before going to Hamilton. I have ten stations and thirteen men in my sub-district.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any remarks of a general nature to make?—We appointed delegates, and the delegates have already given their evidence. Personally, I have no complaints to make.

2. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the Force?—I know there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction in regard to juniors being promoted over seniors.

3. You know there will always be a certain amount of dissatisfaction?—Yes.

4. Has that been intensified of late?—Since the pension fund came into force, because the question of rank affects the amount of the pension.

5. Do you get any young men new to the service in your sub-district?—No, because they have to do a certain amount of street duty in the towns.

6. Do you notice any difference in the physique and intelligence of the men lately?—As far as the men in my sub-district are concerned, you could not beat them. I have not done duty lately in Auckland.

7. We are faced with the position that men are not coming forward for enrolment: to what do you attribute that?—Not enough pay is given to the men joining. There is plenty of work in the backblocks; and lately men have been able to make big wages—from 10s. to 14s. a day. Men have spoken to me about joining the police, but on hearing the pay they would not join.

8. You are in a position to say that money is the principal reason?—Yes, that is the principal reason.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You came from Wellington?—Yes.

10. Was there any general dissatisfaction?—No.

11. You have noticed the men there with reference to their physique and educational qualifications?—They were a very good class of men with regard to physique, with a few exceptions. Some of them were not very good in writing reports.

12. There always have been a few exceptions in the service of men who are not up to the standard?—I think the education standard should be lowered. A boy might pass the Fifth Standard at school, but might not be able to do so some years later. I may say that I have seen some men who could not pass the First Standard, and they were good men all the same.

13. *The Commissioner.*] You think a standard equivalent to the Fourth would be sufficient?—Better education is becoming more general, and the varied duties of the police require that they should be pretty well educated.

JOHN HANSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 182.)

Witness: My name is John Hanson. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Auckland. I was enrolled in 1881, and was promoted sergeant in 1902. I was forty-five years of age when I was promoted, and have been doing sectional duty since 1902.

Mr. Dinnie: Witness is a single man.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You live in the barracks?—Yes.

2. What interest do the men take in the gymnasium?—Some of them take a very great interest, and others do not.

3. What do the majority do?—I should say that at present they are about equally divided.

4. Do you think the gymnasium is a valuable help?—Yes.

5. You think there should be a gymnasium in every centre?—Yes.

6. About the Police Surgeon, what is the general feeling amongst the men?—Against the Police Surgeon.

7. They want a change?—Yes.

8. You are able to say that the feeling is general?—Yes, it is.

9. Is it a rule not to appoint single men to out-stations?

Mr. Dinnie: We have a house always.

The Commissioner: Then a man practically debars himself from advancement if he does not take unto himself a wife?

Mr. Dinnie: We have had one or two stations where we have had single men; but being single usually debars a man from getting a station.

10. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Have you ever applied for a station?—Only on one occasion.

11. Do you find sectional duty a strain on you?—Yes.

12. An increasing strain?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not see why we should not find a station for him.

13. *The Commissioner.*] Would you like a station now?—Yes, certainly.

14. *Inspector Cullen.*] You find street duty very fatiguing?—I do. I may say that the Inspector tries to relieve me in every possible way.

The Commissioner: Do you recommend him for a station?

Inspector Cullen: Yes; I could not find a more exemplary or trustworthy man in the service. He is trustworthy in every way. We have no station in this district at present to which he could be appointed.

Mr. Dinnie: There is a difficulty in finding a suitable station.

The Commissioner: The efficiency of the Force suffers if a man like that is retained on sectional duty.

MARTIN ROGERS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 183.)

Witness: I am a police sergeant, stationed at Onehunga, and am in charge of that sub-district, having two constables and one sub-station—Waiuku—under me. I was enrolled on the 6th February, 1878, and promoted sergeant on the 1st January, 1899. I was two years a sergeant before I was put in charge of a sub-district, doing duty in Christchurch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think the gymnasium is a valuable institution?—I think so.

2. Do you think the men take any interest in it?—I think it is a very good thing for the young men.

3. When either you or your men require medical assistance, where do you get it?—I do not belong to the city Force. We call in a local doctor.

4. Do you know of any dissatisfaction in the Force?—Personally I do not, but I hear a good deal about it. Some of the constables, I hear, are dissatisfied owing to the junior men being promoted over them.

5. Is it more noticeable lately than it has been?—I think it is more noticeable within the last four or five years.

6. Do you think that that is due to the superannuation?—I do.

7. Do you know anything about political influence at all?—I never used any outside influence with a view to promotion as sergeant, or any other billet in the service. I was promoted without applying for it. I do not know anything about outside influence at all.

8. Do you hear it spoken of?—I hear it frequently.

9. As being successfully used?—Sometimes successfully, but I do not think the result has turned out successful.

10. You think such influence gets a credit it does not deserve?—I think so.
11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have been in Christchurch?—Yes.
12. And here some time?—About two years in this district.
13. And outside the question of promotions there is no general dissatisfaction regarding the control of the Police Force?—No.
14. You have no complaint to make?—None whatever.
15. I suppose you have not heard of this “handy” man?—No, not until this Commission.
16. Do you believe such a thing exists?—I do not.

ARCHIBALD MCPHEE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 184.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, at present in charge of the Newmarket Station. I was enrolled in 1892, and promoted sergeant in 1906. I was about twenty-two months before being appointed to the charge of a district, and did duty then in the City of Auckland as sergeant. I have been in Newmarket just over a year. I have three constables and one out-station under me—Epsom. I have no complaints to make as regards the men under me. They are tried men. They did their probation in the city, and were known to be reliable before they were sent to the station.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force?—No. I hear individuals complaining, but I do not think there is any general dissatisfaction in the Auckland District.

2. So far as you are aware, the Force is efficient and well disciplined?—It is well disciplined in Auckland. I have put in the whole of my service in the Auckland District. I was six years at the Thames, and was then transferred to Te Awamutu.

3. You really do not know anything of the conditions obtaining outside Auckland?—Only from hearsay.

4. When you were in Auckland City, had you any experience respecting the Police Surgeon?—There was general dissatisfaction amongst the men about him, but I never had any personal experience of his treatment, excepting on one occasion for a day, but I know that there was very general dissatisfaction amongst the men. For what reason I do not know.

5. A sort of lack of confidence in him?—They had no confidence in him, and on many occasions they paid for doctors out of their own pockets rather than go to him.

6. Is the gymnasium of value?—I think it is of very great value.

7. Would you be in favour of having them in other places?—It is a splendid thing for young men.

8. Do you think they would use it?—I think they do.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Sometimes there was a little difficulty about getting a teacher for the gymnasium, was there not?—That difficulty will arise at times.

10. Of course, we had a good man in Mr. Skinner, but we cannot always get a man to take the interest we would like in the gymnasium?—No, doubt, sir.

11. But it is a good thing for the men?—Yes.

12. You know that men in charge of stations have been selected from the steady men?—Yes.

13. And the Inspector selects them and recommends?—Yes.

14. You know that the trouble we have is generally amongst the men who are just posted to the stations?—That is so.

15. There is not the same trouble with men who have had a little service?—No.

16. How long were you in Auckland City?—About twenty-two months.

17. What was the conduct of the men as regards morality at that time?—Generally speaking, I do not think there was very much wrong, and there was no particular case of immorality in the whole Force.

18. And they were dealt with?—Yes; I think everything that could be discovered in the way of any wrongdoing was strictly inquired into in Auckland.

19. And nothing much would escape notice if the supervision was good?—I think it was good.

LAWRENCE CARROLL, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 185.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, in charge of Eden Terrace Station. I was enrolled in October, 1881, and promoted in January, 1903. I served as a sergeant for two years and seven months before being placed in charge of a district. I have four constables and two sub-stations—Mount Roskill and Kingsland—under me.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are you sufficiently well policed there?—Not at all; the population has increased so rapidly within the last few years. And traffic has increased also.

2. To what extent is it under-policed?—I should say that Eden Terrace alone is two men short; and Mount Roskill's population is seven thousand—too much for one constable. There is a good class there, however.

3. Have you ever made representations?—About two years ago I applied for a man for Eden Terrace, and got one.

4. You want two more. Have you made representations?—No.

5. Have you had any discussion with the Inspector on the matter?—I do not think I have.

6. It cannot be a very crying matter if you have not represented it?—I mean to.

7. Is there any dissatisfaction that you are aware of in the Force?—I think there is with regard to promotions.

8. Is that due to the alleged promotion of juniors over seniors?—I think so.

9. Do you think that complaint is well founded, or not?—I hear that men who have not been promoted can get out-stations without applying for them. I do not know whether they apply or not.

10. You would agree that promotion should not depend on a man's application?—I would, indeed.

11. Do you believe that juniors have been promoted unnecessarily over the heads of others?—I cannot express an opinion, as I have not looked into the matter.

12. Do you know anything about political influence at all?—No; I have heard of it only.

13. Taking the Force as a whole, you think it is efficient and well disciplined?—In Auckland, yes; but the physique of the men now is not nearly as good as it used to be.

14. What do you attribute that to?—To the want of sufficient pay.

15. You think the weedy man is more likely to apply for admission than the well-set-up man?—I think the pay is too small to attract the best class of men.

16. You mean intellectually or physically?—Physically.

17. The well-developed man can get employment better outside?—If he is a good worker.

18. You think that increasing the pay would assist recruiting?—It would attract the better class of men.

19. You think the pay compares badly with the pay outside?—That is so.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you can do with two extra men?—Yes.

21. You have not much crime in your district?—Yes.

22. You have?—Undoubtedly, in a large population like that, which is increasing yearly.

23. Is crime increasing to a great extent?—Not to a great extent, but we are coping fairly well with it.

24. *Inspector Cullen.*] The police-quarters there are very inconvenient, are they not?—Very; but I do not wish to complain about them.

25. The quarters are not suitable?—Not at all.

Mr. Dinnie: The matter has been recommended to me, and it is under the consideration of the Government. We have been trying to get a place.

Witness: The house is forty years old, and there is no office. The place is too small.

Inspector Cullen: I merely wish to expedite the purchase of a site and the erection of a building. There is no accommodation in the present building.

26. *Inspector Cullen.*] With reference to Mount Roskill, you say the population there is over seven thousand?—That is so.

27. And in Kingsland it is also rapidly increasing?—Yes.

28. Your district would represent from ten to twelve thousand people?—From twelve to fourteen thousand.

JAMES COGHILAN GRIFFITHS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 186.)

Witness: I am a sectional sergeant, stationed at Newton, and was enrolled on the 12th May, 1894. I was promoted sergeant on the 1st June, 1907. I came here from the Wellington District, and did three or four months' duty in Auckland City when I first came here.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Was there any dissatisfaction in Auckland with the Police Surgeon when you were in the city?—There was general dissatisfaction. It was not confined to a few men. There was a general lack of confidence in him, and a desire for a change.

2. Was the gymnasium fairly well patronised?—It was not going in my time, but I have been there several times since, and have seen a good many men taking an interest in it. It is a valuable help to the Force, and keeps the young men off the streets.

3. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force?—No general dissatisfaction, but there are always a few men who think they have been passed over.

PATRICK CREAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 187.)

Witness: I am a police sergeant, stationed at Newton, and am doing sectional duty. I was enrolled in March, 1895, and promoted sergeant in December, 1907. I was transferred from Wellington to Newton direct, and have only done duty as sergeant there. It is practically the city.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What about this dissatisfaction with the Police Surgeon?—There is general dissatisfaction with the surgeon, but personally I know nothing about it. The men look upon the doctor as incompetent, and would like a change.

2. What do you think of the gymnasium?—I think it is a splendid thing, and of very great use. I think the recruits joining should get some instruction in that direction, and in wrestling. They could be taught certain holds that would be most useful to them.

3. Do you know of any dissatisfaction generally in the Force?—I do not. Personally, I am satisfied. I have been fairly dealt with.

ALEXANDER MCGILP, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 188.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Birkenhead, and am in charge there. I was enrolled in 1876, and have been in charge of stations for about twenty-two years.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you want to say?—I complain about the promotions. I did not intend to come here at all to give evidence about my case, because it is no use now, as I have been passed over for promotion. In a sense a stigma is placed on us old constables when we parade with the rank and file on account of our non-promotion, and it is a reflection on our families that such should be the case.

2. Have you ever been recommended for promotion?—I have, in 1897 or 1898.

3. By whom were you recommended?—By Mr. Hickson.

4. And it did not go through?—I did not apply. Constable Gordon, now deceased, went to the office with me, and applied for promotion to sergeant, and I did not. I was told by Mr. Hickson that I was recommended for a sergeantship, and to take charge of Dargaville. It ended there, and I pretty well know the reason.

5. Tell me all about it?—I was at Rawene, and the Stipendiary Magistrate and myself fell foul of one another. That was Mr. Clendon. It was at the time of the Maori trouble at Waima, and when matters were in a very bad state, the Natives arming and marching on Rawene. A man-of-war and a contingent was sent from Auckland. The Magistrate wished to leave the place, and I reasoned with him to stay. We had words, and I insinuated that he was a coward. He went as far as Okaihau, and there received a wire from Mr. Hickson to turn back. A few weeks after my interview with Mr. Hickson I had the opportunity of meeting Mr. Tunbridge, and I introduced him to the Magistrate, and, of course, I came to the conclusion that I had put the rope round my neck by introducing him, because Mr. Hickson afterwards told me that it seemed to him that it was Mr. Clendon who stood in the way of my promotion. That was the only occasion I was recommended.

6. Did you every apply subsequently?—I did not. My career is clean, and my efficiency will be shown by the public police records, and your Worship has known me for many years.

7. I have known you for nearly thirty years, and your conduct has been exemplary. You know of nothing else beyond what you have mentioned that would have interfered with your promotion?—No.

8. You have no cause for that ground excepting your belief?—No.

9. The parties are dead since?—Yes.

10. How old are you?—Going on now for sixty-one.

11. Then, you can retire?—I mean to. I might retire in a couple of years.

The Commissioner: What does the Act say, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: They can retire at sixty, but they are compelled to at sixty-five.

12. *The Commissioner:* Do you wish to add anything?—In support of what I said, I may say that while the proceedings I refer to were going on at Rawene the County Council had a special meeting. I do not know what it was about, but Mr. Hickson had just arrived in Rawene, and representation was made to him regarding my services. I know I was recommended.

13. So you left Rawene under a cloud?—Yes, under a cloud.

14. Then, you were removed from Rawene without having any voice in the matter?—Yes.

15. Where did you go to?—I was shifted to Cambridge, and they might as well have sent me to the Bluff, as the different climate nearly killed me.

16. *Mr. Dinnie:* When were you removed to Cambridge?—In 1897.

Inspector Cullen: Much after that.

17. *Mr. Dinnie:* You are sixty-one?—I am just going on for sixty-one.

18. You do not attach any blame to your present Inspector or Commissioner for your non-promotion?—None whatever. I have found them very straight indeed under the circumstances in the way they have provided for me.

TIMOTHY DONOVAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 189.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Parnell. I joined the Force in 1883, and came to Auckland in October, 1883, where I remained till June, 1890. I took charge of Newmarket Police-station in June, 1890. In January, 1891, the late Inspector Broham sent for me, and told me in his office that the constable who was in charge of Coromandel got into trouble through being mixed up with the publican in some scrip, and that he wanted to send a man to Coromandel on whom he could depend, as the place was far away. He then told me that he was going to send me there, telling me that it was the best station in the North Island. In October, 1891, I was transferred back to Newmarket, and after I had been there about a week Mr. Broham came to the station and asked me if I had any idea of the reason why I was transferred. I said, "Not the slightest." He then said he was sorry, but that the first station that offered in his district would be given to me if it suited me. In about a week after this he sent for me, and told me in his office that I was transferred back to Coromandel. I went back about the 1st November, 1891. About 1892 the late Mr. Seddon said that all third-class constables of seven years' service or over with a clean defaulter's sheet would be promoted to second class. I did not get promoted on account of my being reprimanded for not reporting a constable who was on escort duty from the Thames to Auckland, and permitted his prisoner to escape. I captured the prisoner; he was under a house, and I went under and pulled him out. When we reached the station, the sergeant who was in charge of the section was there. I told him about the incident, and asked him if I would report it. He said that the constable could report his own case, and that I must be fond of reporting. The affair appeared in the *Auckland Star* that evening. Mr. Broham had me before him, and reprimanded me for not reporting the constable. I shielded the sergeant by not telling the Inspector that I had reported the occurrence to the sergeant. Some time after Mr. Seddon gave another order, that all constables with trivial charges on their defaulter's sheet were to be promoted. I was not promoted, although the constable who permitted the prisoner to escape was promoted, and has since refused promotion to the rank of sergeant. A considerable time after, Colonel Hume—the then Commissioner—was in Auckland in the Inspector's office. I was in Auckland from Coromandel, and asked to be taken before him, which I was. I asked him why I was not promoted when the constable who let the prisoner escape had been. He was severely reprimanded, while I was only reprimanded. After some argument Colonel Hume said, "Donovan, you have not enough uncles and aunts." Inspector Ellison was then sergeant in the district office, and heard what was said; he may now remember the conversation. I was very nearly fourteen

years a third-class constable. In 1894 the mining boom started in Coromandel, and people of all classes kept coming into the place. The whole of the peninsula from the Thames to Cape Colville was pretty well pegged out. The population of the two townships and surrounding flats would be very near five thousand. Buildings went up everywhere, the flats and hills being covered with tents. In 1895, as a result of hard work, being out night and day, I was attacked with an illness which laid me up for some time. During my illness a sergeant and constable were sent to take my place. As soon as I was able to resume duty both were ordered back to Auckland, and I was again left by myself, with the exception of a constable who was sent to me on special occasions, such as pay week. I had eleven hotels to attend to. About the end of 1895 Constable Smith was sent from Auckland to assist me. During his time the Star and Garter Hotel was burned down. A man named Mackrill, who obtained a bed in the hotel that night, lost his life in the fire. I left the street at 12 midnight, leaving Constable Smith on duty. He was to remain on duty till 2 a.m. The fire occurred at about 4 a.m. The hotel was rebuilt shortly afterwards. Constable Smith was taken back to Auckland about the end of January, 1896. Constable Dempster was permanently transferred from Auckland to Coromandel about the middle of February, 1896. I objected to his staying in a hotel, so he boarded in a boardinghouse. I had great trouble with the Star and Garter Hotel, and did my utmost to prevent Sunday and after-hour trading. Colonel Hume (Commissioner) and the late Inspector Hickson went to Coromandel. I told them how the Star and Garter Hotel was conducted, and that it was rumoured that if I reported the licensee to the Licensing Committee in June I was sure to be shifted. The Commissioner told me to report it, and that he would see I was not removed. I reported the licensee of the Star and Garter Hotel. The June meeting was held at the Thames. Constables Dempster and Smith went to the Thames to give evidence for the publican. When the case was called, Mr. Cotter, who was one of the solicitors appearing for the licensee, objected to the licensing report being read, as it was not signed by the sergeant, who was the chief officer of the Thames Licensing District. The reports were signed by me before posting them to the Inspector. The Chairman and Committee upheld the objection, and the report was not read. Mr. Kenny, Stipendiary Magistrate, said he had not the power to read the report, although it was a terrible one, and from what he knew of me he was sure I must have had good grounds for sending in such a report, suggesting to the Committee that the licensee be severely cautioned. He was cautioned, and his license granted. A constable named Sharp was sent to do duty at Coromandel during the absence of Constable Dempster and myself at the Thames. We arrived at Coromandel from the Thames on the Friday night. On the Saturday I wired to the Inspector for permission to keep Constable Sharp at Coromandel till the following day, as there was about £3,000 to be paid out in wages that afternoon by mine-managers. I obtained permission. At about 7 p.m. I posted Sharp and Dempster on their beats, and at about 9 p.m., when I went to visit them, I found them on the middle of the street drunk, swearing at civilians, and wanting some of them to come out of the crowd to fight them. I managed to get the crowd that was around them to disperse. I took Constable Sharp to his boardinghouse, but was unable to take Dempster. I came back to the street as quickly as I could, and kept Constable Dempster by my side till about 1 a.m. He was then sober. Constable Sharp went by steamer to Auckland on Sunday. I posted my report to the Inspector on Monday. Mr. Kenny, Stipendiary Magistrate, arrived by steamer on the Monday evening, when the two constables were reported to him by civilians. He wired to the Inspector on Tuesday, saying, "The police at Coromandel totally disorganized. Mine-managers and others assaulted by them." The Inspector wired to me repeating the Magistrate's wire, and asking why he had not received my report. I wired back to say, "Report posted yesterday." He then wired to me to say he had received my report, and that I was to take instructions from the Magistrate, and that he would be in Coromandel in the evening with Constable Sharp. The Magistrate instructed me to lay informations against them for being disorderly whilst drunk. I did so. They were before the Court at about 11 p.m. In those days the Magistrate frequently sat on the Bench till 11, and often till 1 o'clock in the morning. Mr. Baume appeared for them. The Inspector prosecuted. After several witnesses were examined Mr. Baume pleaded guilty on their behalf, on condition that they were not sent to gaol. They were fined, and afterwards discharged. The Inspector recommended me for promotion from third-class to second-class constable. The Inspector also recommended me for praiseworthy conduct, as will be seen by my file. The licensee of the Star and Garter Hotel addressed the people from his hotel balcony, and said that he was going to stand for Parliament against all-comers. He also addressed the people at a race-meeting at Kennedy Bay. He afterwards withdrew from the contest, and I was told by people who said that he had told them that I was to be shifted from Coromandel, and that by withdrawing he had a guarantee to that effect. It was a well-known fact that I was transferred by influence. There were a number of sly-grog shops in Cabbage Bay and Kennedy's Bay, about sixteen miles from Coromandel. I found out all about them, and then reported the matter to the Inspector. I was too well known to be able to catch them, so I applied for two recruits, and they were sent to me. I gave them all the information and instructions I could. After they had been in the locality a few weeks they were supplied with liquor by all who were selling it in the locality of Cabbage Bay and Kennedy Bay. By this time I was under orders for Tolaga Bay, but in the meantime I had to take the whole responsibility, as the constables and their reports were sent to me with instructions to prepare informations. I did, and sent a constable named O'Brien with the recruits to make the seizures. Of course, they had warrants. One of the constables rode seven miles to a telephone to get instructions from me. They seized a great quantity of liquor, and a number of convictions followed. I had strict instructions not to take any part in the seizures, therefore I received no part of the rewards. I was under orders for Tolaga Bay. I was Bailiff of the Magistrate's and Warden's Court at Coromandel, as well as Inspector of Factories and Sea-fisheries. In February, 1897, the Inspector informed me that I was transferred to Tolaga Bay. I left Auckland on the 17th

March, 1897, in the s.s. "Dingadee." She was a cargo-steamer, and the steerage was that bad that I could not put my family in it. I paid the difference between steerage and saloon. When we got to Tologa Bay it was too rough for the boats to come over the bar to meet the steamer. The steamer's boat was lowered, and we were lowered into it in baskets, and landed on the beach, about two miles from the hotel. It was a bitter cold and wet evening. I had five children, the eldest ten years and the youngest eight months, having only what clothing we took for the journey; consequently I had to buy changes at a store at a very high price for the whole family. I applied to the Department for a refund of the difference I had paid between steerage and saloon, but was told that I would not get it. My furniture and effects were taken up and down the coast for very nearly six weeks, and when landed it was very much damaged. I did not apply for compensation for the damage done to my furniture because of being refused the difference that I had paid between steerage and saloon. In November, 1901, Commissioner Tunbridge came to Tologa Bay to visit the station, and, whilst examining my books, said, "What were you sent here for?" I said, "For doing my duty." He said, "Yes, it was, and a jolly shame, too." He then said, "This is no place for a man like you. I have a place that will suit you. Sergeant William Walker, who has been in charge of Newton, is going out on pension; he is now on three months' leave of absence." I said, "I do not wish to be shifted about from one place to another with my family so often." He then said, "By taking charge of Newton promotion will soon follow." He said, "Do you know Mr. Cullen?" I said, "I do not, but I am not frightened of doing my duty for any Inspector." In about a week from then I received orders to take charge of Newton, which I did on the 10th December, 1901, having four constables under me. About the 1st February, 1903, Inspector Cullen instructed me to apply for promotion to the rank of sergeant. I did. My application will show how I was recommended by the Inspector. In August, 1903, I was transferred to the charge of Freeman's Bay Station, which is the worst and the hardest station in the North Island. I was there by myself. There are two men stationed there now. In September, 1904, I was transferred to the charge of Parnell, where I am at present, and have two constables under me. I was replaced at Newton by Sergeant Hendry (now Sub-Inspector), two other sergeants, two detectives, and extra constables. The place had not grown to that extent from the time I took charge of it. Sergeant Moore said in his evidence before the Commission that by accepting promotion he lost his station, which was worth £130 a year to him. I lost my station at Tologa Bay, which was worth at least £80 a year, to take a sergeant's place at Newton, with the promise of promotion to the rank of sergeant, but, unfortunately, I did not get the promotion. My file will show what Inspector Cullen said about the arrest of a man named Christian, who was sentenced to ten years and two floggings. I also wish to refer to what the late Inspector Hickson said about my conduct in the conviction of Constables Dempster and Sharp, which my file will also show. I consider I have been cruelly, wrongly, and unjustly treated. Men of half my service and half my experience, and who were never in charge of important stations such as I have been, were promoted over me. I feel it very much to be at times ordered about in front of the public by these sergeants. I also wish to produce Mr. Barton's recommendation, showing how I acted as Clerk of Court at Tologa Bay; also as to how I did my duty as constable: "Magistrate's Court, Gisborne.—William Alfred Barton, Stipendiary Magistrate at Gisborne, do hereby certify that Constable Donovan served under me as Clerk of the Magistrate's Court at Tologa Bay from June, 1900, to June, 1902, during which time he paid strict attention to his work in a most satisfactory manner, and I had no occasion to find fault with him. In my capacity as Magistrate I had full opportunity of judging of the manner in which he discharged his duties as a constable, and I have no hesitation in saying that he performed his duties faithfully, and to the satisfaction of the public.—W. A. BARTON, Stipendiary Magistrate."

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you mean when you say it was a well-known fact that you were transferred from Coromandel through influence?—It was a common remark that I was too active amongst the hotels and in doing my duty generally, and that I was to be shifted, and right enough I was.

2. Did you renew your application for promotion?—No. I think you will see that I was very harshly treated.

3. How old are you now?—Fifty-nine. I think it is the only recommendation of the Inspector in this district that has not been granted.

4. It was not refused. It was left in abeyance apparently by Mr. Tunbridge, who was then leaving New Zealand?—I did not get promotion. I would like to read the following memoranda and correspondence relative to my services:—

"Police-station, Newton, 9th February, 1903.—Application of Constable T. Donovan for promotion to the rank of sergeant.—I respectfully beg to apply for promotion to the rank of sergeant. In support of this application I beg to state that I have served in the New Zealand Police Force for nineteen years and six months. For the past thirteen years I have been in charge of out-stations—namely, Newmarket, Coromandel, Tolago Bay, and Newton, my present station. During the whole of my service I have endeavoured to do my duty honestly, and to the satisfaction of my officers, and I have in the past been complimented by some of my officers for the manner in which I have carried out my duties. I have now served under my present Inspector for over fourteen months, and if he considers I am qualified for promotion to the rank of sergeant I would respectfully ask that he will be good enough to recommend and forward this application for the favourable consideration of the Commissioner.—T. DONOVAN, Constable No. 447.—The Inspector of Police, Auckland.

"Forwarded for the favourable consideration of the Commissioner.—Since Constable Donovan's transfer to Newton he has proved himself a very energetic, painstaking man, and thoroughly trustworthy. I am satisfied he would prove a very useful sergeant if you could see your way to promote him.—J. CULLEN, Inspector, 12/2/03.

“Inspector Cullen.—If there are any vacancies in the rank of sergeant to be filled before I leave I will consider this constable’s claims and qualifications.—J. S. TUNBRIDGE, Commissioner, 16/2/03.

“Police-station, Coromandel, 10th June, 1896.—The following is a copy of the entry made in the diary by Inspector Hickson at Coromandel Station on the 10th June, 1896: Arrived at Coromandel at 10.30 p.m., 9th June, 1896, having received a telegram at Auckland from Mr. Kenny, S.M., that Constables Dempster and Sharpe were charged with having been drunk and disorderly in the streets on last Saturday night about 9 p.m., and also with having assaulted some peaceable citizens. The Magistrate’s Court, which had been adjourned for the hearing of their charges, was reopened at 11 p.m. Constable Sharpe pleaded guilty to the charge of having been drunk and disorderly. Constable Dempster denied it until seven witnesses had testified and clearly proved the offence. His solicitor, Mr. Baume, who pleaded strongly that neither constable should be sent to gaol, but fined, withdrew the plea of guilty. Both constables were then strongly admonished by the S.M., and fined £1 each, with £1 18s. costs. The only man who laid a charge of assault against one of the constables (Sharpe) is F. G. Le Manquais, who withdrew it. Constable Donovan gave evidence that he had placed both constables on duty in the street at 7 p.m., and found them drunk and abusing peaceable residents at 9 p.m., when he visited them. He deserves much credit for the tact he displayed in removing them to their lodgings, the street being crowded, it being pay-day. The Court adjourned *sine die* at 1.30 a.m. this morning. Soon afterwards I suspended both constables, and ordered them to proceed to Auckland by steamer, leaving at 7.30 a.m. on Thursday, 11th instant. Examined station books, and found all correct.—T. DONOVAN, Third-class Constable, No. 447.—J. Hickson, Esq., Inspector of Police, Auckland.

“The Commissioner.—I think it is only right that I should bring under your notice the praiseworthy conduct of Constable Donovan. But for him some of the residents would have turned on Constables Dempster and Sharpe, and in all probability a riot would have ensued. It came out in evidence that there was a fight in the street, and some windows broken, close to where the constables were found. The Stipendiary Magistrate and several respectable persons have spoken highly of Constable Donovan for the tact he displayed in this case, as well as for the quiet, steady, efficient, and impartial manner in which he performs his duty. As he has been in charge of stations some years, I strongly recommend him for promotion to second class.—J. HICKSON.

“Inspector Hickson.—I am glad to find Constable Donovan did all he could under the trying circumstances, and that he prevented a riot. As he is, however, eighteen (18) on the seniority list of third-class constables, and in view to a classification scheme being adopted shortly, I regret I cannot recommend him for promotion.—A. HUME, Commissioner, 17/6/96.”

5. *The Commissioner.*] The difficulty is that you have been passed over, and, like the rest of us, you are getting up in years?—It is very hard on me. You have heard the whole of my career in the Force, and I think it is a very hard thing that I should be ordered about by men with not half my service. For my good services I was shifted to Tolago Bay. That was the promotion I got. I am at Parnell now.

6. What are your emoluments at Parnell?—Fairly good.

7. A free house?—Yes.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What age are you?—Fifty-nine.

9. What is the date of your application?—February, 1903.

10. Are you junior in service to Sergeants Dew and McKinnon?—Junior in service, but senior to pretty well all who have been promoted since.

11. It appears, apparently, that the late Commissioner considered that they were entitled to promotion before you?—I never had anything to say while senior men were promoted, but it is not fair that junior men should be promoted. In years gone by promotions were very stagnant in the Force.

12. Since your application the late Commissioner promoted two men before he left?—Yes.

13. And did not promote you?—Yes; but they were senior to me. McKinnon was the last senior man to me who was promoted.

14. What age were you when I came here?—Fifty-two.

15. How many men were promoted over fifty-two years of age?—I cannot say. There was one case where promotion was given when the man was fifty-eight.

16. The files will show that he had accepted promotion before I came here?—Watt was promoted.

17. He was recommended by the Inspector?—So was I. I think it is very cruel that I should stand here to-day in my present position after the work I have done. Do you think it is just or fair?

18. I do not know anything about your work prior to the time I came here?—Do you think that a man who has performed the duties I have should be so treated, and to be ordered about by men of very little experience?

19. You cannot all get promotion: there may be many cases like this?—I do not think that in New Zealand you will find a man who has been treated the same as I have been. I have never been shifted to or from a station for misconduct. I think the Commission will see that my case is a very hard one.

20. *The Commissioner.*] But my difficulty is how to deal with it?—I am satisfied to take promotion now.

The Commissioner: It is rather a big order to promote a man of your age. Do you know any reason, Inspector Cullen, why this man should not be promoted: would he make an efficient sergeant?

Inspector Cullen: He would have made an average sergeant at the time he was recommended. It would be cruel, I think, to put him on street duty now. I think when a man gets over fifty night duty cripples him.

21. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] If you had got your turn, when would you have been promoted?—In 1903.

22. Were there not a lot of promotions in 1898?—They were senior men to me. There was no man junior to me promoted up to the time I made my application.

23. *The Commissioner*.] It would seem that, in common with one or two other cases that have come under my notice, you have been passed over. I must confess I do not see my way to interfere. However much my sympathies may be with you, I have to be thoroughly practical, and I must not allow my sympathies to outweigh my judgment?—It is very hard, and I understand this Commission is to right wrongs.

24. Yes, in practical directions?—I am sure this is a wrong.

25. There is another very important feature that must not be lost sight of in connection with long-delayed promotion of men getting up in years, and that is the serious manner in which it would affect the Superannuation Fund. Promotion to you at the present time would mean practically an increase in your superannuation, for which you have paid no equivalent into the fund. However, my sympathies are entirely with you, and I shall consider your position very carefully from the file, coupled with the statement of the Inspector that he believes if you had been promoted you would have made an average sergeant.

FRIDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 1909.

Hon. J. McGowan, M.L.C., ex Minister of Justice, attended.

The Commissioner: I understand, Mr. McGowan, that you desire to give evidence?

Hon. Mr. McGowan: Yes.

The Commissioner: I understand that Mr. McGowan voluntarily attends as a witness. I may point out that there is a very important question of privilege involved in calling even an ex Minister of the Crown. This question was raised very prominently during the sitting of the Commission in 1898. The difficulty in my mind is this: When once a Minister or ex-Minister submits himself for examination the question is where the line is going to be drawn as to the questions to be asked him.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not intend to go far in the examination.

The Commissioner: It is not you. I leave that to your discretion as head of the Department; but there are other persons interested in the inquiry. The difficulty to my mind is to always know where to draw the line, because there is undoubtedly a privilege that a Minister of the Crown has a right to claim. However, I am quite willing to take up this attitude so long as it is understood that Mr. McGowan voluntarily tenders himself as a witness, and that I have had nothing to do with his coming forward as a witness; but as a Commissioner, or by virtue of my Commission from the Governor, I should decline to call upon a Minister or an ex-Minister of the Crown to attend. But if Mr. McGowan voluntarily tenders himself that is another matter altogether. I draw, of course, a very strong distinction between the voluntary action of an ex-Minister of the Crown coming forward and offering himself as a witness and a Minister or an ex-Minister of the Crown being compelled to attend here by subpoena. I have no doubt as to my power to compel anybody to attend, but I have very grave doubts whether I have power to compel a Minister or ex-Minister to give evidence.

Mr. Dinnie: Of course, you understand that there is one matter that really affects the Minister himself.

The Commissioner: I am not questioning Mr. McGowan's discretion at all. So long as he says that he comes here voluntarily that will satisfy me.

Hon. Mr. McGowan: I have been requested to come here. If you have any objections, then I say I appear voluntarily. I have been requested to come here on account of an imputation being cast upon the Commissioner of Police in connection with a relative of his, and having some little knowledge of that matter I come to give evidence.

The Commissioner: I quite understand that; but when once you are sworn in as a witness I shall have to ask you one or two questions with regard to certain things.

Hon. Mr. McGowan: I shall be very pleased to answer them.

Mr. Dinnie: I regret having to call Mr. McGowan; at the same time I know that he comes willingly, and in the interests of the Department.

The Commissioner: I do not mind so long as the position is understood, and must not be taken as a precedent. It is no part of my duty to bring Mr. McGowan here; in fact, I should have very strong objection to bringing Mr. McGowan before the Commission.

JAMES MCGOWAN examined on oath. (No. 190.)

Witness: My names is James McGowan. I am a member of the Legislative Council.

1. *The Commissioner*.] And you were for a long period Minister of Justice and political head of the Police Department?—Yes, about nine years.

2. *Mr. Dinnie*.] You were nine years Minister of Justice, and the Police Department is included in the portfolio of Minister of Justice?—Yes.

3. Have you during my administration had any grounds of complaint with respect to the administration or control of the Department?—No special ground.

4. I think when you left you were good enough to give me a testimonial expressing appreciation of my devotion to the interests of the Department?—Yes; and I think you were very well entitled to it.

5. Were you, or are you now, aware of any general dissatisfaction existing in respect to the control of the Department?—Not in respect to control by yourself. But there seems, from what I have seen in the newspapers—and this can hardly be taken as evidence—that there is a general desire on the part of the men for more pay, and each one desires to get promotion, and thinks he is overlooked.

6. I presume you know that a certain amount of dissatisfaction has always existed as regards promotion?—That will always exist while there is the qualification of the individual and length of service to be considered. When these two elements are taken into consideration there is bound to be dissatisfaction.

7. I suppose you know you have not had many appeals from my decisions?—From memory, I could not say there have been any.

8. You remember me speaking to you in regard to the promotion of detectives to the uniform branch?—Yes.

9. I think on the first occasion we were rather of opinion that it would create dissatisfaction, and we thought it better to send them out on probation first?—We discussed the question from both points of view. I certainly considered it most unfair to the uniform branch that detectives should receive during their period of service higher pay and other advantages that I need not mention, and then that they should immediately take precedence of the uniform men in getting promotion.

10. And subsequently I recommended Chief Detective McGrath for promotion during your time because of his splendid qualifications, and you approved of his being put forward for promotion?—Yes. I do not say that a detective should not arrive at the position of Sub-Inspector or Inspector; but the consideration of the whole service must be taken into account, and where special qualifications are shown with regard to detectives being qualified as Sub-Inspectors or Inspectors then they ought to get promotion.

11. You know that in order to maintain efficiency and discipline it is necessary to promote by merit and seniority combined?—It appears to be necessary. It is a pity that it is so. If I were an autocrat I imagine that I would take qualifications instead of seniority, and leave the seniority out.

12. That is taking into account efficiency?—But if the qualifications were equal then seniority should tell.

13. What do you say as regards the efficiency of the Force now as compared with years back?—I was always satisfied with its efficiency during my period; and I left at the beginning of January last. Of course, I have not been paying any attention to the question since that time, but I do not imagine that any great change can have taken place since.

14. Not in so short a period?—That is so.

15. You know that from time to time it has been necessary to dismiss men from the Force for misconduct of various kinds?—Yes.

16. And it always has been so?—Yes.

17. And I suppose you know also that police constables—young constables—are apt to be led into temptations very often as regards being induced to drink; and, notwithstanding their previous history, they will sometimes bring discredit upon the service?—That happens to both young men and old men.

18. As regards influence, political or otherwise, I suppose you will say that it is frequently brought to bear as regards transfers and promotions?—I do not know what political influence may actually mean. If you mean that attempts are made to influence a Minister, I have no doubt I have frequently been inquired of or spoken to with reference to promotion of men by members of Parliament, and that must always take place under our present system of government, and also by private individuals, but it has had no effect upon myself.

19. You have also had many letters?—I dare say there are letters on the file now.

20. In fact, I suppose some transfers or promotions have been delayed owing to these letters, so that inquiries could be made?—After a transfer was ordered a circumstance might arise, and it might be considered advantageous to countermand the order for transfer for a period. That has happened.

21. Owing to these letters?—Not owing to the letters, but owing to the information.

22. But in no case has that influence obtained?—I can only speak for myself in that respect. So far as I know, if a man was entitled to promotion or transfer, and was recommended by a member of Parliament, I would not object to it because he was so recommended; neither would I agree to transfer or promote a man because he was so recommended.

23. So that, really, the recommendation of members of Parliament would have little or no effect?—It has this effect: that it gives you for the time being the opinion of the member of Parliament, and the Minister receiving that opinion has to carefully weigh whether it does not pay the politician to make the recommendation for some one in his district whether he absolutely has a strong view upon it himself or not, inasmuch as he is dealing with a constituent of his own, and that he ought to do what he can in all fairness for his constituent. But it is the duty of the Minister to form his own judgment of the position, and not be influenced in respect to the promotion by the recommendation of any member of Parliament.

24. But at the same time, notwithstanding such recommendation, if you found that the case was not a deserving one, you would not comply with it?—No, I have never done so, to my knowledge.

Mr. Dinnie: I have got here eight files, as samples, in which members have recommended certain action as regards certain men—not only members, but there have been petitions and letters

from private individuals in respect to some constables. I would like you to identify one letter in each of these files, so that they may be put in as evidence. I do not think it is necessary to mention names.

The Commissioner: No, I do not think it is necessary. The order of reference in the Commission is as follows: "3. As to whether any political or other improper interference exists in connection with the said Force; and, if so, to what extent, and whether such interference has any influence in the administration of the said Force."

[Witness identified letters in each of the files.]

The Commissioner: You say these letters are typical of the general treatment of such applications?

Mr. Dinnie: That is so. You will see that there are petitions in some of these cases from private individuals and others either to prevent transfers or to get transfers.

The Commissioner: That is so. I suppose there is a fair inference to be drawn in these cases that constables themselves sometimes assisted in promoting them?

Mr. Dinnie: Undoubtedly.

The Commissioner: That is an important aspect of it.

Mr. Dinnie: Otherwise I do not see how these persons could know what was going on.

25. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] Of course, Mr. McGowan, I suppose you know that every year the Inspectors send in recommendations as to promotions?—I know they send in recommendations, but I could not say there was any stated time for it.

26. And it is principally on those recommendations that men are advanced?—It should be, if the recommendations are borne out by you. I depended upon you giving me proper recommendations and information. It was impossible for me to have all the proper information. I depended upon you.

27. You think the Inspectors are the proper persons to recommend?—I think, on the whole, we have a very fine body of men as Inspectors of Police in New Zealand.

28. Of course, such attempts to introduce influence has to a degree a certain effect on the men, causing a tendency to be insubordinate?—No; if the Minister has firmness of character they will soon come to know that these applications will have little or no effect. The unfortunate thing is that political heads sometimes change, and the result is that they try the same thing with each new Minister.

29. But if their grievances are ventilated in any way, is not that an inducement for them to seek influence?—They should have their grievances ventilated only through their superior officers.

30. But I say, if they are ventilated otherwise, does not that induce them to seek influence?—If they succeed in getting what they desire in the way of promotion or transfer owing to the application through some political party, they naturally may think that it is because they have spoken for them, but it may not happen in that way at all: it may happen because they were really entitled to it.

31. But if they find that their grievances are ventilated, except in the proper manner, they will go in that direction again?—I am inclined to think the Police Force is an intelligent class of men, and I think they will adopt the course by which they suppose their grievances will be redressed.

32. That is, generally speaking?—Yes; I can only speak generally.

33. You know they do seek influence continually?—Yes.

34. What is the cause of that?—They must, I suppose, have succeeded at some time or other, otherwise they would not pursue that course if they did not meet with success.

35. Do you think ventilating grievances in the House has any effect?—I think one of the worst effects that could happen to a Police Force is to have their individual affairs brought up in Parliament.

The Commissioner: If we are to believe constables, certain members of Parliament have invited them to say whether they could do anything for them.

Mr. Dinnie: That goes further even than I am going. I do not want to go too far in that direction.

The Commissioner: There is no reason to doubt the evidence that has been given.

Witness: I have no doubt that has been done.

The Commissioner: I have no doubt of it, knowing some of the men as I do.

36. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] It interferes to a degree with the maintenance of discipline?—It is bad for discipline.

37. *The Commissioner.*] Can you suggest any remedy in a democracy to stop that sort of thing?—I am afraid it is impossible. Do you ask me to suggest a remedy?

38. Yes?—I am afraid you are giving me a rather difficult task. There is a remedy, though I would not like to apply it, and that is if the franchise was taken away from the police.

39. The removal of the franchise might have that effect, but I doubt whether it could be carried out in New Zealand?—I do not think so.

40. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you believe in the Commissioner of Police having the sole administration—a free hand, as it were?—Up to a certain point.

41. *The Commissioner.*] Up to what point?—I would give the Commissioner absolute control, even to the extent of suspension of a man; and he has now under the law the power to dismiss. I would allow him the power to suspend. I would not like to express an opinion as to whether the power to dismiss should be taken away.

42. Is that up to certain ranks?—Yes.

43. Short of commission rank, he should have the power of dismissal, and as to commission rank, you would leave that to the Cabinet?—Yes.

44. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think at the present time he has the power to dismiss any constable?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I think I have the power up to the commissioned officers.

45. *The Commissioner.*] Does the Commissioner recommend merely and the Minister appoint—he enrolls the constables?—Yes.

46. Suppose a man has to be promoted from constable to sergeant, what is the practice?—In my time he recommended the promotion to the Minister; and I discussed the question with him, and if I was satisfied with the reasons given by him I would approve.

47. Then, the Commissioner has no power *per se* to appoint a man from constable to sergeant?—The practice has been that the Commissioner has consulted with the Minister with reference to promotions to sergeants.

48. But I want to understand on what the practice is based: is it upon long usage, or on any principle laid down by the Minister, or under the regulations, or what?—That was the practice when I took office. In Mr. Tunbridge's time it was carried on, and it has been continued.

49. Then I take it the Commissioner has no power to promote a man at all?—Oh, yes; he has great power.

50. He cannot have any power to promote if the appointment must be submitted for the Minister's approval?—I do not know that there is any written authority, but the practice has been as I have described.

51. Do you think that it is in the best interests of the service that every appointment of a sergeant should be subject to the revision of the Minister, or should it be left to the discretion of the Commissioner?—I think the Commissioner is perfectly qualified to decide upon the appointment or promotion of a constable to a sergeant.

52. After all, you only voice his recommendation?—Yes, that is so.

53. In the case of a sergeant that is so; but for commissioned rank, does the Minister appoint or the Cabinet?—The Cabinet appoints.

54. Upon the recommendation of the Minister?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: There is no regulation providing against the Commissioner promoting non-commissioned officers.

55. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Does it not appear to you that if what you say is correct that the Commissioner has gradually parted with his right?

Mr. Dinnie: Practically he makes the appointment.

The Commissioner: The best Mr. McGowan can say is that he found this the practice when he took office, and continued it.

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

The Commissioner: I think it seriously affects the authority of the Commissioner of Police, if he is the right man in the right place in carrying out his duties, if he is deprived of the right to promote a man from constable to sergeant.

Mr. Dinnie: He is not deprived.

The Commissioner: I say technically he is if he has to get the approval of the Minister for making promotions to sergeant; he is parting with the right.

Mr. Dinnie: He has not objected to any of my recommendations.

The Commissioner: Mr. McGowan is not in office, and you might have a man in office who would object to every recommendation you make. I want to get from Mr. McGowan what he considers best in the interests of the Force.

Mr. Dinnie: I quite agree that the Commissioner ought to do so.

The Commissioner: Mr. McGowan does not dispute the fact.

56. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I suppose you believe in the regulation which prohibits members of the Force divulging departmental information?—I think that was quite a proper regulation, and I think it was mainly to carry out that—I think it was under your recommendation—that the clerks in the main office were chosen from the service, so that there should be no opportunity of leakage of information, because naturally and necessarily the police become possessed of certain information, and it is very unwise that it should be made public; and for that reason I think it is a wise provision that the officers of the Police Force who are appointed or promoted, if it is promotion, should be men who had joined the Police Force, and have shown that they possess qualities fitting them for the position.

57. They are selected because they are special men in whom one can place confidence?—I presume that would be the course.

58. *The Commissioner.*] Do you remember the reasons that influenced you to make the Chief Clerk a Sub-Inspector?—No; I do not know that I could call to memory the particular reasons.

59. *Mr. Dinnie.*] He was holding the position of Chief Clerk and Accountant was he not?—I am unable to give the particular reasons at the moment.

Mr. Dinnie: Only that he was recommended by me for that rank.

The Commissioner: You would have to show some special reasons that would influence the Minister to make this new departure. It has created dissatisfaction, and will be touched upon still further by-and-by. I only want to know whether there was anything particular in the Minister's mind that caused him to authorise it.

Mr. Dinnie: I had a conference with him on the subject. I told him the system that exists in all other Police Forces practically; and it was simply with the view of the duties being carried out, as Mr. McGowan says, confidentially, and preventing the divulgence of departmental information?

Witness: I think one of the reasons adduced by the Commissioner at that time was the fact that Mr. Wright was occupying the Chief Clerkship, and would be in the office, and would be dealing in some instances with Sub-Inspectors and Inspectors, and that instructions might sometimes have to be given in the absence of the Commissioner.

60. *The Commissioner.*] Give him a higher status?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: The point is easily answered. He could not have the pay unless he had the rank.

The Commissioner: To my mind that is subject to comment—whether it is in the best interests of the service that a man should be promoted to police rank simply to secure him extra pay.

61. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You understand, as you have said already, that it is essential that he should have police experience in that position?—It is better.

62. There is a regulation that men should be in the barracks by 11 o'clock: it has been said that that is too restrictive: what is your opinion?—It depends on circumstances, and the decision should be left to the Inspector.

63. As you know, if they apply for extra leave off they are allowed it?—That is a matter of detail I have not a knowledge of.

64. You know when I took charge here I first organized the finger-print branch of the service?—It was in operation partly, I think, before, but you certainly took the matter over, having the knowledge, and having come direct from Scotland Yard, that we had not at that time.

65. Perhaps you will remember that I had to order the destruction of two or three cabinets which had been made, and reorganized the matter entirely?—Yes.

66. Perhaps you will also remember that on my recommendation you approved of the raising of the status of the Chief Detectives by giving them 1s. a day extra pay?—Yes.

67. And to make future appointments on merit and seniority, and not on seniority alone. Prior to that you will perhaps recollect that seniority alone would qualify a Chief Detective?—Yes; I have expressed my opinion on that matter.

68. You know also that I have revised the *Police Gazette*, and that the photographs appear in the *Gazette*, and every constable gets a copy of the photographs?—I am not at all acquainted with the *Police Gazette*.

69. You know the pay of the sergeants was raised, so as to prevent a large reduction when they were transferred on promotion?—I know there was an increase of pay all round some time ago.

70. You know that weekly classes were introduced in the cities?—Yes.

71. A system of drill adopted?—Yes. It would be to the interests of the Force if we had one central training-place, instead of five or six.

72. You know that all photographs are now produced by members of the service instead of by private individuals, and you know the saving this has made?—Yes.

73. You know that you approved of the erection of new barracks for the probationers, with up-to-date accommodation, in Wellington?—Yes. I think it is important where you have a centre and a number of young men to train to have a room in a proper barracks where they can get recreation.

74. You know there was an increase of pay generally on my recommendation which you approved of?—Yes; I think we discussed that matter.

75. And that there was an augmentation of four station sergeants and several other sergeants, which was recommended by the Commission, which improved the supervision of the Force?—Yes.

The Commissioner: That was the outcome of the Commission held by myself, so that you did not recommend it, Mr. Dinnie.

76. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It was carried out. (To witness): The most important matter, Mr. McGowan, that I desired your attendance about is the one you have read of in the papers. I suppose you know what has been said in respect to the leave granted to my son?—Yes; I have been following the Commission in the papers, seeing I was not busily engaged otherwise.

77. Now, I will produce to you a file in respect to that leave, and ask you whether this is not the original application [file handed to witness]?—Yes; this is the application.

78. The initials thereon are yours?—Yes.

79. *The Commissioner.*] Was that the only document in connection with the matter which was laid before you?—I have no recollection of any other, and, speaking of what was in the newspapers, if such an application had come before me it would never have been considered.

80. The suggestion was that probably the recommendation of the Commissioner was made in a certain form, that it was afterwards withdrawn, and this one substituted for it?—It never came before me.

81. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The suggestion is that he was granted leave on full pay, and that it was altered after a certain paragraph appeared in the paper?—There is no alteration as far as I am concerned.

82. The paragraph is here. I want you to look at the date on this paper—*New Zealand Truth* [paper handed to witness]. The date of this paper is the 27th February, 1909, and it mentions that my son is on leave with full pay. The leave, it will be seen, commenced on the 12th February, so that by the time this paper appeared my son was a good way on the water on his way Home. The alteration could not possibly have been made, even if we had wanted to make it. That is what I want to show—

The Commissioner: I think it should be quite sufficient for your purpose if Mr. McGowan says this was the only application that came before him in connection with the matter.

83. *Mr. Dinnie.*] This application is dated and numbered, Mr. McGowan, and that number would refer to a record in our register?—That is so.

84. I think you know Detective Herbert?—Yes.

85. Do you know anything about his previous history at all?—Yes; I have known him for many years. I knew him when he was stationed at the Thames many years ago.

86. Perhaps you have noticed what he said when speaking of your remarks in the House respecting the promotion of Chief Detectives?—Yes.

87. Do you wish to give any explanation about that at all?—It is not necessary. At the time he interviewed me—I do not say he did so because of his previous acquaintance with me—he wanted

promotion, and I declined, and I may have used the words he referred to. It is possible I used that as a reason for his not being promoted, but even now he is not the class of man I would promote to Inspector or Sub-Inspector.

88. *The Commissioner.*] Touching political influence, Mr. McGowan, when you get letters from members of Parliament marked "Confidential," and from other persons, what do you do with them?—I keep them.

89. What action do you take on them?—I generally wait to see the people, as I want to know the reasons in regard to anything wanted to be done in connection with any department I had the control of.

90. No "confidential" letters would appear, of course, on these files?—They should not appear.

Mr. Dinnie: There might be some.

91. *The Commissioner.*] That is what I want to know, because when anybody approached Mr. McGowan about matters they did not want to be made public they marked the letters "confidential." What would be done with those letters?—They should not appear on the file. The "confidential" letters regarding the Police Force would be considered between the Commissioner and the Minister.

92. Of course, members have also approached you personally?—Yes.

93. What did you do? Did you discuss the matter with them, or tell them to again put it in writing?—Sometimes I discussed the matter, and at other times I told them to put it in writing, and I would make inquiries.

94. Then that also would pass through the Commissioner?—The letter would be embodied in the file.

95. Coming to other matters of detail, have in any instance promotions been made other than on the recommendation of the Commissioner?—Not in my period. I do not remember any.

96. In making these promotions on the recommendation of the Commissioner, have you, as a rule, examined the general papers in connection with the matter, or have you simply acted upon the recommendation of the Commissioner?—I have, in general, had the papers, and the Commissioner has given his reasons for making such recommendations, and supported them from the file in some instances. In other instances I would take the Commissioner's statement, without reference to the file at all.

97. Would he, when recommending constables for promotion, state the fact that the men were recommended by their Inspectors?—He would, and, in addition to that, would give all the information he had; and I myself had from the late Commissioner a "confidential" document embodying a very great number of the names of those men who were entitled to or suitable for promotion, and I used to compare this document, which was a "confidential" one of my own, with the recommendations of the Commissioner.

98. You safeguarded it in every possible way?—Yes.

99. A great deal has been said about anonymous letters: does the Minister often receive such letters?—Very often.

100. What does he do with them?—They generally go to the waste-paper basket.

101. You know it is not the practice to do that in the police?—No, but I was not a policeman.

102. No; but take the practice in the Police Department, which you were the political head of?—I also may have received anonymous letters, and I believe I have consulted the Commissioner of Police with reference to handwriting, but it was useless to keep them.

103. But it seems to have been the general practice—the Commissioner of Police will correct me if I am wrong—in all cases of anonymous letters containing allegations against particular constables to send these on for inquiry in the district where the constable was stationed?—If it came before me I would make a note of the fact.

104. If you received anonymous letters regarding the conduct of a constable you would hand that letter on to the Commissioner?—Most likely.

105. With regard to promotions, a practice seems to have grown up of "offering" a man promotion. It seems to me if a man is considered worthy of promotion, and is given the option, and he declines it, it means possibly a very serious loss to the efficiency of the police. What is your opinion about that?—My opinion would be opposed to that. I believe in the man being entirely the servant of the public.

106. You agree with me. I would not give the man the option at all. I would say you are promoted, and you have to go?—I know it has been done. I have had men I was acquainted with myself, and who by their services and qualifications were entitled to promotion, and I have known them refuse because they were financially in a position to obtain more money, and the result was that in that case promotion would have been a loss to them financially; but my opinion, nevertheless, was that they should take the promotion, and that they should always remember they were the servants of the public.

107. But did you act on that?—No, I did not.

108. Why?—I am giving an instance where the man's family was employed in a particular town, and he did not wish to be removed from that town. One of his boys was learning a trade, and he had two girls employed, and he therefore did not wish to be shifted.

109. Those reasons can generally be urged?—I suppose they could at any time.

110. Therefore you think that, having regard to the complete efficiency of the Force, and making that the main consideration, that every man should do what he is told?—That is my opinion.

111. Would you lower the standard of education?—No.

112. We are faced with this serious position: that for some reason men are not coming forward to join the Force; and the position sooner or later will be very serious indeed: how is it

to be met?—I have discussed the same difficulty with the present Commissioner, and I would like to give my opinion as to the reason there is a scarcity before suggesting the remedy. The reason has been, in my opinion, on account of the action of unions, and the result of the Arbitration Court awards, which have given men employed in manual labour, and in some trades, a very much higher rate of wage than they previously obtained. Many of those men would otherwise have perhaps joined the police, but they have found that they can do very much better by going in for trades. The principle of increasing wages by the Arbitration Court is an unsound one, because every one is really a seller of something. He is selling his services, his labour, or his advice; and if the Arbitration Court appraises the services of any man, or of labour even, above its economic value, then the country, or that particular trade, is in danger; and that is the trouble, so far as I can see, if the wages are going on rising. While the country is prosperous these increases can be given, but when a depression comes we will all suffer. This being the position, then we must increase the pay of the Police Force to some extent.

113. So as to get over the difficulty of meeting the attraction afforded by outside avenues of employment?—Quite so.

114. Then, you do not think it is an element in the falling off of the recruiting-power that the educational standard is, say, the Fifth instead of the Fourth?—I think I would keep it to the Fifth.

115. There is one aspect of that matter that is worthy of consideration, where a young man, seeking enrolment, having given no evidence of having passed the Fifth Standard, might be able to meet the requirements of the Fourth Standard, and in his case, if he entered the Force, he would be as suitable a member as though he had passed the Fifth when a boy?—The way in which you put it is quite correct. You might get a man who has not perhaps passed more than the Third Standard, but if he has a well-balanced head, and has brains, when it comes to practical work at twenty-two or twenty-five years of age, perhaps he is a fairly smart man.

116. Then he has to start and go to school again, and pass the standard?—He should be able to do that if he has the qualifications, but I would not say he should only pass the Third Standard.

117. You would leave the question to the personal judgment of the Inspector or Commissioner?—Yes; I should say the Inspectors would be qualified to judge, as well as the Commissioner.

118. A curious matter came under our notice yesterday. You might remember something about it. For some years past the Inspectors have not been supplied with forms of application for enrolment to the Police Force?—I was not aware of that.

119. That is the fact, and I have not been able to trace why. The Commissioner agrees that there can be no possible reason why there should not be every facility afforded for enrolment?—I know nothing about it.

120. It is a curious fact, but the forms were suddenly withdrawn, and the Inspectors now are not supplied with them: would you be in favour of having the period of probation enlarged before men are finally and absolutely enrolled in the Force?—No; I would have the strictest inquiry before enrolment, and I think it would be a wrong thing to let a young man do twelve months' probation, and then to dismiss him. Three or four months ought to be quite sufficient.

121. Six months has been suggested as a maximum?—If an Inspector was not able to recommend a man after three months I think it would be a folly to keep him.

122. Has it ever been brought under your notice the desirability or otherwise of empowering Inspectors to take evidence on oath in connection with their departmental inquiries?—That matter has never come before me.

123. You know of no reason why an Inspector should not be empowered to take evidence on oath?—No. I also think—and I say it with all due respect—that such a Commission as this should be in the nature of a departmental inquiry. A Commission of inquiry such as this, whether held by yourself or any other Commissioner, should not be a public Commission.

124. You, as an ex-member of the Cabinet, know that these matters are dealt with in Cabinet, and whatever may be our matured opinions about it, they are our masters for the time being. But I am very much inclined to think that publicity is not always in the interests of the Force. For a long time I have held the opinion that the police might be utilised as a nucleus of a Force to be relied on for assistance in any emergency. I would be in favour of encouraging them to qualify in rifle practice. Have you considered that?—No; and I do not think it would be a wise thing. The police at the present time have quite enough of their own work to do without the additional work involved in qualifying as marksmen.

125. I would encourage them merely. I would not make it absolutely obligatory. I would offer prizes?—Then you would have jealousy between the regular Forces and the Police Force who qualified.

126. No; I think it would help them?—It might. I would not like to say that it would not.

127. A great deal has been said about the difficulty of the Police Force getting concessions from other Departments, and they do a great deal of work for other Departments for which they get no credit?—That is true.

128. For instance, the Postal Department makes every other Department pay for the work it does for them. Why should not the police be credited with the work they do for other Departments, and in that way the cost of little concessions such as railway passes on holidays could be defrayed? Is there any reason why that should not be considered?—No reason, excepting that the Minister in charge of the police would require to take a larger vote in the meantime; but the credits would appear in due course on the other side of the ledger.

129. The work done for other Departments would go to the ultimate credit of the Police Department?—Unfortunately, the Police Department never gets the credit it ought to receive. I am not speaking with reference to the money, which is one thing, as against the Police Department. Some of the finest men in New Zealand are in the Police Force, and yet they are mentioned disrespectfully.

130. One might give that as a reason for men not coming forward for enrolment—that they do not like to be called policemen. They should be treated with every respect, but I am afraid it is not so?—Quite right, sir; that is so.

131. And, after all, the country depends on the support of the self-respecting men rather than on the others?—That is true.

132. When you were a Minister, was the question of the desirability of dealing with the Police Surgeon here ever raised?—We had an inquiry.

133. It was held by Mr. Brabant. That inquiry was probably set up by you?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, by Mr. McGowan.

134. *The Commissioner:* On representations made to him?—Yes, which went to Cabinet through the Minister.

135. Did you ever realise, Mr. McGowan, that there is a very deep-seated objection to the present medical officer, apart altogether from the merits of the question?—I noticed that from the papers.

136. I have, however, to form an independent and unbiassed judgment on the matter, and it seems to me there is a very deep-seated objection to that officer. Would you be in favour, as Minister in charge, of retaining an officer the men complain of, and say they do not want?—I would not like the position; but, at the same time, if I found that the medical officer was doing his duty fairly, I would not be in favour of dismissing him merely because members of the Police Force said they did not want him.

137. I think it was the unanimous wish?—Even if I was satisfied that it was the unanimous wish, and I considered he was doing his duty properly, I would not dismiss him.

138. At the same time, he might not have the quality of inspiring confidence, and if there is anything at all in having faith in your medical man, the absence of that quality would be a disadvantage, would it not?—I do not attach any importance to having faith in a medical man so far as the Police Force is concerned. If he does his duty properly, although he might be unpopular, I would decline to dismiss him simply because he was unpopular.

139. Even if there are sixty men here, and those sixty strongly object to a certain man attending them, would you keep him longer in the service?—If I believed the medical man was right I would say so.

140. How are you going to find out?—By inquiry.

141. These inquiries go to a certain point only. This officer is qualified, and it is not within the right of any constable to say whether he is duly qualified or not, but it seems to me there is a personal question involved. It is only £100 a year?—The principle is the same if it is only £50 a year, and I would not be one, if I were in charge of the police, to make a change if I thought the officer was doing his duty. If some policemen object to a certain man there is no great hardship in their applying to be allowed to consult another doctor.

142. They have been paying for another man themselves rather than have the man paid for by the Government?—If I found that state of affairs continued long, the likelihood is I would be very sorry to have to shift the medical man; but I certainly would be in no haste to act if I thought the officer did his duty properly, or if he were a man who had been very badly treated because of an unpopular feeling.

143. There is just one other matter with regard to the districts, some of which appear to be absolutely out of proportion?—That is true.

144. Have you ever considered the desirability of rearranging the boundaries of some districts?—It has been considered.

145. How many stations are there in this district?

Inspector Cullen: I have sixty-two stations, and about 172 men under me, including district and Native constables.

The Commissioner: You might compare that with some other district, please.

Inspector Cullen: The closest district to me is Thames, which has, I think, twenty-two stations and about thirty-eight men. Greymouth has twenty-one stations and thirty-seven men.

The Commissioner: And the Inspector there holds equal rank to yourself?

Inspector Cullen: The same rank.

The Commissioner: Have you any views on that matter, Mr. Cullen?

Inspector Cullen: Yes. The Inspector at Invercargill has twenty-one stations and thirty-eight men.

146. *The Commissioner:* What is your opinion, Mr. McGowan, of the size of these police districts?—The Inspector here had the whole of the Auckland District under his charge some time ago, and, seeing that it was the largest one in the colony, a proposal was made to cut off a portion somewhere about Hamilton, and constitute it a separate district. I found on consultation with the Commissioner that to make the Thames a separate district would be to the best advantage, on account of the line of railway; the new district would then lie to the eastward of the main range. Hamilton would be served by the northern railway. I think Mr. Dinnie's recommendation was that the division should take place about Hamilton. The alteration finally arranged was an improvement, on account of affording an economic method of dealing with the different parts of the province. Coming to the number of districts, I do not think it is wise to have what might be termed an equal district for each Inspector, because you have Inspectors and Inspectors, without speaking disparagingly about any one; and I would like to see always the best Inspector in charge of the most important district.

147. Of course, the West Coast must be worked as a separate district?—On account of the main range again. Invercargill, Napier, and Thames are small districts.

148. And the Inspectors ought to be able to go upwards from those districts to the more important ones?—Yes.

149. So that you see no objection to small districts from the police point of view?—No.
150. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The Inspectors in charge of cities receive better pay than the district Inspectors outside?—Yes; they have increased expenses.
151. The question of the size of the districts depends entirely on the conveniences and the railway provision for conveying instructions?—Yes.
152. Christchurch is a big district, but the railway is so convenient that it takes no time to get about?—Yes.
153. Regarding this district, the only question was whether we should not make Hamilton one of the headquarters, and give it part of the King-country, and include it in the Thames?—The difficulty is that you would still have a sort of circle in connection with traffic, and when you get southwards of Waihi you have the main range coming in. From Te Puke to get to Hamilton is a day's journey, whereas from Auckland you can get there in three hours.
154. If the Department were credited with services rendered to other Departments our expenditure would not be so great?—That is a matter that can be easily settled, as I have no doubt the Government would agree to it if the recommendation were made.
155. Do you think constables ought to have a fixed rate of pay, and no further emoluments for other appointments they might hold?—Other emoluments are added to their pay from motives of economy. A policeman's time may not be altogether taken up with police duties, so he becomes Clerk of Court and Bailiff, and he gets paid for the extra services he renders. The services of a separate officer are saved.
156. The suggestion has been made to grade the stations according to emoluments, so that the best men should receive the most emoluments?—I believe it has.
157. As regards rifle practice, do you not think that every man in the Dominion should be able to use the rifle?—Well, every one could use it.
158. I mean with effect. Do you not think that all recruits ought to be trained?—I think most of the police, in connection with their drill, should learn enough to be able to shoot straight.
159. I understand that the police in the country do have shots occasionally?—Yes.
160. Do you remember that I spoke to you about reducing the educational standard from the Fifth to the Fourth, and you were not quite in favour of it?—I have not altered my opinion yet.
161. Do you know that we send out a great many application forms, and they never come back, and there is no doubt that the reason is that the men have not passed the standard?—That is very likely.
162. And we lose a great many of the farming class who might make good constables because they have not passed the Fifth?—Every boy in New Zealand ought to be able to pass the Fifth Standard.
163. Of course, when members of Parliament speak to you about an officer of the Department being promoted, or appointed to some position, you generally send for the files, or consult me, as to the position of things?—Yes, if it is a case worth troubling about. But I have been spoken to about cases that I knew at once were not worth troubling about.
164. When a man is offered promotion, do you not think he cannot be very much of a man if he does not accept it?—His ambition is only to get as much money as possible, and when he finds that by accepting promotion he is going to lose money he will refuse it. I know a case in point of an officer I was acquainted with personally for many years.
165. But with numbers applying for promotion there would be no loss to the service if two or three refused it?—Yes. I follow the line of His Worship's argument just now—that when a man is entitled to and is qualified for promotion, and he refuses, it is a loss to the service, because you have to bring another man up.
166. Where other men are equally qualified?
- The Commissioner:* I think you are on very much safer ground on the proposition I put forward, Mr. Dinnie.
167. *Inspector Cullen.*] As to the disparity in pay, Mr. McGowan, you know there is a small difference of pay between Inspectors in the small districts and those in the large ones. It is only £50 a year?—Yes, and £50 is £50, and £2 more would make it £1 a week.
168. You know it costs more for a man to keep himself in town: he has to dress better?—I have considered all that.
169. And there is more expense generally?—And there is more credit, which naturally follows the position. An Inspector feels, as it were, a better man if he is the Inspector of a large district than he does if he is only head of a small one.
170. He may be?—He ought to be.
171. You know that an Inspector in a large centre like Auckland or Wellington has his whole time occupied, every day in a week, and until after 9 o'clock every night?—Yes; but his is not a single case. Every true officer—in fact, every true man—is working all the time, whether he is engaged in the public service or not. The Magistrates work all hours. The whole point is as to whether a man likes the business he is engaged in. If he does not like it, then it is all labour to him.
172. But supposing a man does like his business, and he cannot find enough work to do, what then?—If he cannot find work to do, he is either a very good man or a very poor one.
173. I was in charge of the Greymouth District when it was much larger than it is now, but I could not find work to keep me going more than a couple of hours a day, no matter how much I tried to make work; yet the Inspector in charge there will be drawing within £50 of me when he reaches the maximum?—Circumstances alter cases. That is a special case, and circumstances make it special. I suppose you could not very much increase that man's district without cutting down some others.

174. But they have reduced his district by taking off the ten stations at Nelson and adding them to the Wellington District?—I see the line you are going on—whether the better plan would not be to equalise the districts. If the men who have the large districts are working all hours, then they should get some relief by adding to the districts where the men have not too much to do.

175. The Thames District was taken off my district, but it has not made the difference of fifteen minutes' work a day to me, taking my last week's work as a basis?—If I were the Commissioner I would note that, and try and manage to give the Thames District a wider sphere of operations.

176. There is the fact that it has not made a difference of fifteen minutes a day since the change took place?—Did you report that to the Commissioner?

177. I was not asked whether it was necessary?—Do you not make suggestions without being asked?

178. I would not make a suggestion of that kind to him. I am making it now. The same applies to Invercargill. There was a new district created there when there was no need for it. It could be worked from Dunedin. The same applies to Greymouth?—That is evidence suitable for the Commission.

179. These are matters I wish to refer to, but there is no comparison between my work and the work that the Inspectors in these small districts do?—I would increase the small districts by taking off a portion of the large districts that are heavily worked.

180. Then that would not be enough?—I would increase them still further, and then if they had not enough work I would abolish them altogether.

181. Now, leading up to that, I think you will admit that no business firm would run their business on the same lines as the Police Force is being run in respect to small districts. No firm having its headquarters in Auckland will pay an agent at the Thames almost as much salary as they pay the head manager here?—The Police Force is a different thing, and is not run on business lines in the shape of making money. It is run in the interests of the public, and the police are the servants of the public. It cannot be dealt with as a money-making concern. If the districts are too small, they ought to be enlarged. I would not be in favour of increasing the salaries of Inspectors of larger districts, because you would then at once introduce an element of unfairness to the others.

Inspector Cullen: What I am driving at is this: that the men in the small stations should have work to do commensurate with the pay they receive.

The Commissioner: That would be the answer to Mr. McGowan's suggestion in regard to districts. I quite agree with Mr. McGowan that there should be prize districts the same as prize districts for Magistrates.

Inspector Cullen: I intend to go into that point.

182. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It was during my time that the difference was made in the pay between the districts and Inspectors outside and those in the cities. There was no difference at all when I came here. Do you not think an Inspector is pretty well paid at £450 a year and a free house?—I am not going to express an opinion upon that point. I do not believe that an Inspector should be paid in proportion to the size of his district, but I believe that the districts should be more equalised, so that they should have districts somewhat compatible with the salary they receive. The principle of paying an Inspector according to the size of his district would, I think, be a vicious one.

183. The difficulty, you know, would be how to work the districts geographically?—Yes, that is so.

HENRY WILLIAM NORTHCROFT, Stipendiary Magistrate, examined on oath. (No. 191.)

Witness: My name is Henry William Northcroft. I am a Stipendiary Magistrate, and take the Lower Waikato District.

1. *Constable Donovan.*] Did you know me at Coromandel?—Yes; you were constable and Bailiff there.

2. And Inspector of Factories?—Yes.

3. What was your opinion of me?—You did your duty fearlessly and well. I gave evidence in regard to you before the Commission of 1898.

4. Did I satisfy you in every way in connection with the discharge of my duties?—Yes.

5. You remember me being shifted from there?—Yes.

6. Was there any question of political influence in connection with that transfer?—No. Mr. Tunbridge told me afterwards that you were shifted because you treated some of the licensees a little too strongly, and they brought pressure to bear; and you were shifted to Tolago Bay.

7. Did you consider that was very hard?—No doubt it was a hardship at that time.

8. Did you consider that I interfered unduly with the publicans, or was I only doing my duty?—I think you did your duty fearlessly.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you could speak in similar terms in regard to other constables?—Yes, in most instances.

10. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinion upon the present condition of the Force—as to its efficiency, and so forth?—I think there is a feeling in the Force, rightly or wrongly, that a great many get on because they have what is called a political “pull.” They will tell you that it is not done openly, as before the 1898 Commission, but that there is political influence right through, or influence in some form or other—that influence is brought to bear in respect to some getting promotion and others not getting promotion.

11. You have heard Mr. McGowan's specific denial of that?—No; I was not present when he said that.

12. He absolutely denied that political influence influenced him in any way?—There are some men who have been left behind—men who have been in the Force a long time. I noticed that Constable Foreman has given evidence. I know him. He served with me in 1874 in the Armed Constabulary. He has been a Clerk of Court for nine years. I should think that men who are capable of taking charge of out-stations, where they have no one to guide them except the Magistrate occasionally—men who are capable of doing that work are fitted for non-commissioned rank.

13. What about the capabilities of the constables generally in your district?—Very good right through.

14. They are a good stamp of men, and reliable for their work?—Yes. A Magistrate is brought very closely into contact with the men in country districts. As to the discipline of the Force, I would like to say that I was astounded to read in the newspapers that a constable, in his evidence before the Commission, criticized the method of a Magistrate in conducting the business of his Court.

15. Or rather, attempted to criticize?—I should say that if the local Police Force decided to bring that before the Commission it shows an absolute want of discipline. When I read the statement it almost made my hair stand on end.

The Commissioner: He acted as a delegate on behalf of the rest, and he did not feel very happy in alluding to the question. He spoke in a very apologetic way. I think it is very greatly to be regretted that it should have been referred to—it is unfortunate it should have occurred.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You can understand that I had no knowledge of what was going to be said?—Yes; I am sure you would have stopped it if you had known.

The Commissioner: We had an instance quite as bad—indeed, I think much worse—of a meeting of police at Wellington criticizing a Royal Commission.

Mr. Dinnie: I quite disapprove of anything of that sort.

The Commissioner: The only way to deal with these cases is to treat them with contempt. I treated the case in Wellington with perfect contempt.

17. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I understand that the Inspector speaks to you occasionally about the qualifications of the men: that is a good idea, is it not?—Yes; it was in the old regulations, and when Inspector Cullen comes through my district he does so.

18. *The Commissioner.*] I have heard of a Magistrate making it a grievance because he was not consulted. I would not do that, would you?—Sometimes one would rather not be consulted.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You believe in the system which obtains of Inspectors recommending the men for promotion?—I think the roll should be taken, and the men oldest in the service, unless there is some reason, should have the first right to promotion. I quite admit that a man may be a first-class constable, but not be fit to be a non-commissioned officer. The non-commissioned officers are the backbone of the Force. The men in the out-stations have in most instances to act on the moment; they cannot always get the advice of their officers. Surely they are fit for the rank of non-commissioned officers.

20. Those are the men we select from?—I have heard of a murmur throughout the Force.

21. *The Commissioner.*] It is more than a murmur: we have it in evidence?—District clerks and others get speedier promotion than other branches of the Force where the men have to do the practical work.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What are you to do with the old members of the Force who have been overlooked in the past?—I should say rectify the wrong. I saw a statement that men applied for promotion. I think that is absolutely wrong. You generally find that the man who is continually blowing his own trumpet is not the man who is going to do the work. There should be no application for promotion.

Mr. Dinnie: It is the recommendations, not the applications, that are taken notice of.

Inspector Cullen: I merely wish to say that, so far as the officers and non-commissioned officers are concerned, we had no more idea what the delegates from the constables were going to say than the Commission had. There was no non-commissioned officer present at their meeting; in fact, they would not go there. It was desired that the men should have an opportunity for free discussion amongst themselves. The Sub-Inspector tells me that some of the men present at the meeting say that the question of the Magistrate was never discussed. The senior delegate never mentioned the matter in his evidence.

The Commissioner: I think the witness who mentioned the matter ought to be brought forward again, and asked for an explanation.

JOHN THOMAS WAINHOUSE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 192.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Kingsland. I was enrolled in 1895. I was present at the meeting of constables that has been referred to.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was said at that meeting about the manner in which the local Magistrates administered justice in the Court?—It came up at the meeting about the men being kept at the Court, but no Magistrate's name was mentioned. The question was raised whether it was advisable to bring up the subject before the Commission in regard to the men getting time off, and we decided before doing that that the delegates should wait on the Inspector. I was present at the meeting from start to finish.

2. You, as a senior constable, would deprecate any reflection on the Magistrate?—Yes. I might state that at the end of the meeting it was agreed that if anything else was thought of the delegates were to be notified.

The Commissioner: We shall have the constable back again to give an explanation, because it affects the discipline of the men under Inspector Cullen's jurisdiction.

THEOPHILUS WAKE, Farmer, examined on oath. (No. 193.)

Witness: I am a farmer, residing at Hobsonville.

1. *The Commissioner.*] I think you were at one time in the Police Force: what do you wish to say?—I was in the Force from 1886 till 1892, when I resigned. We have a very excellent district constable at Hobsonville, but I think that district now deserves more than a district constable. Some time ago I had occasion to draw attention to the fact that a district constable only was stationed in another district. I made a complaint in respect to that matter. It does not work out well to have a district constable in some districts. Showing that I was right, the Department eventually granted the request for the appointment of an ordinary constable. The unsuitableness of having district constables has been also made clear to me in other districts. District Constable Roser, at Hobsonville, is in every way suitable for appointment to the regular Force as an ordinary constable, and I would be glad if the Commission would make inquiries, and see if it could not see its way to recommend his appointment. There is no ordinary constable within a considerable distance, and I feel sure the circumstances warrant the appointment of a regular constable there. I may state that Commissioner Dinnie has just informed me that the matter is receiving the consideration of the Department. I may add that there is a big gum-digging community round about that district, and the settlers are being continually worried by people going over their land with their spears and spades. I think if the district constable were elevated to the position of a regular constable that trouble would be removed. The district constable feels that he is in an anomalous position, working as he does in the potteries, and alongside men whom he may have to deal with in his official position. In my opinion, time off should be allowed the police for attendance at Court. As to police pay, and increasing it, I think it would be better to make a good man's promotion sure than give him temporary higher pay as a constable. I suggest that there should be no extra emoluments given to the police beyond their departmental pay. I think the fees and extra pay for services to other departments, &c., should go to the Department, and be devoted, say, to the Pension Fund. The present method of allowing a constable to draw extra outside pay is a haphazard way of rewarding him instead of promoting him.

2. Would you not give extra remuneration to a constable acting as Clerk of Court?—The constable does the duty in police time. In regard to mileage, would it not be better to allow more mileage, and let it go into the Police Provident Fund? I think the old idea of promoting men for length of service should go by the board. Merit should be the main consideration. I feel also that men should not be kept in the service unless they are capable; and if a man is not capable of being promoted he should not be there. Men should not apply for promotion; but if they are thought fit by the Department for promotion, they should have no option, but should accept it.

3. Do you know that a man may show great ability as a constable, and yet make a very inferior sergeant?—Possibly.

4. And, on the other hand, a man perhaps might not distinguish himself very much as a constable, but having the advantage of position, may develop into an excellent sergeant. I do not see how you are to get over the consideration of seniority?—If you promote a good man in the country to be a sergeant he has to go to the town for a time and do duty there. I may here state that some years ago a large amount of revenue was lost through evasions of the Beer Duty Act. In 1889 Mr. Jackman was appointed a detective to see that the provisions of the Act were carried out, and in three years there were forty convictions against brewers for evasion of that law, and a large amount was added to the revenue by the fines imposed. I think it is open to doubt whether we are not losing a lot of duty now through evasions of the law in this respect in connection with the illicit manufacture and sale of whisky. Under the old system, if a constable obtained information as to the existence of a still, he had to advise the Inspector, and if a conviction was obtained, and a fine of, say, £150 was imposed, the poor constable perhaps only got £5 out of it; and the constable frequently had to put his hand in his own pocket in order to get information leading to the conviction. As the Inspector had to be advised of these cases, it sometimes happened, too, that he came along with his commanding presence, and the result was, when the officers got to the place, the bird had flown. At one time it was well known that the illicit manufacture of whisky was rife in certain bush districts, and comparatively recently a still with great capacity was discovered near Wellington; and not so many years ago a whisky-mill was found within a stone's-throw of the Invercargill Police-station. There are more whisky-mills in existence than people imagined. Greater encouragement should be given to the police in connection with the carrying-out of the law under this head, and some monetary assistance should be given to them to help in working up these cases.

5. The increase of no-license will get over that?—Yes; that is one way. I think also that time off should be allowed in the case of night duty for meals, and I would like to see the Commission make a recommendation to that effect. I hold that we ought to try to elevate the service, and make men feel that it is an honour to engage in a calling that has for its object the enforcement of the laws of the country. Here I may mention that I have twice visited the Old Country, and I could not help noticing the great civility and attention given to the public by the London police. It was splendid. They seemed a happy and a contented Force, and no one seemed to look down on the police there. Here I feel that people do frequently have a bad word for the police, and the position is in many cases looked upon as being a low one. I may say that it never affected me in that way, because I had too much independence of character. But I knew a young fellow in one district—a farmer's son, and a splendid fellow—who resigned from the Force because he could not stand the treatment he received in that respect. I think something might be done to raise the tone of the Force and the respect in which it is held. I have been in this provincial district since 1900, and I have not heard anything but good said of the police administration by Inspector Cullen. He did well in sending Constable McCarthy to Kawhia. That officer did good work there. It was prohibition in name then, it is prohibition in fact now. He went to great trouble in carrying out

his duties I have known him bury himself in the sand in order to get evidence against persons who were breaking the law. A large number of convictions of sly-grog selling were secured. I may add that Constable McCarthy is not a friend of mine, but I understand he is still a constable in a lower grade. I think he is stationed at Frankton now. Single men are provided with quarters. Perhaps the Government may feel inclined to erect quarters for married men, charging them fair interest on the outlay. It was stated some time ago that the Inspector liked to have the married members of the Force fairly close to the barracks. That means the married men must pay large rents, because the police-station is in a central part of the town. An increased house-allowance had been asked for. That might be given, or plain furniture might be provided for them.

6. But the erection of houses would entail an apportionment of the rents according to the cost of the houses?—Yes, but my point is this: that these men are already paying rent to the private landlord, who is not satisfied with the interest, but wants a large profit. The Government would require only a fair rate of interest on their outlay. I consider, also, that a set of the statutes should be supplied to each station.

Mr. Dinnie: Every police-station is provided with the statutes.

Witness: Then, continuation schools might be established, where men could be trained during their service in the ranks to fit them for the higher branches. Perhaps you have noticed during this inquiry that, as a rule, the men who get into trouble are those who do something; but the man who sits down quietly and does nothing becomes popular, and perhaps gets a little assistance in time of promotion. As an old constable I would ask the officers to always look lightly on little slips constables may make, say, in wrongly interpreting the laws. I myself had to pay £10 because I arrested the wrong Chinaman on warrant. A man was fined and did not pay the fine: a warrant was issued for his arrest, and I still believe I arrested the right man, but a constable who was brought from another district to identify him refused to take the risk of doing so, and so I had to pay the fine. I noticed that the man who was anxious to obey his oath, and look after the welfare of the Department, was always in trouble. I am not referring to cases that have occurred under the present Commissioner, because it is an order of things he has battled against himself.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You mean to say that the man who gets reported a few times is not always the worst man?—I am not referring to men who are reported for faults of character, but perhaps for wrongly interpreting a by-law, or inadvertently making a false arrest.

8. Sometimes men who get into trouble turn out very good men, and it is through endeavouring to carry out their duties that they get into trouble. That is what you mean?—Yes.

9. You think there should be no emoluments at all?—No.

10. And the men should know exactly what they are to get?—Yes.

11. I take the same view as you do on that point. You think they should be treated alike in that respect?—Pay them according to their merits.

12. And all these emoluments and allowances should go to the credit of the Department?—Yes.

13. You speak as to time off to allow the men to get meals at night. I suppose you know there is a little difficulty over that, seeing the few men we have?—I realise that.

14. Do you know the system in other Forces?—No; but I have been given to understand that some arrangement is made.

Mr. Dinnie: We have provided cans for carrying tea.

The Commissioner: They do not take advantage of it.

15. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] As regards Customs gratuities and rewards, you think that the Customs Department is the one to arrange about those rewards, and that they should be nothing to do with the police?—Instead of being paid to the constable, they should be paid to the Department.

16. You do not want any reward or order of merit?—I want to be paid my regular screw as a constable, and if I deserve higher pay I ought to get it.

17. Then, you would not suggest any reward, or any gratuity, in recognition of steady conduct, or services rendered by yourself, if you were a constable?—No; only speedy promotion. Inspector Cullen referred to the way a business firm would run its business. That would be the key-note of my recommendations—to treat these matters on business lines.

18. Would it not be rather difficult to define between one case and another, and thereby create dissatisfaction?—If I had a good man I would not let him out of my sight; and if he wanted another 10s. a week I would give it to him rather than lose his services. But get rid of the “waster” at once.

19. If you could suggest a system of promotion that would prevent dissatisfaction I should be very pleased to hear it. I have tried?—There will always be jealousy in the Force in respect to promotions.

20. As regards Roser, you say he applied to be appointed?—Not recently, but I believe originally. The Inspector could give the information.

21. And he was brought before the doctor?—Yes.

22. And the doctor would not pass him?—Yes.

23. Then, we could not very well appoint him?—Perhaps you might be able to see your way to recommend that the examination should not be so stringent.

24. But there is a physical defect that has to be considered in his case?—I will write down the particular matter that had to be considered. [Statement put in.] This man is working under most stringent conditions at manual labour, and if he is good enough for that he is good enough for the police.

25. *The Commissioner.*] The statement you have put in shows an abnormal condition of a particular organ, and it is liable to be accentuated. I do not think, under the circumstances, the man should be in the service. How old was he?—About thirty-five.

Inspector Cullen: He had been in the Imperial army and some rural Police Force in England before coming out here.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You referred to McCarthy being a very good man, Mr. Wake?—As a civilian.

27. Of course, you know what his services are?—What are they?

28. He joined in 1899?—Is he still a third-class constable?

29. Oh, no; he is in a higher class now. He would have received two increments by that time?—That is so, and I believe he has a good station, and is well pleased; but a private employer would not wait twelve years to give his men pretty good positions if they deserved it.

30. No doubt his Inspector knows his qualifications, and will look after him?—I am quite sure he is in safe hands under Inspector Cullen.

JOHN FREDERICK HAMMERLY, Constable, further examined. (No. 194.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You gave evidence on oath yesterday?—Yes.

2. You got into hot water over the statements you made about the Magistrate's Court. Upon what authority did you make that statement?—Well, it was the unanimous wish of the men on the station.

3. Arrived at at a meeting?—No, not at a meeting.

4. How did you ascertain the unanimous wish of the men on the station?—By discussing it with them at different times after the meeting. Our meeting was somewhat broken up at 9 o'clock in the evening owing to a number of men going off on night duty, so that we had not gone very far into the different subjects we were discussing, and it was left open for the delegates to bring before the Commission anything brought under their notice, and this was one of the things discussed afterwards.

5. You could not have seriously expected the Commission, or anybody else, to really condemn the Magistrate's conduct in deciding cases?—No; we did not at any time discuss the Magistrate's ability in regard to determining whether the person was guilty or otherwise, but what we did discuss was the time he took over sentencing the men who pleaded guilty.

6. Then, you are practically criticizing the action of the Magistrate, and you are placing yourselves in a position that will gradually give you the right to do so. The Magistrate takes very strong exception to this, and rightly so in my opinion, and thinks it is a very grave breach of discipline on the part of the Auckland police that they should have presumed to appear in any way to go into the question of a Magistrate's administration of justice. I do not think you were within your rights, but the same blame would not be attachable to you as it would be to men of more mature experience. Your Inspector has expressed his disapproval of your action, and some of your comrades have repudiated any knowledge of it?—That may be so, sir; but I understand that a certain constable gave evidence here this morning, and says he was present at that meeting. That constable is in charge of a suburban station, and is not in practical touch with the police in the main station. As far as I am concerned, I had no personal grievance, and I am not on foot duty, and therefore the question of the time in Court does not affect me.

The Commissioner: I saw that you did not care much about the duty yourself when you were performing it, and bringing it before me: you put your representations, however, in a very proper manner; at the same time, I disapprove of the question being brought before the Commission. I regard it as an error of judgment. I would not treat it as a deliberate error of judgment, but I think it was an error on the part of the men, and I will let it rest at that.

Inspector Cullen: I think you will find, sir, that the men who discussed this matter after the meeting are all young and inexperienced men. They are in the wrong, of course. They are all of twelve months' service and under.

The Commissioner: It is a very serious matter to go into the question of the action of a Magistrate. I think it was simply an error of judgment; but I have now done with the matter. It is one of those instances that should not have occurred.

GILBERT RONALD MCKAY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 195.)

Witness: I am a police constable, and joined the Force on the 1st November, 1907. I was first stationed in Wellington, and am now at Eden Terrace.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before me?—I want to know why I was fined in Wellington for an alleged offence, and did not have an opportunity of defending myself.

2. The entry is here: do you want it read?—I do not like being advertised.

3. You are entered as having pleaded Not guilty?—I never had a chance of pleading.

4. You were fined 5s., transferred to Christchurch, and strictly cautioned as to your future conduct. Was that carried out?—Yes.

5. Were you transferred to Christchurch?—No.

6. That was altered to Auckland?—Yes, on my own application.

7. Do you say you were transferred and strictly cautioned regarding a matter you have had no chance to reply to?—I never saw anything. I was only about six months in the service, and I was not quite sure of my ground. I never was brought before the Inspector or the Commissioner to answer the charge, or to cross-examine witnesses, or reply to anything said against me.

8. Did you see the entry?—Yes.

9. Did you say anything after you saw the entry?—I mentioned the matter to Sub-Inspector O'Donovan in Wellington, and he said he did not know anything about it.

10. About what?—What I was charged with.

11. Do you mean to tell me that you did not know what you were fined for?—No. I am fined for a thing I am not guilty of.

12. What you mean is that you were fined for an offence you never had a chance of defending yourself in respect of?—Exactly.

13. That was on the 26th May, 1908. I think you had been previously carpeted for two other offences?—Yes.

14. Did you know anything about those?—That is quite genuine.

15. What was the difference between the procedure in respect to these two offences and the one we are considering?—I was brought before the Inspector.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The file will show. I have not got it here. You have evidently indorsed the fine?—I would do if it was a case of transfer.

17. Were you asked to report in respect to anything?—I was.

18. So that you knew exactly the charge against you?—I knew exactly, but I never had a chance of pleading “Not guilty” to it.

19. Did you report on the matter in detail?—Exactly.

20. And gave your version of it entirely?—Yes.

The Commissioner. Do you always have the men before you, Mr. Cullen?

Inspector Cullen. Yes, but sometimes not for merely trifling offences.

The Commissioner. This is not a trivial thing, apparently. It is rather a serious thing for a man to have on his sheet, without being given the opportunity of defending himself.

Inspector Cullen. In the case of anything serious I call the man before me, and hear everything for and against him.

21. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] I will call for the papers, and ask Inspector Ellison his version of it, and if there is anything to justify the reopening of the case I will have you brought to Wellington. Do you still say that you were never present when these witnesses were examined?—No.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When you marked this entry “Seen,” did you make any reference to the fine that had been recorded against you?—No.

23. You were satisfied?—I was not.

24. Why did you not make some reference to it?—I felt I was a wronged man, and I did not like to get into trouble over it.

25. *The Commissioner.*] What has made you bring it up now?—The opportunity afforded me by this Commission to get redress, and I have an assurance that I shall be protected if I give evidence.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You had two previous fines for misconduct?—Not for misconduct, but for being off my beat only. I stayed about five minutes talking to a night-watchman.

JAMES FERGUSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 196.)

Witness. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Auckland, having joined from the Artillery in 1895. I was promoted sergeant on the 1st September, 1908, when I was transferred to Auckland from Waimate.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware of any reason for dissatisfaction in the Police Force at present?—No, with the exception of the pay, which the men think is not sufficient on joining.

2. Have you ever spoken to capable men who thought of joining?—Yes, and have found some anxious to join, but have been deterred from what they have heard about the pay from other men. They say the labourer can get 1s. an hour outside.

3. What class of young men are you getting in Auckland?—Fairly good, intelligent men. The discipline is good. There is a lot of work to do, and it is done well.

4. Are you married?—Yes.

5. What rent do you pay?—I bought a house, but the rent of one would run up to about £1 2s. 6d. a week.

6. What is the average the sergeants pay here?—Fully £1.

7. You get an allowance of 10s. 6d.?—Yes.

8. With regard to this trouble about the Police Surgeon, is there anything in the complaint?—The men generally object to him.

9. It is not confined to a few men who want to get rid of him?—No; it is general. He attended me last month, and I was surprised at the attention he gave me. They tell me he has improved very much lately, since it was known that the men do not want him.

10. Is the gymnasium of any educational value?—A number of men use it, and take a real interest in it.

JOHN JAMES HOGAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 197.)

Witness. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Newton. I joined the Police Force from the Permanent Artillery in July, 1893. I served as watch-house keeper and assistant clerk for three years and a half at Christchurch, and was transferred to Auckland, and promoted sergeant in March, 1907.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you leave the district office at your own request?—I was promoted, and transferred to Auckland.

2. How long were you out of the uniform branch before being promoted sergeant?—About three years and a half. I am now doing sectional duty.

3. Which do you prefer?—The office, of course. It is the best job.

4. Have you ever applied to get back again?—No.

5. What sort of men do you get as recruits?—At Newton, where I am stationed, we have a good class of men at present.

6. Do you indorse what has been said about the Police Surgeon?—Yes; I have heard the constables complaining repeatedly about him. The objection is general.

7. What do you think as to the value of the gymnasium?—It is a very good institution, and has justified its existence.
8. Is there any dissatisfaction in the Force that you are aware of?—No, excepting that the men want more pay.
9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What service had you when you were promoted?—Fourteen years.
10. You took your turn by seniority?—Yes.
11. Did you find that your experience in the office and the watch-house had been of assistance to you?—Very much indeed.
12. And you think it is important for those who are promoted to the higher ranks to have had clerical tuition?—It assisted me very materially.
13. Do you know anything about this “handy” man?—No. The only reference I have seen to him is in the correspondence.
14. What correspondence?—The other day, in connection with Sergeant Sheehan’s evidence.
15. Any others?—No.

ALFRED ERNEST ROWELL, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 198.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed in Auckland City. I was transferred from the Permanent Artillery in September, 1894, and was promoted sergeant on the 1st November, 1906, and transferred to Auckland from Hampden, Otago.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How do you find the recruits who have joined recently?—From an educational standpoint, I think the men are all right; but physically, I do not think they are as good as they were fifteen years ago.

2. What do you attribute that to?—Fifteen years ago they all came from the Permanent Force, where they received a very high physical training. We then got good men for the police, but they are not so good now physically. Educationally, I think the men are perhaps better to-day than they used to be.

3. To what do you attribute the falling-off in recruiting?—To the times being good in New Zealand, and the consequent disinclination of the men in the farming districts to take on work of this kind. They do not look at the future prospects of the service, but the rate of pay on joining.

4. You think the only solution is to raise the pay?—Yes.

5. Do you know anything about the feeling of the men against the surgeon?—I do not. I am a married man, and never away from the station, but I hear the men have been dissatisfied.

6. What rent do you pay?—Up to £1 1s. a week ever since I came here, and I get 10s. 6d. allowance. And then I have to live about a mile and a quarter away from the station.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service as regards the present control?—I do not.

8. Of course, you know there always will be dissatisfaction with regard to promotions?—Yes, there will always be dissatisfaction.

9. Do you think, if the Government rented the houses and charged the men so much, it would be a wise method?—I have always considered it would be a good thing to do. That question was raised during the 1898 Commission, but the difficulty in the case of the large cities would be that the time has gone past when you could get the land.

10. But supposing they rented the houses, and charged the men a certain amount, so that they would all be on the same footing, would that be better?—It would be an excellent thing.

11. It was the system that existed in the West Riding of Yorkshire when I was in the Force—the Government rented the house and the constable paid 3s. a week: so that each man was paid a uniform amount?—Here, under present conditions, there is a good deal of luck in getting a house at all.

12. *The Commissioner.*] You say there is a difficulty in getting land. Why should it not be taken under the Public Works Act?—Yes, but not for the principal stations. There was a certain block of land mentioned in this connection in Christchurch in 1897—that large block towards the Museum. The Government could get that land and build on it.

EDWIN EALES, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 199.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Auckland, and joined the Police Force from the Permanent Artillery in 1893. I was promoted sergeant in August, 1906, and am now doing sectional duty in Auckland.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Then you are looking forward to getting charge of a sub-district?—I hope that it will come soon. The past three years have been the hardest three years’ work I have done since being in the police.

2. Are you a married man?—Yes, and pay 13s. 6d. a week for a four-roomed house, which is very old and dilapidated.

3. How far is it from the city station?—About five minutes’ walk. I only live in it because it is close, and would sooner pay £1 and get a decent house; but they are not to be got.

4. What do you think of the quality of the recruits?—You saw ninety-four men on parade, and over forty of them were under two years’ service. I think you could judge from that of the quality of the men. What fault there is lies in their not getting any drill and discipline at the start. They should have three months’ recruit drill, and the period of probation should be six months; in fact, twelve months would not be too long.

5. But men will not take the risk of that?—The Inspector should have power to appoint any man who proved suitable permanently before that time after three months. It would give a good man a chance; but the longer period would give a better chance of finding out the poor man, and also perhaps a good man. I would leave the decision to the Inspector, and the sergeant’s report.

6. Speaking generally, the quality is as good as you can expect?—I think that parade on Monday was as good as you have ever seen. There might have been one or two finer men than usual amongst them, but the general parade was very good indeed.

7. Do you find the discipline well kept up?—As good as you can expect in the case of men who have not been through a thorough course of drill.

8. Assuming it is a fact that the recruiting is falling off, what do you attribute it to?—Insufficient inducement in the shape of pay. Only a fortnight ago a man told me he would rather earn £2 8s. outside the Force for five and a half days' work a week than join the police and get £2 13s. 6d. a week for seven days' work.

9. Do you think the remedy lies in improving the pay?—The conditions and pay.

10. What conditions?—Better inducements for promotion, and the lowering of the increment period to three years, and free clothing.

11. What do you consider the weak point in the system of promotion?—I do not think there is a weak point in the present system. You must go by merit. I think the increment period should be lower, and the increase of pay should be regarded as a kind of promotion.

12. In this station there is an objection to the Police Surgeon: what is the objection?—I have been sick twice, and I have taken his physic, and am well now.

13. Does the Force generally want a change? Have they no confidence in him?—Well, they have no confidence in some of their sergeants.

14. In some sergeants?—You will find the same thing in all Forces. There is a feeling against him.

15. What would you be inclined to do if a large body of men made up their minds that they did not like a man, and preferred to go outside?—It is not a satisfactory condition of things, and should be changed.

16. About the gymnasium: what do you think of it?—I think it is a splendid thing.

17. Do you think there should be one attached to every station?—Yes, and especially to the training depot.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you would believe in three months' training in the probation class and three months on street duty under an Inspector?—Yes.

19. That would be satisfactory?—You might not find a man out in three months.

20. That means six months?—I said twelve months altogether.

21. But if a man failed at the end of twelve months' probation, and had to be dismissed, it would be rather hard?—Perhaps the man would think so himself and get out at six months if he found out he was not doing any good.

22. I think you had charge of a station when some influence was brought to bear to get you moved?—I was stationed at Porangahau, and the residents of that district got up a petition for my removal, after I had summoned a publican for permitting drunkenness on his premises. The petition was sent by the member for the district to the Minister, and an inquiry was held.

23. What was the result of it?—I think you complimented me on my action in respect to this hotel, and I was there for about eighteen months afterwards.

24. You were not moved?—Not on account of that.

25. You were rather complimented on the action you had taken?—Yes; the files will show it.

26. *The Commissioner.*] It was merely a section of the public supported by the member. Who was the member?—He is now dead.

PETER HARVEY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 200.)

Witness: I was enrolled in April, 1896, and promoted sergeant in June, 1908, and have been in Auckland ever since. I am not aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force, while its efficiency is well up to the standard. The gymnasium is a valuable adjunct here, and the men seem to take an interest in it. The young men who are sent from Wellington to the Force here are a very good class. There is no falling off in the standard.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How do you account for the lack of candidates?—The pay is against it.

2. Are you a single man?—No, married. I pay £1 5s. a week rent, but I let two rooms, and so reduce it to 15s. Before that I had to pay 18s. a week. I was not able to get a smaller house near the station.

WILLIAM RAMSAY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 201.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, in charge of the wharf station. I joined the Force in July, 1886, in Dunedin, and served five and a half years there. I was then transferred to Christchurch, and promoted for energy displayed in capturing an escaped prisoner. I was subsequently transferred to Hawke's Bay, Auckland, and then to Christchurch, being promoted sergeant in March, 1905. Was sent to Dunedin at the time of the police scandals, and afterwards to Auckland, where I have since served.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Were you put in charge of a sub-district straight away?—No, I was transferred to Newton, and did sectional duty in the city, but was afterwards sent to the wharves, where I have been for two years and three months.

2. Have you anything to say regarding the condition of the Force at present?—Things are satisfactory here, and I have no complaints to make. We have some good men here.

3. What about this difficulty in getting men?—I have seen good men who will not join the Force on the present pay while they can get 1s. 6d. an hour on the wharves as lumpers. We have some very dirty duty to perform, such as bringing up dead bodies from the harbour, and the uniform supplied gets very soiled and useless, and we cannot keep ourselves respectable. It will not last the time it is supposed to when you have to do wharf duty, especially in the winter, and

have to go out in launches to vessels. Greasy firemen sometimes get hold of you, and the clothes get very soiled.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you ever represented these facts?—No.

5. I think you should do so. You have heard and read in the Press what Mr. Taylor has said about you?—There is no foundation for the expression at all. When I was transferred and promoted I received a presentation from the Bench which will show that there was nothing against my character. One was also given to me by my comrades when I was transferred from Auckland to Christchurch.

6. You were transferred from Christchurch to Dunedin to fill the vacancy caused by the transfer of O'Donovan?—Two sergeants were transferred from Christchurch to fill that vacancy, and for no other reason.

7. For no other reason?—No Inspector can say anything against me.

8. Was any complaint made against you in Christchurch or in Dunedin?—None whatever. I was complimented there on the way I did my duty by the last Commission.

9. I suppose you know that Mr. Taylor has not come forward to substantiate his charges?—It is an old grievance which occurred between Mr. Taylor and myself which has caused the trouble.

10. *The Commissioner.*] What was it?—He wanted me to come forward to give evidence against Inspector Emerson at the time he was in Napier on a charge of drunkenness during the Commission of 1898, and I refused to do so.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your case was brought before that Commission?—They had no chance of bringing it up then.

12. But the matter was inquired into?—Yes, by Mr. Tunbridge, and there was nothing against me.

13. He found there was no foundation for it whatever, and nothing was done; but it is a matter he still hangs on to?—Simply because I would not give evidence against Inspector Emerson for being drunk the night I took him home.

14. Then, Mr. Taylor has not come forward to make me eat my words, has he? I think when in Christchurch some years ago you did some detective work?—I did.

15. And on occasions since then you have frequently had occasion to make inquiries about crimes so soon as they were reported; in fact, you have done a good deal of your own detective work about the wharves?—Yes.

16. During the course of these inquiries did you not find that you had to have your hand in your pocket almost continually?—Since I have had charge in Queen Street I have had a number of men before the Courts, and in doing so I have had to put my hand in my pocket and pay men to get the information I required.

17. I bring this forward because Sergeant Sheehan stated in his evidence that he saw no reason why a detective wanted a greater allowance than a sergeant, as he had conducted his own detective work, and it never cost him one penny?—Quite wrong; we are all the time putting our hands in our pockets getting information.

WALTER JOSEPH BASKIVILLE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 202.)

Witness. I am a sergeant of police, at Devonport, and have had thirty-one years' service. I was transferred to the police twenty-three years ago, and promoted sergeant on the 15th June, 1906. I did two years' sectional duty in Dunedin, about ten months in Auckland, and I was transferred four months ago to Devonport. I have charge of that sub-district. I have no personal grievance, and was transferred on account of my wife's health. I know of nothing calling for remark.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were at Wellington for a time doing street duty?—Yes.

2. Did you find that there was any general dissatisfaction there as regards the control?—No.

3. Did you find the discipline well carried out there?—At Mount Cook the probationers were subjected to the same discipline as other men, and the discipline was very good. I was there nine months, and it was carried out strictly. I saw where Sergeant Hodgson remarked that there was some "hooliganism" carried on there. I entirely disagree with that statement. In the first place, he did not see the work there, because during my time I only saw him twice at the station, and I had my eye on these men for nine months.

4. I think he admitted subsequently that it was hearsay, and he had not seen it himself?—Yes.

MONDAY, 30TH AUGUST, 1909.

CHARLES CARGILL KETTLE, Stipendiary Magistrate, examined on oath. (No. 203.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You are the senior Stipendiary Magistrate of the City of Auckland, a late District Judge, and you are a barrister and solicitor?—Yes. I have been a Magistrate for nearly twenty years.

2. Have you any opinions with regard to the discipline, efficiency, and organization of the Police Force?—I think the discipline of the Force is not as good as it should be. I refer more especially to the demeanour of the younger men of the Force, who have been enrolled during recent years.

3. What are they lacking in?—Well, in my opinion, they are not sufficiently up in knowledge of their duties, and their general bearing is not of that military stamp I should like to see. To-day, in coming into the Court, I noticed officers in uniform smoking pipes, and that is not quite in keeping with the dignity of their office. Many little matters of that kind require attention, in my opinion. I think there should be a proper military discipline in the Force, as, without discipline, you cannot have efficiency.

4. Have you noticed that more particularly of late years than in the past?—Up to the time Mr. Tunbridge was appointed Commissioner it was somewhat marked. After he came here there was a great improvement, and during his term he no doubt did excellent work. Since then I cannot say there has been any marked difference, but from time to time I notice matters that indicate a want of military training. I do not blame the Commissioner, because I have no doubt he has very great difficulty, under the existing conditions, in getting a sufficient number of suitable men to fill the ranks.

5. Do you think a longer period of training before enrolment would get over the difficulty?—Three months should be the minimum term of training in the barracks in Wellington; but I think there should be a Board or committee of selection in Wellington, consisting, say, of the Commissioner and two Stipendiary Magistrates, to finally select the men. Then he should be put on duty on probation for a time, to see how he gets on. After he commences street duty the Inspectors, and possibly Sub-Inspectors, should be required to give lectures to the men—say, once a fortnight, for an hour. This would be the means of assisting the weak men after they leave the barracks. As to the Auckland Force, Sub-Inspector Hendrey represents what I call the preventive branch, and he is a man of undoubted capacity. He is fit to occupy any position in the Force. Chief Detective Marsack represents the detective branch, and he is universally acknowledged to be master of his profession. The sergeants are able, sincere, and true men, who are doing their duty faithfully and fairly to the public. But there are constables who have been in the Force some years, and I have often wondered why they have not received promotion. There is Constable Donovan, who asked me some time ago if I could give evidence on his behalf. I told him I would do so with pleasure, and I wish to say now that he has been in charge of Parnell Station during my time here, and I believe him to be an absolutely straightforward, honest, and fearless constable, and one who performs his duty without fear or favour. He deserves promotion, if it can be given to him. With regard to discipline, I am a disciplinarian myself, and I think the constables should not be seen talking to groups of people in the streets, and they should not indulge in betting on the totalisator or smoke in uniform. When they attend the Magistrates and Ministers officially they should be in uniform. That remark applies to the commissioned officers. If they attend a Minister when he comes here I think their duties should warrant their being in uniform.

6. Is not that always the case?—I do not think so.

7. Do you know anything about political interference?—I have heard of it, of course, and I gave evidence before the Royal Commission in 1898, and after looking through that evidence I have no alteration to make in it. I know of no specific case of political influence, but we all know it is a matter of common notoriety that men who want favours from the powers that be have only to use their influence to get concessions. I think that state of affairs is bad and wrong, and no officer who is in the service of the country should be permitted to use influence with the Government, Ministers, members of Parliament, or any other person, to gain any advantage. Anything he has to say should be done by a written communication through his superior officers; and if he thinks he is not getting satisfaction he can always petition Parliament; but anything in the shape of political interference by a member of Parliament, or any other person, should be stamped out, and not allowed to exist in any shape or form.

8. But the difficulty is to stop it. You know that it exists?—I should put a stop to it very quickly. If I were Commissioner of Police, and political influence was attempted to be used against my office, on its being proved I should discharge the man involved from the service.

9. But he has no knowledge of the man having instigated it?—I am assuming he has a knowledge. The Commissioner of Police is supposed to be, and ought to be, and must be, a strong man, and he must have a free hand. Of course, in matters of policy the Government must rule, but in respect to administration, promotion, and transfer of one officer from one station to another, he should have an absolutely free hand, and he should be trusted. He should be a strong man, a good man, as I believe our Commissioners have always been, and he should not be in any way brought within the sphere of political influence.

10. The Hon. Mr. McGowan has told us here on oath that during the eight years he was the political head of the Police Department he knew of no instance in which political influence has ever been successful?—I know of none.

11. In the face of a statement of that sort what are you to do?—I have heard of things. One hears a great deal of these things, and one sees it in the papers, and in *Hansard*, but I know of no instance. And I should not be likely to know of one, because everything in connection with my office is done by correspondence through the head of my Department. I would like to say that I would like to see more of the Inspector of Police. I know he has a large district to look after, but I have been here now five years, and I do not think I have seen him in uniform in my Court, or even about the city. When I go to other cities I see the Inspectors there in their uniforms, and I think it has a very great effect in dealing with the public if the Inspectors occasionally put in an appearance in the Courts in uniform. He sees what is going on, and the men never know when he is going to pop in. Everybody knows the Sub-Inspector, as he conducts his cases in the Courts with ability, fairness, and impartiality at all times. It is the same in regard to the Chief Detective; but at the same time, when the Inspector looks in now and again to see what is going on, especially if there is a case being heard in which the veracity of constables is concerned, the effect is good, not only on the public, but on the whole Force. At the time of the last Commission I

drafted a Bill giving power to Magistrates to take evidence on oath in connection with complaints against constables—complaints made not only by commissioned officers and sergeants, but general complaints made by the public. The signed depositions could then be forwarded to the Commissioner, instead of the reports only from the Inspector. That Bill was introduced into Parliament, but it was dropped. With regard to the question of promotions, I do not feel competent to express a decided opinion on that matter. One can, of course, talk generally. One would expect that seniority would be the first thing to look at in cases of promotion, and, although that is so, there are other matters that require equal consideration—namely, competency and fitness. All things being equal, assuming the man is otherwise capable to perform the duties of his office, I think the senior constable and the senior non-commissioned officer should get the promotion. I think the views of Mr. H. W. Northcroft, late Stipendiary Magistrate, on that question are very sound, and I defer to his opinion on that matter. He is a man of common-sense, and has had a military training. I favour the setting-up of an Appeal Court, where officers, or constables, could have their grievances inquired into, and their evidence taken on oath before a competent and impartial tribunal. That should consist of a Magistrate, an Inspector—if he is not interested in the case—and an officer of the Permanent Force. It would be a sort of court-martial where a matter could be fairly considered and reported on, always understanding that the Commissioner is the final court of decision. I wish to offer a few remarks as to the employment of constables or other persons to induce or entrap people to commit offences. I recognise the difficulty as much as anybody of detecting slg-grog sellers, or other persons who break the law, and of getting evidence to convict them, but at the same time I have always had a decided objection to the employment of any person who is sent for the express purpose of endeavouring to procure the commission of an offence with the express object of afterwards prosecuting for such offence after and if the person has committed it. A case came before me in Wanganui some years ago in which a constable had given a Maori 10s. to buy a bottle of whisky from a storekeeper, his object being to see if the storekeeper would sell it, and the Maori went to the store. But the storekeeper smelt a rat, and the Maori could not get the whisky. He was sent back again with the suggestion that his wife was sick, and this time he got the bottle of whisky. The case came before me, and these facts came out. Then, take the liquor law: what do we find? Would it be tolerated that people could be employed to go round hotels on Sundays to see if the hotelkeepers would sell them drink with a view to prosecuting them? Or would it be tolerated to employ people to go round the shops and try to purchase goods after the shops are supposed to be closed, with a view to prosecuting the shopkeepers accordingly? In my opinion, this is wrong, and it is a matter for the Legislature to deal with. In the Gaming Act there is a proper clause saying that it can be done; but I go on this principle, “Lead us not into temptation,” and therefore it is wrong to lead other people into temptation by offering them money to commit an offence, which is a temptation. I had a case the other day connected with the St. Helier’s Bay Hotel, and I had to convict, and imposed a substantial penalty. Two constables went down with their wives and children. The men were in plain clothes, and stayed there all day long, and they went to this hotel. They got into the confidence of the people, and lunch came on, and drink was ordered and supplied. Afterwards they had afternoon-tea. I think that is unfair, and it grates on my idea of what is fair and square. We have two great branches of the Force—the preventive branch and the detective branch—and the fact that the detective has to detect surely does not make it right that we should endeavour to get people to commit an offence for the purpose of punishing them perchance they should fall. It may be their first fall, and I think it is a very dangerous practice indeed. If that sort of thing has to be done it should only be under the authority of Parliament.

11A. Do you know anything about the matter mentioned by Mr. C. H. Greenhead before me yesterday?—He was written to on the 26th April, and was advised to have an information drawn by a solicitor, or that he should lay the matter before the Commissioner of Police. I understand that the matter was brought under the notice of the Commissioner of Police, and he decided that the police could not take it up. Then he again approached the Clerk of the Court, who referred him to a solicitor. It is no part of the duty of the Clerk of the Court to draw up informations. I do not think, under the circumstances, I would have been justified in acceding to the request unless a Judge of the Supreme Court compelled me to do so by mandamus, and I doubt very much—indeed, I do not think he would do so in this case. I understand, Mr. Bishop, that you told him that all he had to do was to go down to the Court and swear an information.

12. I consider that we are bound to take the information, but the police are not bound to proceed?—But supposing a man came to me to lay an information against a Judge of the Supreme Court, or against an Inspector of Police, or somebody else, charging him with some gross crime, and I was not certain that the person seeking to lay the information was absolutely sane, I would not in such a case be bound to take the information.

13. I doubt whether we have any right to exercise personal discretion. However, that is a matter that we might honestly differ upon. I want to explain in very few words how the matter came up. Greenhead said he had laid an information against this man before you. I said if that was so it was bound to be disposed of in some way or other; but he was using the expression “information” in its popular sense, but I took it in its technical sense. I thought he had actually laid an information before you which you afterwards declined to act upon, and that you had referred him to the Inspector of Police. I explained to him that if he had a grievance against the Magistrate the proper course was to apply for a mandamus. Now you explain that no information was laid?—I do not think I have ever seen the man. He certainly never applied to me and asked me to take his information.

14. You distinctly understand that I would never think for one moment of allowing criticism before the Commission as to the manner in which you discharge your official duties?—I understand that. As to this man, I have never seen him, and know nothing about the case. I understand

that the matters referred to in his letter have been inquired into by Mr. Justice Edwards and by Mr. Brabant, Stipendiary Magistrate. I have no further information about the case, and am not in a position to express an opinion about it.

15. The gravamen of his complaint was this: that because his allegations related to a solicitor he was blocked. But there is an easy way of testing the matter if he wants to. Is there anything else you wish to say, Mr. Kettle?—I noticed in the newspapers the other day a statement that certain constables, during the course of this inquiry, alleged that they had a certain grievance with regard to the Magistrate's Court. I have not been able to make out exactly what it was. What I want to say about that is this: Before making any such statements, if they had any complaints to make, they should be made through their superior officers. It has always been my desire to help the Force in every possible way consistent with my official position. If I had known that there was any trouble at all about this matter I should have been the first to see if anything could be done to remove any grievance. But I do not know what this alleged grievance is even now. I draw the inference, however, from the statements that have appeared in the newspapers that some of the constables on night duty have to attend the Court in the morning when they ought to be in their beds. That is a matter that is unavoidable. A man may be brought before me in the morning on, say, a charge of drunkenness on, say, a Sunday night. The evidence has to be taken. Then the Sub-Inspector will say that the constable who made the arrest is in bed, and he has to be sent for. I can quite understand that the constable may regard it as a grievance to be turned out of bed to give evidence in a simple case like that, and I shall be very pleased to see if I can arrange the hearing of the cases so that the constables may have their ordinary rest. I am quite willing to meet them in that way if it is possible to do so. But I have never heard of any such complaints. I was surprised to notice that a constable whom I had never seen in the Court—a mounted constable—should have raised such a point, and should have said that there was some grievance in connection with the business of the Court.

16. I did not allow any reference to it?—What surprised me was that a constable should be allowed to make a statement of that sort. If constables have any grievances they should make them known through the Inspector, who can see the Magistrate, and ascertain if anything can be done to alleviate the trouble. The Police Regulations (Regulation No. 45) provide that police officers in charge of districts shall consult with the Magistrate in respect to matters affecting the Force. I suppose there was some intention in framing that Regulation No. 45. If the officers of the Force waited upon me, and consulted with me in respect to these things I would be very happy indeed to do what I could to help them to get over any difficulty; but I have never heard a word of murmur from anybody. I do not know what the constables complain of. Perhaps the Inspector will be able to tell us what it is. The relationships between the Sub-Inspector and myself have been of a very satisfactory character. I would like to know what the troubles referred to are.

17. I stopped the witness going any further. I do not know what the grievance is?—If any one has a grievance I would like him to put it before me.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think that if constables have any grievance they should represent it to their superior officer?—Undoubtedly; but I do not think it is the duty of Inspectors to instruct sergeants or constables to report to them on the conduct of a Magistrate. I wish to emphasize that.

19. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any motive in making that statement?—Yes; I understand it has been done. I have heard it has been done.

20. What has been done?—That sergeants and constables have been instructed to report on the conduct of a Magistrate—that complaints have been made against a certain Magistrate.

21. In the administration of his official duties?—Yes; and that they have been instructed to report on those matters. I do not say it has been done, but I have heard it has been done.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you heard whether those instructions have emanated from my office or elsewhere?—Not from your office.

23. You have had long experience as a Magistrate?—Yes, and as a District Court Judge.

24. In your capacity as a Magistrate you have met many constables, and you are able to speak of their qualifications?—Of course, there are some first-class men in the Force, and there are some indifferent men.

25. What do you think of the men in the out-stations—in charge of those stations?—At Wanganui there were some excellent men when I was there, and we worked well together. Inspector Gillies also worked well with me, and I can speak in similar terms of Inspector Dwyer, Inspector Kiely, Sub-Inspector Norwood, and others. We have always worked well together in the public interests, and there has been no difficulty whatever.

26. You say the sergeants as a whole are good men?—Yes.

27. They deserve the promotion they have got?—Yes. In regard to Sergeant Ramsay, I think he is an absolutely straight, honest, good man, and I do not think that wealth or influence or anything else would deter him from carrying out his duty.

28. You have heard what has been said in respect to Sergeant Ramsay?—Yes. I have stated my opinion of Sergeant Ramsay. He may be a little impetuous.

29. Have you heard that Mr. Taylor, in the House, said he was not fit to be in the service?—All I can say is that I disagree with Mr. Taylor. Taking the whole of his conduct and services into consideration, I say he is a very efficient officer. I speak from a long experience of Sergeant Ramsay, and I speak of a man as I find him.

30. Mr. Taylor implied that I knew something about Sergeant Ramsay of recent date?—Every man who does his duty must make some enemies sooner or later. An enemy may, behind your back, come and give you a nasty stab, and it is very likely that an enemy of Sergeant Ramsay has been behind this. I do not know what information Mr. Taylor has got.

The Commissioner: This is what Mr. Taylor said in the House: "One man was transferred to Christchurch from Auckland, and his reputation for immorality was so notoriously bad—charges that had been made against him in Auckland that brought about his transfer were of such a scandalous character—that I waited on the Commissioner of Police as he was passing through Christchurch, and challenged the man's character, and the reason for his transfer. The only justification the Commissioner urged for keeping him in the public service was that he was a capable officer. I told the Commissioner that if that man remained in Christchurch twenty-four hours I would call a meeting of citizens, and demand that the city should be relieved of his presence. That officer was removed from Christchurch within forty-eight hours."

Mr. Dinnie: I proved that the reason of the transfer was to fill a vacancy.

The Commissioner: Is that the man referred to?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes; and Mr. Taylor referred to him again at page 271 of *Hansard*.

Witness: I should say that the statement as to immorality is monstrous.

The Commissioner: At page 271 of *Hansard* Mr. Taylor says, "The police officer against whose presence in Christchurch I protested, and told the Commissioner that if he remained there I should call a meeting of citizens to protest against his remaining in the Force—it was not in connection with the matter of an offence committed in 1897, but in connection with a serious crime charged against him during the last two or three years, and the Commissioner must know, if he knows the facts, that what I say is absolutely true, and the files in his office will prove every word of my statement this evening. He removed the man within the time I specified, and, if I had not done right, would he have done that? I insisted on the city being cleared of that man's presence, and why did the Commissioner shift a sergeant from the City of Christchurch within forty-eight hours at my request unless what I said to him was well founded? If I am given access to the official files I will make the Commissioner eat his words."

Mr. Dinnie: The official files have been laid before the Minister of Justice, and I think you have them yourself.

The Commissioner: He does not refer to the sergeant by name. You are quite sure it is the same man?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

Witness: Instead of having this sort of thing brought up in the House I would say to a man like Mr. Taylor, "If you have any charge to make against this man make it." Then let the evidence be taken, and if the charge is proved, let the man be punished or dismissed. There should be a proper investigation before an impartial tribunal.

31. *Mr. Dinnie (to witness):* Have a proper charge made, and deal with the man accordingly? —Yes. No slander is so difficult to deal with as innuendo—a shrug of the shoulders. A person may imply something very nasty against a man without saying very much, but simply by innuendo.

32. You believe in military discipline?—Yes. You must have two things in your Force—absolute military discipline, and also every man should feel and believe that he can perform the duties of his office without fear of consequences to himself—that he can perform his duties honestly and according to his convictions without interference.

33. You say there was a marked improvement in the Force after my predecessor came here? —I do not wish that to be taken as any reflection on you. I have only met you once or twice, but I very frequently met Mr. Tunbridge, and often travelled with him about the country. I saw a good deal of him.

34. Do you know that he did not adopt any system whatever of military training?—I do not know.

35. There was no system of military training when he was here?—There are many things that a policeman should do and many things that he should not do—for instance, a man should not smoke in uniform.

36. There is more military discipline in the Force now than there ever has been?—That may be so.

37. There are stated periods of training: we train them before they take up actual police duty?—Yes.

38. The officers in charge of the men here have a lot to do with the men in respect to the points you mention?—I do not know who is responsible. It is hard to fix the blame on anybody. It is only evidence of a general laxity in respect to discipline.

39. You think that three months' probation would be better than two months, as at present? —Yes. A man wants to know his duties—when he can arrest a man, and how to act in connection with breaches of the law. A constable has very great power placed in his hands.

40. The men are trained in the law and in the Police Regulations before they come on duty? —The police have great powers, and they ought to exercise them with discretion.

41. You cannot turn out a model policeman straight away?—Quite so; a man must know something of his duties.

42. He must use common-sense in the exercise of his duties?—Yes, he must carry out his duties in a common-sense way.

43. You suggest the appointment of a Board for the selection of constables?—Yes, two Magistrates, with the Commissioner. A great deal depends on the physique, appearance, personality, and temperament of the men.

44. Would not the Inspectors be able to judge on those points?—Yes; the Board should have the assistance of the Inspectors.

45. The probationers are put through a course of training, and they are seen by the Commissioner?—I do not wish to argue the matter. I have every confidence in the Commissioner. It is my opinion that it would be an assistance to the Commissioner to have two Magistrates associated with him in this work.

46. You mentioned lectures to the men: do you know that they have to attend a weekly class for twelve months after they take up street duty in the city?—No, I was not aware of that.

47. I made a regulation that the men should attend a weekly class for twelve months after being put on street duty?—I am glad to hear that.

48. And they have to pass an examination in law and on police duty?—I am very glad to hear that. It is a capital idea.

49. You have mentioned Constable Donovan's name: if he had been promoted, that should have been done a long time before I came here?—I am not casting any blame on you. I consider Donovan is a good man, and one who is prepared to do his duty straightforwardly.

50. You have spoken of gossiping and smoking men: do you know that men are repeatedly reported and punished for such things?—I did not know that, but I think it should be at once attended to.

51. You say that we all know that influence is used?—I have no doubt that the influence of members of Parliament, of representatives of the liquor party, and all kinds of influences may be exerted.

52. I think it has been proved beyond doubt that they do seek influence continually, but the question is how far that influence has affected the Police Force?—I cannot say.

53. Can you say whether it obtains or not?—I cannot say how these influences affect the Inspectors, Commissioner, or Ministers. I know they would not affect me.

54. You say the Commissioner should have a free hand?—Yes, except on questions of policy. In dealing with the men he should be wholly responsible. The Act provides for that.

55. You believe in taking evidence on oath in all cases where constables are reported?—Yes; so that witnesses may be liable to a charge of perjury if they wilfully give false evidence.

56. You say that promotion should be by seniority first?—Yes, all other things being equal.

57. Do you know that that is the system that is adopted at the present time?—I do not know.

58. In reference to the bearing of the men and the discipline, do you know that we have a monthly drill?—It is a good thing that a man should have a military bearing, and carry himself well. It impresses the public when a man walks down the street in the way one sees our Sub-Inspector do here—you are impressed with his carriage and personality.

59. With regard to sly-grog selling, you know that special cases require special treatment?—Yes.

The Commissioner: I understood Mr. Kettle to be speaking of the principle. If he is going to differentiate between sly-grog cases and other cases, I do not agree with him for a moment.

60. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If we do not resort to subterfuge, I do not think we will get many successful cases?—I do not know. I think sly-grog selling and other offences can be detected without the police inducing persons to commit the offence.

61. You have had no experience in that direction?—Yes; I have seen smart men who knew how to do it. I may mention that under the Police Act the members of the Force swear that they will do everything they can to prevent crime, or the committing of crime. It is an unfair thing to ask a constable to go and entrap a person to commit an offence with the view of afterwards prosecuting him for that particular offence. But if the Legislature likes to amend the law, and say that a constable may go and procure the sale of liquor illegally, I bow my head; but I do not agree with it. I take my stand on the principle I have stated, "Lead me not into temptation." I say that no man should be led into temptation.

62. *The Commissioner.*] I would rather, Mr. Dinnie, that you passed that question over, because it is more a question of ethics, and Mr. Kettle looks at the matter from his own point of view.

Witness: I do not think it is a fair thing to put constables to do that sort of work.

63. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] As regards the Police Force in Auckland, as a body, do they carry out their duties efficiently?—Yes, honestly and efficiently. There are here and there things that require to be remedied, but there are some very good men in the Force here. Speaking from my experience on the Bench here, I can say that Sub-Inspector Hendrey and Chief Detective Marsack are very able and fair men—they do not push charges against offenders to the fullest possible extent.

64. *Inspector Cullen.*] You say that police inquiries should be made on oath?—Yes, all inquiries of importance.

65. I ask you to look at section 51 of the Evidence Act, and the interpretation of persons acting in a judicial way—whether that does not give the Inspectors power to take evidence on oath?—I refer you to the Attorney-General on that point. I think that is a matter in regard to which you ought to get the advice of the Crown Law Officers.

The Commissioner: I am going to deal with it.

Inspector Cullen: It is the view I hold. I think there is some authority for any one acting judicially, and the Inspector could act.

The Commissioner: The only question is whether it is a judicial act.

66. *Inspector Cullen* (to witness).] You complained that I do not go more into the Court in uniform?—Either in uniform or not. I am sorry I do not see you there.

67. What could I do if I went there?—In other centres I see Inspectors there.

68. How often have you been in other large centres in the last five years?—Two or three times in Christchurch, and in Wellington a great many times. I may mention that at New Plymouth Inspector Pardy used to be there every day. It has a wholesome and good effect.

69. Inspector Pardy had very few men under him at New Plymouth. You know that my duties here are more office and administrative work?—I do not know.

70. Do you not think that a man in charge of a large district—that his duties are largely office and administrative work?—I understand that you are a good deal out of town.

71. Have you ever sent for me and asked me to attend?—Yes, quite recently. I do not say that you ever refused to come down to see me.

72. Have you ever asked me to come down to see you that I have not come down?—No; but I say that under the regulations it is your duty to communicate with the Magistrate.

73. In regard to what could I communicate with you?—I do not know. I do not wish to discuss the matter.

74. You are making an allegation?—No. Since I have been in Auckland—five years—I have never seen you in my Court in uniform, nor have I seen you in uniform in Queen Street. I believe that you do attend the opening of the criminal sessions of the Supreme Court in uniform. I think the appearance of an Inspector of Police in uniform in the streets at times has a good effect.

75. Is there any important public function in Auckland where it is my duty to attend that I do not attend in uniform?—I saw you once in uniform on Dominion Day, and once or twice at the racecourse.

76. You know that I go to the races in uniform?—I very rarely go there.

77. Do you know that I attend the Supreme Court in uniform?—I have stated that I understand you attend the opening of the criminal sessions.

78. Do you know that if there is any big meeting in Auckland I attend frequently in uniform?—I cannot say. I say that it has a good effect if the Inspector of Police is seen occasionally in uniform. Inspector Gillies, of Christchurch, and Inspector Ellison, of Wellington, frequently appear in uniform.

79. Would it surprise you to learn that the Inspectors in the four large centres do not appear in uniform unless there is some necessity for it?—I do not know. I have seen you attend the Hon. Mr. McGowan, and you were not in uniform. I say that you ought to be in uniform.

80. But supposing he did not wish me to go to him in uniform?—I do not know about that. Of course, that would be different.

81. If you were not sure, you should not have said so?—I say it is a good thing for the Inspector of Police to be about the Courts and streets in uniform.

82. I do not go to the Minister unless he sends for me?—That may be so.

83. I tell you I do not, because I think his time is sufficiently occupied; and when I am sent for I attend in uniform. Does not that satisfy you? You stated that you had heard that the Police Inspector had called for reports in reference to the Court and the Magistrate?—Yes.

84. Did you believe that?—I thought it was quite possible.

85. Why?—I do not know whether I should answer that.

86. *The Commissioner.*] It is rather a serious allegation against the Inspector—an allegation made through somebody else to you?—If the Inspector says in his evidence that it is untrue, that may make a difference.

The Commissioner: I regard it as a very serious reflection on the Inspector of Police.

87. *Inspector Cullen* (to witness).] What grounds have you for making such a reflection?—I have been told so.

88. And you believe it?—I thought that it was quite likely.

89. Did you think I had taken leave of my senses?—I do not know.

90. You know there are a number of busy-bodies, mischief-makers, who say things?—Yes.

91. And supposing some mischief-maker, some busy-body, were to say that a Magistrate wrote paragraphs for the Press, or that he wrote an article criticizing the promotions of Clerks of Courts, is it not likely there is as little ground for the one as for the other?—There might be.

92. So that, you see, you cannot take every little rumour one hears for gospel?—That is so.

93. Will you take my assurance that I have never done any such thing?—It is not for me to say. If you give your evidence on oath I must accept it.

94. I will say so on oath when I am giving my evidence; and I think, as a gentleman, you should accept my assurance that I intend to give that evidence?—I am not making any allegation against you.

95. It is a serious one?—I am here to give my evidence. If you give evidence on oath that you have done no such thing, it is for me to be satisfied.

96. Supposing I were to say that a certain Magistrate went behind my back to a certain Minister of the Crown, and made certain statements—that I was not doing my duty?—I have never done so.

97. You have not?—No.

98. If a certain Minister told me something to that effect, in the presence of Mr. Dinnie and his Private Secretary?—It is not true. I have never gone to any Minister about such a thing.

99. If the Minister told me that on the railway-station at Auckland?—It is not so. I think on one occasion I did say to Commissioner Dinnie in the street that I would like to see more of you in the Court.

100. But this is not Commissioner Dinnie?—I am not a man of that sort.

101. I have said that there are no grounds for that statement. Is it not just as likely that there is as little ground for the other thing?—Yes; I think it might have occurred.

102. In this St. Helier's Bay case, you have omitted to quote *Smith v. Donovan*, a decision given on the point recently by Mr. Justice Cooper?—I know the case quite well; but that does not dispose of my objection.

103. With reference to these young men, how long have you been in the profession altogether?—I was admitted in 1873.

104. Before that you would be articled?—Yes, for five years.

105. I suppose that during those five years there were little shortcomings on your part as an articled clerk as there must be in all professions?—Yes, I suppose so.

106. And when you were admitted I have no doubt that you were not as proficient in the law as you are now?—Certainly not.

107. And when you were practising your profession there were clients who thought that perhaps you might have done better?—Certainly.

108. And now you are on the Bench probably there are suitors who disagree with your decisions occasionally?—Certainly.

109. That being so, in the case of a man of such long standing at the Bar, is it not reasonable to think that some allowance should be made for those young constables who are not as highly educated as yourself?—Certainly. I make every allowance for their shortcomings.

110. You know it takes a lifetime to make a policeman, just as it takes a lifetime to make a lawyer?—No doubt. I do not expect the young men to become Sub-Inspectors and solicitors in six months. Some of them are very smart indeed. It was a treat to hear one constable give evidence before me the other day, and I complimented him.

111. You say there should be lectures to men in the service: would you be surprised to know that I was the first officer to start those lectures in New Zealand?—I am very glad to hear it, and I give you great credit for it.

112. In the St. Helier's Bay case, did not the parties plead guilty?—Certainly.

113. And there was no evidence taken for the defence at all?—I think Mr. Baume appeared in that case, and I think he brought all the evidence before me.

114. But they gave no evidence themselves?—I think they did.

The Commissioner: I do not think it is necessary to go into these cases.

Inspector Cullen: The witness is referring to our action.

The Commissioner: Oh, no; he is dealing merely with the principle, not with your application of it.

115. *Inspector Cullen*.] That is all right. (To witness): You do not believe in the principle?—It is the system I am against. I expressed the same view before the Royal Commission in 1898. I do not think it is a fair thing to ask constables to do it.

116. *Mr. Dinnie*.] You think it is a fair thing, supposing a constable sees a drunken man going into a hotel, that he should stop that man, or allow him to go in?—Stop him.

117. Not let him go and get a drink and then charge him?—The constable ought to warn the publican not to serve him, and so try and prevent offences being committed.

118. *The Commissioner*.] I have a letter from a man wishing to give evidence, and one of the items is, "Mr. Kettle's, S.M., directions flouted and set at nought, especially by the detective branch of the Force": do you know anything about that?—Not a bit. The business of the Court is conducted in the most satisfactory manner, and if I make a suggestion to which the detectives or Sub-Inspector think they can see their way to carry out they always meet me.

119. Thank you?—I would like, before I leave, the Inspector to say what it is these young constables object to in the Courts.

Inspector Cullen: I was as ignorant of that matter being brought forward as Mr. Kettle himself was. The constables held a meeting as to the grievances they might wish to put forward, and those grievances might have been directed against myself personally. No non-commissioned officer was present with them when they were discussing matters for the instruction of their delegates. It was never thought that any reference would be made to, or reflection cast on, a Magistrate, and had I known such a thing would be done I would not have allowed it.

Witness: What was their grievance?

Inspector Cullen: I do not know. His Worship knows as much about it as any one.

The Commissioner: This constable was speaking as a delegate on behalf of his comrades, and I pulled him up at once when he commented on the length of time that was occupied in the Magistrate's Court in hearing small cases. I said I was not here to consider the official conduct of any Magistrate. But during the hearing of evidence the question has often been raised as to allowing constables who have been on night duty, and have to appear at Court next day in connection with their cases, time off. It has nothing to do with the Magistrates, but is a matter of police administration.

Witness: I do not understand the constable's reference. If he means that I take more time over these unfortunate people who appear before me, I admit that I do take an interest in them, and perhaps a little more time than most Magistrates in seeing what I can do for them. I admit that; but I also say that I get through more work in my Court than any other Magistrate in New Zealand.

The Commissioner: Or in the same time.

Witness: I say so, sir, undoubtedly. I refer to criminal cases, and in those cases there is more work in Auckland than anywhere else. I take a special interest, I admit, in the faults, failings, and misfortunes of people, and I endeavour to help them in every possible way. If the complaint is made that constables are brought out of bed to give evidence against people arrested for drunkenness, I have every sympathy with them, and shall endeavour to meet them in every way possible; but it must sometimes happen that the cases cannot be quickly disposed of.

The Commissioner: It was not intended to cast any reflection on the administration of justice.

Witness: I understand that Mr. Northcroft stated in his evidence that the Inspector had stated to him that it would be better, in the interests of all concerned, if I did not give evidence. I cannot understand what that means. If the Inspector did not say so, there is an end to the matter, and I have been misinformed.

The Commissioner: Did you have any conversation with Mr. Northcroft, Inspector Cullen?

Inspector Cullen: I did. We often have conversations by telephone, and we meet occasionally—sometimes in the train, and sometimes at the railway-stations.

The Commissioner: But Mr. Northcroft never mentioned it here.

Inspector Cullen: What took place was this: we were discussing the Police Commission, as to who was likely to come forward, and Mr. Kettle's name, amongst other things, was mentioned. I said that I trusted "he will not be coming up, and will not say one word one way or another."

Mr. Kettle: Why?

Inspector Cullen: I do not think it tends to amiability in life in the least.

Mr. Kettle: I am quite satisfied.

120. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Is there anything you wish to mention further?—We send warrants of commitment from the office here to the police for execution, and we have had a good deal of trouble about getting reports from the constables as to the execution of those warrants. Recently the Justice Department assented to a memorandum being indorsed on the warrant limiting the time within which these warrants shall be returned. A typical case is that of Taylor against Wood. The warrant was sent out for execution of Wood on the 17th June, and there has been no return to it yet, and no report on the matter.

The Commissioner: This is not a police matter at all, but a Bailiff's matter. You would immediately inquire into it, I presume, Mr. Cullen, if referred to you?

Inspector Cullen: If the Magistrate referred the matter to me I should have inquired, but this is the first I have heard about it. These warrants go from the Court to the constable direct.

Witness: When these warrants are sent out we want to know within a reasonable time why they have not been executed. I think the constables should report once a month in these cases what action is being taken on the warrants. I refer to warrants of commitment more particularly, which go through the police.

FREDERICK WILLIAM SHORTLAND, Barrister and Solicitor, examined on oath. (No. 204.)

Witness: I am a barrister and solicitor, practising at Taumarunui, and about three years ago I was practising at Taihape. Constable Baker was Clerk of the Court, Bailiff, and officer in charge of police there, and in conducting Police Court cases I had serious differences with him. He seemed to regard it as a personal insult to be opposed in any way. When prosecuting it was his custom to put leading questions, and I told him his procedure was most unfair, and although I complained to the Magistrate I could get no assistance. Generally his conduct was calculated to humiliate me in the eyes of the public, and to do me harm in my profession. In cross-examination he told at times so many falsehoods that I reminded him of the story of George Washington. Eventually I reported the constable to Inspector Kiely, who came up and investigated the matter, and I received a communication from the Commissioner of Police stating that the constable would be cautioned. Not being satisfied, I then asked for a public inquiry, which was granted, Mr. Kettle being sent up to hold it. I might here say that whenever Mr. Thomson conducted the Court the constable behaved himself, as that Magistrate would not allow any nonsense to go on. I heard that Mr. Kettle was coming up, and one afternoon Mr. Thomson came to my house, and, after expressing regret at the conduct of the constable, said that Mr. Kettle was coming up, and had expressed a wish to meet me at the hotel at night. I went accordingly, and Mr. Kettle told me that the Minister of Justice had asked him to try and settle the differences between the constable and myself. I said, "I must have a thorough inquiry," and he said, "You cannot get a thorough inquiry, and it would be much wiser to let me settle this matter." I said, "I should be very glad to fall in with your views, but from my previous experience of the constable, there is only one way in which it can be settled properly." He then left the room, and brought in some papers, and pointed out several things in them against me. I explained the actual fact, but seemed to make no impression on him, and he urged me not to press the matter, and went so far as to say that if I got the constable's jacket taken off I would be a marked man with the police. He asked me to suggest the names of men suitable for appointment as Justices of the Peace, so that the work would not be left, as was usually the case, to two local men in particular. I suggested three or four men, and then he promised to deal with the constable in such a way that he would not trouble me any more. At last I agreed to his suggestion that he should be allowed to settle the matter, and the constable was called in, and after the interview Mr. Kettle said, "Now, Mr. Shortland, the matter is all settled; there will be no further trouble. Do you not think, as an act of grace, you can write a few lines to the Minister of Justice that will put the constable right?" I agreed to do so, and eventually the letter was sent in signed by myself.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is this the letter: "Taihape, 19th October, 1905.—To the Hon. Minister of Justice, Wellington.—SIR,—I have much pleasure in informing you that the differences between myself and Constable Baker have been settled this evening to our mutual satisfaction. Judge Kettle arrived this evening, and after an interview between the Judge, Constable Baker, and myself, I do not think it necessary that the inquiry fixed for to-morrow need be held. I have now much pleasure in withdrawing all the complaints which I have made against the constable, as I am now convinced that any little friction that may have taken place between us in Court was not intended by the constable to be in the way of insult or annoyance to me, but only the result of laudable eagerness on his part to do justice to his cases, and put the facts fairly before the Bench. Ever since I have been here—nearly five months—I have always recognised that Constable Baker has at all times honestly endeavoured to perform his duties both in and out of Court in a fearless and straightforward manner, and I believe him to be an active and zealous officer. I hope that in the future we will be able, when we meet in Court, to conduct the business in hand without friction or unpleasantness. I will hand this communication to Judge Kettle, to be forwarded by him to you, and have asked him not to proceed with the inquiry to-morrow.—I have, &c., FRED. W. SHORTLAND." You signed that letter?—Yes, but it was composed by Mr. Kettle. I accept the responsibility for it, however.

2. What happened?—The letter had evidently been arranged between Mr. Kettle and the constable, because the latter said he would not shake hands with me until it was signed.

3. But you do not suggest that Mr. Kettle and the constable conspired to injure you?—I suggest that Mr. Kettle had read all the papers, that he heard only the one side, and that his mind was made up against me when he came up to hold the inquiry.

4. I cannot account for your signing that letter, in the face of what you are saying now?—I was overpersuaded by Mr. Kettle, believing he was a fair-minded judge.

5. But he would not persuade you to do a wrong thing?—I say Mr. Kettle came up there with a strong bias against me.

6. Do you wish me to understand that you signed that letter without a due appreciation of what it contained?—I admit that I was not honest in signing that letter; I was overpersuaded by one I thought was a very experienced man like Mr. Kettle to sign that letter.

7. Which you now say was not true?—It is not true to a certain extent. I was in doubt, but I listened to Mr. Kettle, and allowed myself to be overruled. Before I left Mr. Kettle I made it clear to him that he was to protect me with the Minister of Justice, and he assured me that he would do so. He also stated that he had a good report of me from Mr. Thomson, S.M., and naturally I thought my honour was safe in his hands. Before Mr. Kettle left I handed him a letter. He said, "I think the constable should have a copy of that letter." I raised no objection, and I believe that before he came away he gave the constable a copy of that letter. I have every reason to think that the constable showed that letter round about the town. The consequence was that a ferment set in, and there was an agitation that the matter should be made public. The next morning I went to the train as an act of courtesy, and wished him good-by, and put into his hands a packet containing my testimonials, one being from Mr. Burgess, S.M. I wrote to Mr. Burgess, and asked him to certify as to what my relations were with the Bench and Bar, and he gave me some friendly advice, and added his opinion in respect to myself.

8. But your character is not in question. I have nothing to do with your character. I should not have gone into your case at all if it had not been that you accused the Commissioner of Police of acting in a very treacherous manner?—I considered it so.

9. But you are now referring to your own personal credentials. You are not on your trial. All I have to do is to inquire into the efficiency, organization, and discipline of the Force. If incidentally I was satisfied by you or anybody else that the Commissioner of Police had behaved in a treacherous manner to one of the public, it might form a question whether I should not consider that matter; but that is only incidental to your grievance?—As a result of our conversation at the train, an agreement was arrived at as to what should appear in the Press, and a short paragraph appeared in the newspaper in reference to the matter; but a day or two after that another article appeared in the paper in reference to the question. [Witness read correspondence relating to the case.]

10. That is a matter that I am not concerned in. I want you to be perfectly clear that I have nothing to do with that special matter at all?—I think, as a matter of fairness to me, the Commissioner of Police should have given me notice in regard to the publication of the correspondence. I brought the matter under the notice of the Minister of Justice; and I subsequently went to see the Minister, the late Colonel Pitt, who knew all about this matter.

11. Is this the first time you have dealt with the matter since then?—I have never disturbed the matter since I went to see the late Attorney-General. I wrote to Mr. Kettle in November of last year.

12. Then, the matter has practically been dormant for two years?—I wrote to Mr. Kettle in November last year. I went to live at Taumarunui, and have been there upwards of two years. I think that an injustice has been done to me in this matter.

13. What remedy can you possibly obtain now?—I think that if the matter is looked into properly the true position will be seen, and the position I have taken up throughout will be vindicated. A sort of slur has been cast upon me, and that should be removed. The Commissioner has it in his power to inquire whether my story is true or not.

The Commissioner: The trouble to my mind is this: There is a letter signed by yourself, in which you give an explanation of the circumstances under which the letter was written. Mr. Kettle gives a different version. That being so, it is simply a question between you and Mr. Kettle as to the circumstances under which the letter was written. I do not express any opinion upon these matters.

EDWARD WILLIAM SHARMAN, Police Surgeon, examined on oath. (No. 205.)

Witness: My name is Edward William Sharman. I am a duly qualified medical practitioner, and hold the appointment of Police Surgeon at Auckland.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before the Commission?—I made a statement to you the other day, and you asked me to substantiate it.

2. I advised you personally not to come forward. I am afraid you are under some serious misapprehension. If you remember, you referred to the advisability of your coming forward. You referred to statements which had been made to you by some prominent politician with regard to an effort being made by somebody to get you out of your appointment. You then said that you intended to see this gentleman—I have not the slightest idea who it was—and that you would decide by 3 o'clock whether you would give evidence or not. How you can possibly say that I wished to hear you I cannot understand?—You asked me if I could substantiate that statement, and I concluded that you wished me to substantiate it.

3. I did not care a rush whether you did or not?—I may say that subsequent to the inquiry that was held by Mr. Brabant—just immediately afterwards—a politician was approached with the idea of getting me removed.

4. Who is the politician?—Mr. Poole.

5. The member for Auckland West?—Yes. Unless you wish it, I do not wish to mention the doctor's name.

6. That a certain doctor did what?—Approached Mr. Poole with the idea of getting me relieved of my position.

7. And Mr. Poole told you this?—No; it was told me by somebody else. I interviewed Mr. Poole, and he said that was the case, and he is coming to substantiate it.

8. I see that Mr. Poole, who is present, is shaking his head, and I do not think he is going to substantiate it. You are giving secondary evidence of a conversation Mr. Poole had with somebody else?—I understood Mr. Poole to say that my conception of the matter was right.

9. With regard to this appointment, are you clinging to your office?—One does not like to be dismissed.

10. But that is scarcely an answer. If it became a question that you lost the confidence of the men?—I do not admit that.

11. You know I have been seeking for information as to whether the apparent antagonism towards you in the barracks was the result of a general feeling on the part of the men, or whether it was the result of isolated cases, or differences of opinion; and you know that so far as I am assured the feeling is almost unanimously against you; I do not say it is, but so I am informed?—Do you wish me to go through the whole gamut of asking all the men?

12. No; I ask you if you are clinging to office in face of that. If you tell me you have no reason to believe that there is a feeling in the barracks to justify that, that is an answer to the question?—I am sure that I have not lost the confidence of the men.

13. What is the average number of men per day that you have been attending?—It varies.

14. Are you in general practice in Auckland?—Yes.

15. How long have you been here?—Fifteen years.

16. How long have you held this appointment?—For ten years.

17. When did this feeling against you—if there is a feeling, and I suppose there is—begin to become apparent?—I have never heard of it until a year ago.

18. But the Minister would never have set up a departmental inquiry unless he had felt that there was a pretty strong feeling?—I asked for the inquiry.

19. How did you come to ask for the inquiry?—I received a pile of correspondence from the Government for my information, and asking me if I had anything to say in the matter. I replied, and asked for an inquiry, and it was granted.

20. From whom did the objections come?—From members of the Force. They were brought under Mr. Dinnie's notice. There were six cases.

21. Do you wish me to believe that these objections against you—which I am bound to say from the evidence appear to be general—were engineered by some medical man in Auckland?—I would not make that statement.

22. Who do you think is at the bottom of it?—I do not know. I would like to know.

23. Then, what is the connection between this conversation about which you want Mr. Poole to give evidence and your present position?—It appealed to me in this way: there were certain threats being made to supplant me in my position.

24. But if this conversation with Mr. Poole had not been with a medical man you would not attach any importance to it?—I do not say that.

25. The inference is clear, surely. Will you write down the name of the man you say approached Mr. Poole? [Witness wrote down a name and handed the paper to the Commissioner.]

26. Is he a medical man in practice here?—Yes.

27. Is he a friend of yours?—Yes, professionally. It is a case of "Save me from my friends."

28. Still, you have no grounds for believing that this is the result of any effort on the part of a medical man to take your place?—I want to get at the bottom of it.

29. How are you to get at the bottom of it?—I do not know. I have never given any cause for dissatisfaction.

30. I have no intention of going into the question of your qualifications. It is enough for me that you are qualified and on the register. But I do not think that answers my question. The fact that you, in your opinion, have never given cause for this extraordinary attitude taken up by the men does not answer the question as to the origin of it. You must have in your mind some idea of the origin?—One does not like to state an opinion unless one has absolute proof of it.

31. Either it must be the result of an endeavour on the part of a fellow-practitioner who wishes to jump into your shoes and draw the £100 a year, or else it must be the result of a sort of cabal amongst a certain section of the Police Force to get rid of you in favour of somebody else?—Yes, either one of those two things.

32. You leave me absolutely in the dark, you see. If you were satisfied that there was a widespread feeling against you, what attitude would you take up in the matter?—I would resign at once.

33. Then, how would you expect to get evidence sufficiently satisfactory to enable you to arrive at that decision?—The only way I can see out of it is to call every man in the barracks. I may say that I asked a constable whom I meet in the street every day if there was dissatisfaction, and he said there was no dissatisfaction.

34. I have asked at least ten men. I also asked several sergeants—one or two of them are known personally to myself—whether they were aware of this feeling, and they said it was a general feeling amongst the men?—I have attended for the last six years and nine months practically every sergeant; and if you ask them I think they will say they are perfectly satisfied with my attention.

35. I asked them whether they were aware of any general dissatisfaction with you. Several sergeants told me that personally they had nothing to find fault with you, but they were aware of this general feeling of dissatisfaction amongst the men?—I make this statement: that a sergeant whom I have attended during the past six months has informed me that he is quite satisfied.

36. If the men were having forced upon them a medical man who for some reason or other has lost their confidence, then I should consider seriously the effect on the discipline and efficiency of the Force owing to that. That is the only connection the matter has with me at all?—I would like to get at the bottom of it.

37. So would I. Sergeant Sheehan assured me that he is aware of the dissatisfaction; and also that he is aware that men rather than go to you pay fees to other medical men. That may be true or false, but coming from him I believe it to be true?—I never attended him. I may state that I have attended 25 per cent. of those men up there, and nearly all of them are perfectly satisfied. I went into the barracks the other day to look for a sick constable whom I recommended for sick leave, and I met a constable who actually did not know me. That shows the number of new men there are.

38. It is the men who have no ground themselves for complaining of you whose word is more likely to be valuable as to the extent of the dissatisfaction outside themselves. I do not say it is conclusive. I am sorry the matter has been raised?—I make this statement, and Mr. Dinnie will tell you so, that according to my appointment every member of the Force who is not satisfied with me has the right to call in outside assistance.

39. Is that under the contract?

Mr. Dinnie: They have all the right to call in other men, but they have to pay for it.

40. *The Commissioner.*] Who is the constable who is going to send for an outside man, and run up a doctor's bill, and pay it out of his salary? If there is any one you wish to call, Dr. Sharman, I shall be very pleased to hear the evidence. I am not here to try your qualifications; but the question arises whether your relations with the men are such as to affect the efficiency of the Force?—Yes; I would like to call Sergeant Eales, who is now present.

EDWIN EALES, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 206.)

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] I have attended you, sergeant?—Yes.

2. Have you every confidence in me?—Yes.

3. Do you know of any cause of dissatisfaction with me?—Personally, no.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know that dissatisfaction exists?—I know of cases where men have applied for another doctor.

There you have the whole thing: that he personally knows men in the barracks who would rather have other medical men than you. It is an unfortunate position.

Dr. Sharman: It has been said that the matter was discussed at the meeting of constables. I am informed that my name was never mentioned at the meeting.

PATRICK JOHN DUNNE, Constable, further examined. (No. 207.)

Witness: I was present at the meeting of constables.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Was Dr. Sharman's name mentioned?—I believe it was mentioned.

2. In what connection?—Some of the men were dissatisfied with him.

Dr. Sharman: I have been told by two of the constables who were present that my name was not mentioned.

The Commissioner: I will call for the papers, and will look into the whole matter. As to what attitude I will take up I am not prepared to say; but you may depend upon it that I will make no representations that are not warranted by the evidence and the facts.

EDWARD WILLIAM SHARMAN, Police Surgeon, further examined. (No. 208.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] The question of the physique of the Force has cropped up. Men have been robust when they came here, but after doing duty for a while they have gone to almost a shadow. One man, Sergeant Rowell, alleged that he lost 2 stone in four months, and I quite believe it. What was that due to?—Night duty. They complain that they do not get more than an average of four hours' sleep when on night duty.

The Commissioner: What are the hours, Inspector Cullen?

Inspector Cullen: They come off duty at a quarter to 5 in the morning—it may be a little later—and they do not go on again until a quarter to 9 at night. Sometimes they have to go to Court, but, as a rule, not as often as the constables.

The Commissioner: There must be something wrong with that sergeant, and he should get something else to do.

2. *The Commissioner (to witness).*] Is there any other suggestion?—I think the men should have a lighter tweed for uniforms in this climate. They wear the same quality all the year round.

3. You think that in summer time the present clothes are rather taxing?—I think so. In the London Metropolitan Police they have summer clothing.

4. Is there any real necessity for a change?—I think so.

5. But if a man drops off some of his underclothing in summer and puts on a little more in winter, what does it matter what material the uniform is made of?—Personally, I wear the same quality of underclothing all the year round, and I should recommend the men to do that.

CHARLES HENRY POOLE, Member of Parliament, examined on oath. (No. 209.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You might deal with the matter Dr. Sharman has brought up, Mr. Poole, first. Please give us your version of it?—At the outset I might say that the appeal to political influence is becoming a commonplace in this country, and up to date, and from week to week members are approached on various matters relating to the Departments. Sometimes they are approached by people who have grievances that ought to be redressed, while others are looking for a number of political favours. This statement will help to show the position a member is placed in when, from time to time, he is approached for favours in connection with certain matters as to which the “pull” lasts for the moment only, and passes from him; therefore, on those matters that are so brought up from time to time there may be just a haziness perhaps as to what transpires. Last year the police inquiry was held here, and the members of the Force were interested particularly in the finding at that inquiry, and there was a little dissatisfaction and restlessness because the report was not forthcoming. I believe the publication of a report is in the interests of the public good, and, as a member representing a city constituency—Auckland West—I deemed it my duty to ask a question in the House as to that report. But for some reason or another the report has not been forthcoming, and to this day I am ignorant of its contents, and, in view of what transpired on that occasion, possibly the suppression of that report created in the minds of the people—in Auckland, at least—the impression that it was prejudicial to the medical officer's standing, and that possibly there would be a change in the office. Returning from Auckland to Wellington after the fleet week celebrations, I was standing on the railway-platform when a medical gentleman approached me, and said, “Mr. Poole, I would like you to take an interest in a certain doctor of this town who is well fitted to occupy the position of medical officer to the Police Force.” I am at variance with Dr. Sharman on this point: that medical practitioner, being anxious to secure the position for his fellow-medico, sought my influence, but he said absolutely nothing about turning Dr. Sharman out bag and baggage, and that is the point I take exception to.

2. The gravamen of Dr. Sharman's evidence lay in that?—I want it to be thoroughly understood that the feeling was abroad that the position would be vacant. I do not know where it originated, and, as a member of the Legislature, I do not know to this day what the contents of the report in question are. When the medical gentleman spoke to me I passed the matter over, and said, “I have been approached in another direction by another medical man who is looking for the position, and I cannot commit myself to any procedure whatever; and the whole matter dropped out of my mind like numbers of other things that have to be passed over; and as a public representative I believe that it is my duty, responsibility, and obligation to avoid using undue influence in any direction, particularly where an office is not open to be filled; and I am only here to-day because some garbled report got abroad respecting Dr. Sharman which carried a measure of truth with it, and in order to clear it up I wish to point out that I am not a miner. I do not go underground to do business in regard to these matters, and, knowing that political influence is prevalent all through the Dominion, it will be a phenomenal thing if the Police Department escapes it. Under these circumstances, I want it to be clearly understood that I have never taken any hand whatever in regard to moving Dr. Sharman, or in appointing a man to his place. In the public interest I asked that question in the House, and to this day I consider it is a calamity that the report has not been furnished.

3. What did you ask for?—I asked for the finding of the inquiry, and the reply seemed to be evasive. The matter, it said, was before the Cabinet. It is still before Cabinet. It has been there for the last fifteen months.

4. We will get at it. But, to my mind, there is no reason why a matter of that sort should be left over?—No. I firmly believe that when an inquiry takes place which has been the outcome of expressed dissatisfaction, the position is only aggravated by the withholding of the report.

5. The inquiry should not have been held unless there was good ground for it, but having been held, there is no reason why the report should not be carried out?—That is so.

6. You think that, in the interests of the men, it would be better settled one way or another?—The inquiry was supposed to be the remedy for the difficulty, but the result has not been revealed to this day, and I call that poor administration.

The Commissioner: Are you satisfied with what Mr. Poole says, Dr. Sharman?

Dr. Sharman: Oh, yes; I wanted the matter cleared up between the two of us.

The Commissioner: You have been misinformed?

Dr. Sharman: Misinformed to this extent: that Mr. Poole was not asked to use his influence to kick me out bag and baggage.

7. *Dr. Sharman* (to witness).] Did I endeavour to secure your good offices as a politician?—No, doctor.

8. I have known you some time?—Yes. The first time anything transpired in connection with Dr. Sharman was at the time I put that question on the Order Paper as to the alleged delay of the mail-steamers in the harbour here.

The Commissioner: I think you will have to leave the matter at this. I am perfectly satisfied that no one wished to do you any injustice.

Dr. Sharman: I am perfectly satisfied.

9. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Are there any headings under which you care to offer any opinion, Mr. Poole—as to the efficiency, discipline, and organization of the Police Force?—In expressing any opinion of my own which may be of value I do so with the remembrance that it is very hard to get a perfect system, even in the Police Force. I belong to a country where one of the finest Forces in the world is to be found—the Royal Irish Constabulary, which is a semi-military

Force, under good discipline. The members of that Force win their laurels and promotions by recognising their obligations in regard to enforcing the law. Now, in reviewing the position in this country, I recognise that the Police Force constitutes the fingers of the law, and if the fingers are interfered with, there is a breakdown in the whole system; and so, for the efficient preservation of law and order, it is necessary that we should have the most efficient system possible. I have been looking closely into the matter of recruiting, and from evidence produced in the House, and from my own observation and knowledge, it seems to me that there is a laxity in connection with the recruiting that should be avoided as much as possible. There are within reach of the Force very capable men, and possibly an increase in the allowance would be an inducement to better men to come forward. While making that comment, I do not wish it to be understood that I am anxious to cast any reflection on the Police Force generally, as I believe that some of the most capable officers in the world are connected with our Force here; but I believe their efficiency is considerably discounted by the enrolment of men—I do not know whether by political influence or not—who are unfit, and should not be accepted. The greatest care should be given to the recruiting, and the local Inspector should have some say in this question. We hear that the recruiting goes on through Wellington, and that, after being put through a short period of training at the training depot there, they are sent out to the various districts, where they are placed under the supervision of the Inspectors. We hear that sometimes those recruits turn out unsatisfactorily, and thereby the country is put to unnecessary expense, and loses money. I believe that the applications should first be made through the local Inspector of Police, who would deal with the elementary requirements of the Department, and test his character, and physical fitness, and then if it were discovered that he was a "reject," the case need go no further. I consider that there are better opportunities for gauging these qualifications locally than by concentrating all the recruiting operations in Wellington. I further consider that various influences are operating that are frequently prejudicial to the Police Force; and, although some people tell me that I take a fanatical view of the temperance question, I recognise that this is one of the greatest propositions that the police of this country are up against. Most of their work in the enforcement of the law is in direct opposition to the intentions and policy of the liquor traffic in this Dominion, and where a policeman has to step out and arrest some disorderly person, or enforce the Licensing Act, or carry out some objectionable piece of work, frequently there is an inclination on the part of those interfered with to intimidate police officers on duty. A good many men are strong and capable enough to rise above this, and others, I am afraid, are unable to withstand the temptation, and the result is that there is a shy observing of the law, a laxity of duty, and then disorder creeps into the Force. The recent outbreaks—in Wellington particularly—created quite a measure of consternation amongst the legislators, and you can lay your hand on the cause of the trouble. It may be said that the outbreaks in Wellington have been inquired into, and the men involved have been dismissed from the service, and very often such occurrences may be explained away; but where a temptation stands in the way of a man doing his duty, some consideration should be given to the police officials who are trying to carry out their work without being intimidated by doing so. I listened to the evidence of two constables before this Commission. I listened to Constable Donovan, and it is quite evident to me that he feels that because he tried to enforce the law at Coromandel he had to suffer in some measure on that occasion for his action. I also listened to Constable Dunne's evidence. He does his duty regularly and well, and the only explanation these men get now of their non-promotion to sergeant is that they are too old; and, looking back on long careers of loyal service, these men firmly believe that because they endeavoured to grapple with the liquor traffic, and the breaking of the law in Coromandel and at Mercury Bay, they have been overlooked in the matter of promotion. This may be no reflection on the present Commissioner. Commissioner Dinnie excuses himself on the ground that these promotions should have taken place before he came into office. That is no consolation to these men, and they feel, and others from end to end of this country feel, that they are not protected in regard to administering the law in connection with the liquor traffic, but that they are going to be humiliated and kept back in the service. I make that appeal on behalf of these men, and the Commission will recognise that a good deal of the evil influence that is brought to bear in the United States upon constables and upon sergeants is influence from the direction I have indicated. I should like to state, in connection with the question of the efficiency of the Police Force, that the men are called upon to carry out unpleasant work very frequently, and that sometimes because they are called upon to carry out that work their motives are questioned. I listened to Mr. Kettle this morning giving his evidence, and it is not for me to comment on what he said as a senior Magistrate; but I do say that when a man is operating under the direction of his senior officer it is necessary for him frequently to play the game, if he is going to secure the man he is sent after, and the detectives in our service here are trackers—man-hunters. The constables of this district, if they are going to catch those who go in for breaking the law in a quiet, sly fashion, have to adopt methods for which they should not be censured—if they are going to bring to book those who are so well conversant with matters of deceit that they are able to evade the law frequently. And I do not like to think, as a representative, that any influence should be set abroad amongst the men that is likely to clip their wings, and keep them from being efficient in hunting down criminals who have to be watched very closely. There is an impression on the part of a good many legislators—it is my impression personally—that better monetary inducement will have to be given to the constables in the service if we are to have the most efficient and reliable type of men; and certainly a discipline stern but kind will have to operate, and the policemen will have to understand that they are going to be protected by the law from any intimidating influence, no matter from what direction it comes. I feel certain that the result of this Commission will help us to do better in the Police Department in the future.

TUESDAY, 31ST AUGUST, 1909.

Dr. Sharman (Police Surgeon): You very kindly said yesterday that if I could bring evidence to show that general dissatisfaction did not exist, you would hear evidence to that effect. Since yesterday's sitting of the Commission I have seen eight or nine constables, and they are prepared to say that they do not desire any change in the Police Surgeon. These constables are not here just now, but I would like to have an opportunity of calling them later in the day. In the meantime I would like to ask Constable Donovan a question.

TIMOTHY DONOVAN, Constable, further examined. (No. 210.)

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] You have known me for some years?—Yes.
2. Are you satisfied with me?—Yes, perfectly satisfied.
3. *The Commissioner.*] Were you at the meeting of constables?—No; but I gave evidence at the previous inquiry.
4. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force with regard to *Dr. Sharman*?—I am stationed at Parnell, and do not mix up with the members of the Force in the town very much. *Dr. Sharman* has attended me.
5. You know of no necessity for a change?—I do not know anything about matters in the barracks.

CHARLES HENRY POOLE, Member of Parliament, further examined. (No. 211.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You are aware of a position that might become very serious indeed—that of the failure of the right class of young men to come forward as applicants for enrolment?—Yes.

2. To what do you attribute that mainly?—I consider, in the first place, that there has been a laxity in the recruiting; and, in the second place, I think the inducements held out in other avenues of labour are such that the monetary inducements for joining the Police Force are not sufficient to command the best type of men entering the service.

3. How would you propose, as a public man, to improve the efficiency of the recruiting?—I consider that better inducements should be offered, and a higher standard of efficiency should be demanded of the men. The increased inducements would make up for any drawbacks in the nature of the increased test in recruiting.

4. How would you go about bringing the inducements before the young men?—There are times when it is easier to get a desirable type of men than at other times. For instance, in seasons of commercial depression recruiting is far easier than when other departments require employees at good figures. I think personally that I would make it more a local matter in the testing of men who are likely to make good members of the Police Force. For instance, we have a good many young men in country districts, and some recruits from the country make most admirable members of the Police Force. I am of the impression that a good many young men are not prepared to go through the roundabout method of securing the position through Wellington. For that reason I believe that a system of local test would place the Department more in touch with the recruits who are likely to be induced to enter the service.

5. Have you any views with regard to the educational standard?—I think with the growth of educational facilities, and with the greater demand there is for men of intelligence, it would be a mistake to lower the standard below the Fifth Standard.

6. Do you not think there are a great many intelligent men who have only passed, say, the Fourth Standard who would make good policemen?—Certainly, I do; but it would not be a very hard matter for a man with his heart set on entering the Force to pass the Fifth Standard. With increased monetary inducements, I do not think it would be a difficult hurdle for a man to get over to pass the Fifth Standard test, although I admit that very desirable men could be found—honest, capable men—who even could not pass the Fourth Standard; but there must be some standard of education.

7. In the present condition of the industrial world there must be special inducements held out?—That is so. For instance, some time ago they found it most difficult to get suitable recruits for the American navy—they could not get them at any price, because industrial enterprise was going ahead at such a rate. Then a time of depression came, and immediately they closed the doors of the recruiting department for the time being.

8. There has been some depression here lately, but the recruiting does not seem to have improved in the Police Force?—I think that dissatisfaction in any Force will prevent men from joining. By that I mean that if men already in the Force have grievances, and feel that unfair methods are adopted for pushing on possible favourites, outside men will say, "This is not going to be a meritorious department; I am better out of it."

9. That, I suppose, is a fact—that the modern youth does not appreciate very much any kind of discipline?—It is a drawback to a good many departments in our Dominion—the dislike the average young man has to any system of discipline. With our colonial life there is an instinctive love of freedom that will not be held in check.

10. You see it exemplified in the scarcity of domestic servants?—Yes. They like freedom. That is also the difficulty with the Volunteer system.

11. Summed up, you think that if the Force were put all round on a better footing, as regards pay and other things, and by carrying out the recruiting on different lines, you would get over the difficulty?—I would also like to add, the removal of intimidating influences. I tried to emphasize that point yesterday. It must be very evident that if a man carries out his duty to the letter of the law he is likely to be up against some hard proposition.

12. How are you going to carry out that in its fullest integrity under democratic conditions?—As far as possible, those influences should be removed.

13. Yes, we know that is the difficulty. You started your remarks yesterday by saying that it had become a commonplace, political influence?—Yes. I do not want to be considered illogical on that point. Political influence is rife all through the country, but it should be the duty of the Administration as far as possible to secure men, and women also, for the Departments who, by the support of the Crown, will be made proof against this sort of thing in the execution of their duty.

14. It seems to me impossible to guard against this: there are people who will not use political influence, and there are those who will use it through the medium of members of Parliament and others who lend themselves to that sort of thing. You know that some members of Parliament do not discourage it, at any rate?—Yes; I am prepared to admit that a good deal of influence is used by members.

15. Where that encouragement is given it is always, to my mind, a source of danger; and yet you cannot educate a man in his public position as to what his conduct shall be?—That is so.

16. It is only really by raising a higher tone of public feeling that this sort of thing can be remedied?—Yes; that is the only remedy that I can see.

17. A political millennium?—Yes. I do not think that is likely to come yet; but we can minimise the existing evils, I believe. I think that if the police received better pay, and the conditions of service were somewhat altered, they might be lifted into a position that is similar in a degree to that of a Judge—to a position where the officer is supposed to receive enough to keep him clear from any bribery.

18. Where the inducements within the Force are considered a factor to keep the men contented?—Yes.

19. Do you think it would improve matters to insist upon men entering the Force having a period of probation before they are finally enrolled, it being very much easier to get rid of a probationer than a man who has been enrolled?—Yes; that is so. A man is generally engaged for his lifetime in the police, and it would be just as well to put him on probation before he is accepted into the full privileges of the Force.

20. Do you know of any reason why the Police Force, in the matter of leave, allowances, &c., should be put on a different footing from the officers of the Mental Hospitals and Gaols Departments—there is a very considerable difference?—Yes, there is. I think that officers of the mental hospitals, gaol warders, and the police are pretty well on an equal footing so far as their occupation goes. I think the conditions as to the matters you have referred to should be regulated under somewhat similar rules.

21. There is no reason for any special exception being made?—I do not think so. I listened to an appeal being made here for the accumulation of leave for three years. I do not think this is a privilege that should be denied to the men.

22. Some people take up the position that it is essential, in the interests of the service, that the men should be compelled to take their leave?—In other departments the holidays are allowed to accumulate.

23. In reference to the question of saloon and steerage fares: of course the suggested change would mean a considerable addition to the public expenditure, but, on the other hand, as to the steerage in some of the boats, I should be very sorry to see anybody belonging to me travel in the steerage?—That is so. The question of cost must be taken into consideration. On some of the smaller steamers I do not think it is right to ask officials to travel steerage. I was very glad to hear the Inspector of Police say that the Northern Steamship Company has been good enough to allow police officers to travel saloon by their steamers at steerage rates.

24. The Commissioner of Police has under consideration a new regulation in reference to this question of officers travelling?—Yes; and it has been suggested that the police should be credited with the services done for other public departments.

25. That is being done in other departments—take the Postal Department, for instance. If that principle is adopted in reference to some departments it might be equally applied to all?—Yes, if the principle is to be carried out to its logical conclusion.

26. It is done in some departments. I do not see why the police should not be credited with the value of the work done for other departments. You know that police officers are paid in certain stations for extra services rendered, for acting as Clerks of Court, &c. The result is that in one or two instances very serious anomalies occur. We had one constable who stated on oath that when he was promoted to be sergeant he was in receipt of £130 a year over and above his police pay. What would you do in regard to securing better equality? Would you do away with all extra emoluments, or would you credit the Police Department with that?—It is very convenient for certain departments to have a police officer to carry out their duties. The anomaly exists certainly, and I can quite understand that there are men in some stations who are not anxious to have promotion under circumstances where they are making more money, and where they can live at a smaller cost than if they accepted promotion and transfer. I think that if a man holds an extra office he should receive an extra allowance for it; but why not, where certain stations have such emoluments, promote some of these men who are making a noise because they are neglected or have been neglected?

The Commissioner: We must not lose sight of the fact that many of the men who have been passed over are not now physically capable of filling those positions.

Inspector Cullen: That is so.

27. *The Commissioner.*] It is the young and active men who can do the work. The difficulty is how to make the alteration satisfactorily. We recognise the need, but how are you going to do it?—I cannot give advice to experts on this matter.

28. It is a matter more of common-sense and the interests of the service?—I can see the difficulty.

29. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose it is your desire, as a representative of the people, that all Government departments should be efficiently and well organized?—Yes.

30. And that influence should be deleted as far as possible?—Yes.

31. Have you any practical knowledge of police administration and control?—I cannot say that I am an expert in connection with these matters. I endeavour to watch as closely as possible the administration of the departments. I am not a very old politician, but I have watched closely the administration of some departments, and have tried to become as conversant as possible with the work carried on by them.

32. Do you know anything of the system adopted in this Force of recruiting candidates for the police?—I know that at present candidates apply through Wellington, and I am personally convinced that an unnecessary amount of laxity has taken place in connection with the acceptance of some.

33. If you do not know the system, how can you know that laxity exists?—From the character of some of the men who have been taken in.

34. Do you know what occurs in other Police Forces?—I do not know that these occurrences are justifiable anywhere, and my desire is to get the best results in the New Zealand Police Force.

35. Do you know anything about the inquiries made as to the character of the men taken on?—I have an idea that some searching inquiries have been made.

36. Have you been reading the reports of the evidence before this Commission?—I have followed them.

37. Have not you noticed that the witnesses have said that the inquiries now are much more strict than they used to be?—I am glad to hear that.

38. Have not you observed that in the Press?—I am not going to contradict those statements, but we have not yet been presented with the official copy of the evidence from the Commission, and you cannot get all the necessary evidence from the newspapers.

39. I am not saying that there is any objection to sending the forms to the districts, but the system has been to send the applications to Wellington, and the forms have gone out from there?—I understand that.

40. You do not know what those forms are?—No.

41. And what information is to be supplied?—No.

42. Do you know that the forms are sent to the districts for inquiry, so that the Inspectors know all about the applicants, and the matter is not confined to Headquarters entirely?—I have wondered lately why the application forms have not been held in the local office.

Mr. Dinnie. The present system went on before my time, but I could not at present tell you the reason why it is so.

Witness. If you are so much in sympathy with the application forms being held in the local offices it would have been wise to have placed them in the local offices years ago.

Mr. Dinnie. It may have been, but they were taken back for some reason. I have simply continued the system in vogue when I took office, but I will raise no objection to the forms being sent to the local offices.

Witness. I heard you make that statement the other day, and, knowing you were in sympathy with the procedure, I wondered why it had not taken place before.

Mr. Dinnie. The form is sent out to each district concerned with the candidate, where he has been employed, so that we have a knowledge of the men wherever the inquiry is made.

Witness. I believe that the local men should be so in touch with possible recruits that they could make the initial inquiries without disturbing the Head Office, and in sending in the application forms of the desirable men should do their best to eliminate the abuses.

Mr. Dinnie. They do make the first inquiries when the application forms go out, and the same inquiries would have to be made whether by the districts or by the Headquarters. But there is no objection to the forms being sent out in future to the districts. You know that we inquire into the history of a man from the time he leaves school, and not a week is missed of all that time.

Witness. I believe inquiry should be made to that extent. It is a mystery to me how some men have managed to get on if the inquiries are made from week to week.

Mr. Dinnie. It has been necessary to appoint men on probation before the inquiry was completed, and one or two have turned out wrongly, and we turned them away. Their services were very much required, as we had not got the number we wanted, and we required to have a batch complete before we could send them to the drill-ground.

Witness. I know the difficulty there is in dealing with this very complex matter, and to make sure of all your men; but at the same time it is of vital importance that not a shadow of a doubt should rest on the policeman.

Mr. Dinnie. I quite agree with you.

Witness. I was hinting at a man in another department who was putting up telephones in the houses of the people in one of the cities here, and who had served twelve years on about sixteen convictions, and is now an habitual criminal. This man had access to the homes of people. I do not blame the officials. That man got in by false pretences.

Mr. Dinnie. In a Government department?

Witness. Yes, and I believe it is quite possible even to beat the ingenuity of the police officers at times.

43. *Mr. Dinnie (to witness).*] Of course, you do not know what inquiries are made by other Police Forces in respect to candidates?—No; I have been through the evidence of the last Commission.

44. But since the last Commission the inquiries have been much more strict?—I think the result clearly warranted that.

45. You referred to the Irish Police Force as being a well-disciplined body of men?—I consider it to be so.

46. How long is it since you were there?—I was in the Old Country fourteen years ago, and I think I am not making any rash statement when I say it is one of the most efficient bodies of policemen in the world. The men being amenable to discipline has a good deal to do with its efficiency.

47. Do you know the difference in maintaining discipline here to at Home?—I have some idea of it.

48. So have I?—Because, notwithstanding compensating qualities in the colonial, they must be handled in another way to a good many of the people attached to defence bodies in the Old Country.

49. I suppose you think that a practical knowledge of police discipline and control is necessary for any Commissioner of Police?—I certainly do.

50. And you think that the Commissioner in his office should be as free as possible from influence of any kind?—I do. That is, provided the Commissioner has a thorough grip of his business, because if a man has to establish confidence in his administration he should have an absolutely free hand.

51. I suppose you do not consider it wise to interfere in any way with the administration of any department concerning which you have little knowledge?—I do not consider it wise.

52. For instance, it would not be wise for me to interfere with the Secretary of Mines or Public Works?—I do not think so. But, of course, the position of a representative of the people is different in a sense. He is responsible to his constituents for the efficiency of every department, and to a large extent he has to depend on the reliable qualities of officers in charge of those departments for that efficiency.

53. Yes, and it is his duty to get to know a good deal about the workings of the Department before he says much about it?—That is so, and sometimes it is resented.

54. What is resented?—The interference of a member with some departments. This has no particular reference to the Police Force; but in other departments men who are actively engaged from year to year resent the interference even of a member of Parliament sometimes, because they think he is too busy in trying to hunt up anything that might be astray.

55. If a politician comes to you and makes representations that "So-and-so" is dissatisfied and has been passed over, or has been transferred against his will, what would you do?—I would communicate either with the Commissioner or the Minister, very often with the Minister, he being the responsible head.

56. You would communicate with the Minister to satisfy yourself as to whether there is any ground for the complaint?—Certainly, if a man comes to me with a grievance I ask him to put it in writing, and I tell him, "I will refer your letter, with one from myself, to the Minister." I have done that in some cases, and then that is referred to the officer in charge of the Department, and the Minister gives me a reply ultimately regarding the position.

57. You have done so?—Yes.

58. Did you have a satisfactory reply?—Sometimes, and sometimes an evasive reply. Ministerial replies, when they are not favourable, are not calculated to give you an aching heart. They are on the side of courtesy.

59. You think the standard ought to be kept up as regards education?—I do. I think the Fifth Standard pass is easy enough for the men that you require in the Force. I do not reflect on the men who have served a number of years in the Force, and have become efficient; but the modern policeman is expected to have a better grip of things than previously, and I believe the increased monetary inducement at the bottom of the ladder would more than compensate for the obligation to produce a Fifth Standard pass. There is no excuse, in my opinion, for a policeman to be behind the times with the opportunities now afforded to obtain education. I have known men who have worked themselves up from the bottom of the ladder by taking advantage in their spare hours of the classes within their reach.

60. Do you really think applicants for the Force have any notion that unfair methods obtain in the Department?—I do not think that applicants at the outset are acquainted with the irregularities of the system. From the outside they see the rosy tints, but when they get in they have experiences that disillusionise them.

61. But do you suggest that there are unfair methods obtaining in the Police Department?—I certainly consider that irregularities have taken place that look like unfair methods.

62. What are those irregularities?—The question of promotions. Of course, this is a difficult question, I acknowledge; but I have watched very carefully the evidence in connection with the cases of some police constables who have been overlooked, and I do not think their cases have been met with the measure of fairness they deserve.

63. But I suppose you will admit there is a difficulty if a man has not been promoted—I have had charge of the Department a certain time only—and he is over fifty years of age, and, although he may be qualified, what am I to do if I have younger men who are better capable of carrying out the duties?—I can see your difficulty, Mr. Dinnie. But I consider, if the Commissioner knows the qualifications of those men why have been overlooked for promotion, he should give them consideration, even though they are above the age.

64. I have been trying to do that, and am in trouble because I promoted several old men who ought to have been promoted a long time ago?—I would not quarrel with you on this score, provided these men have the qualifications apart from age. All the men hold the view that those who have been left behind should be lifted up now.

65. That is what is being done now. I have promoted those who are qualified?—I hold no brief at all for any constable or sergeant, but I have listened to men who have given evidence here,

and I am convinced that those men deserve consideration if other men equally as old have been considered.

66. But you do not know the details of the qualifications of those men, but simply speak from what you have heard?—I may not know all, but I have heard their recommendations and credentials.

67. But you might find other men with credentials equally as good. The men, as a rule, have very good credentials?—Constable Dunne passed the efficiency test above 300, and in "procedure," and that does not look bad for a man who has not got a very black sheet against him.

68. No doubt, but his superiors have never thought fit to recommend him. You may not know the details?—I do not know the details. I am speaking from the evidence, which is genuine.

69. As regards influence, you have heard of one case. Evidence was given here in which political interference took place in respect to a man who was doing his duty, and an inquiry was held, and the constable was complimented and kept where he was, and was not transferred. You do not know of any case where influence has actually obtained?—Well, I do.

70. I should like to have it?—I am bound in confidence on that score.

71. Will you let the Commissioner (Mr. Bishop) know the name?—I will communicate with the Commissioner at the close of the evidence, if you so desire.

72. I do. As regards emoluments, the police hold various offices connected with other departments for which they receive small gratuities and payments, and the question has been raised as to whether they should be allowed to receive any emoluments outside their pay. What is your opinion on that matter?—If a constable is called upon to do work that is outside his calling as a constable he should receive some compensation.

73. But supposing it is done in his own time?—Yes.

74. A constable is supposed to be always on duty?—Yes.

75. Supposing his police duty is not sufficient to keep him employed all the time?—He is like a sailor, always on duty—above and below.

76. *The Commissioner.*] Perhaps in a district which provides the best emoluments the ordinary police-work would not occupy the constable more than half a day a week, and Mr. Dinnie wants to know whether, looking at that fact, he should be paid for work that he is really doing in his police time?—They may only do half a day's police work a week, but they are always on command, and therefore in being called on to handle other offices their responsibility and work is increased.

77. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know that when it interferes with their police duties they do not hold those other appointments?—No; that is an acknowledgment that the men who hold these appointments do not allow them to interfere with their police duties.

78. Then, you would not put them all on one footing, let them do their work, and give them increased pay and allowances, whatever the cost may be, so that they will know exactly what they have to receive?—I am still in favour of a man receiving compensation for extra work done, and by placing them on a level footing they will lose some of these emoluments.

79. They might as well be doing that extra work as walking about doing nothing half their time?—If you give them no monetary consideration they will begin to protest, because there are men in other places who have not got these offices to fill, and who are getting the same salary.

80. *The Commissioner.*] Quite recently the enforcement of awards was put on to the Magistrates, and the fact that it was going to involve a lot of additional work was not taken into consideration. It is not a complete analogy, but it has a bearing on this question?—I can see the application from that standpoint, your Worship, but I am not defending or advocating extravagance in any sense. No doubt it would be a better thing for the departments if they could get their work carried out at a smaller cost.

81. We only want to deal with the differentiation of the treatment of constables, and it affects the efficiency of the Force if constables at certain stations, where these emoluments are considerable, do not wish to leave there?—If there are constables who are fit to fill these minor offices I think an increased departmental allowance, and a recommendation as to seniority or promotion, might be a set-off to the granting of special emoluments at the present time.

82. I would not care a straw for any man who would decrease his efficiency in connection with certain offices he is called upon to fill gratuitously?—The filling of these offices is calculated to create greater efficiency in a man for higher offices, and therefore his work should be a stepping-stone to a better position.

83. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There are difficulties about house-allowance. Would you be in favour of the Department renting houses and deducting, say, 5s. a week from the man's pay, instead of making them an allowance?—I think such a system would be preferable to the present one, but, of course, rentals vary according to the localities. Take Wellington rentals.

84. Napier is a long way ahead of Wellington?—In Napier the rents are becoming prohibitive.

85. The house would be rented by the Department, and under its supervision, and you think better results would accrue?—Yes; because the departmental houses would be better than those selected by the men.

86. The men want a rise in pay, increased house-allowance, free uniform and boots, and many other things: do you know this would mean an enormous expenditure, and all could not be recommended at one time?—No. The allowances to the Force should be on an established principle. I am anxious to see the men getting full compensation for their services, because if there is a breaking-down it means trouble all round.

87. *The Commissioner.*] We are actually concerned with the rate of pay to a constable entering the Force, and that question will have to be dealt with?—The primary monetary inducement.

88. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Of course, you know that once they get charge of a station the compensation is fairly good?—I understand that.

89. You know that it takes about five years before they can get a station?—Yes.

90. What do you say of the Force as regards efficiency or discipline?—I consider that the majority of the men in the Police Force compare favourably with any men I have seen anywhere, but I do not like to think that the efficiency of the majority is going to be impaired by the inefficiency of the minority, and, as I stated yesterday in connection with the question of intimidation, it is the one point I wish to be very strong on—the intimidating influences that are sometimes brought to bear on men doing their duty. That is not properly understood, and I want this point to be clear. I stated yesterday that men were called upon to do unpleasant duty in certain places, and if there were a danger of influence being brought to bear—it has been brought to bear, and will be brought to bear—if some care is not taken, our policemen will not be able to do their duty without being interfered with. Down towards the foot of Queen Street I notice a good many drunken men. It is not hard to find them, and these drunken men are loitering at street-corners and in front of the hotels, and I firmly believe that the influence of the party responsible for the creation of these drunken men is a sort of nightmare to some constables, and that their instinct was to shirk their duty when they knew there were influences in existence that were going to play havoc with them if they interfered in respect to some matters. If possible, therefore, I believe that some men will select the line of least resistance, and get through with the least amount of trouble. I do not intend to reflect upon the Inspector. His position is pretty well known here, and I believe he has been handled pretty severely from time to time on some score; but I am anxious to see our cities patrolled by a Police Force composed of able men who will say, “I have the commission of the Crown to do my duty, and I intend to do it, and any vested interests or local interests must stand second to the carrying-out of my duty as a police constable.”

Mr. Dinnie: Of course, we have occurrences in which interference no doubt does occur, but I am rather surprised that you should think that it should go as far as that.

The Commissioner: Mr. Poole is merely arguing from this standpoint: that it is the fear of that influence being exercised that operates against the fullest discharge of his duty by the individual constable, not that there are instances in which punishment has been dealt out to the men.

Witness: It is a fear, and the influence is felt, and they want to be emancipated from that feeling. Not long ago a protest was entered in connection with the arrest of a drunken sailor who was left lying in a urinal where a million flies could light on him. Comment was made at the state in which this man was left. The policeman on beat is not supposed to find that man, but as soon as ever an expression of opinion was uttered regarding the case a threat comes from the other side, not to the Police Force but to the man who has commented on it, but he said, “I am responsible for the sailors of this country, to see that they have fair play,” and as the result of his threat and hunting up of cases of sailors and firemen who have been turned out drunk from that hotel, the number of cases was astounding. That is one of the threatening influences entailed as far as the police are concerned, and I think that we will add to the efficiency of the Force if we give the men the guarantee of their position, and let them understand that their claim to promotion will be preserved, notwithstanding their interference with any vested interests.

91. *The Commissioner:* They should have the feeling that they would receive assistance instead of resistance?—That is so. We find influences coming right to heads of Departments and to the representatives of the people to interfere with men who are striving to do their duty.

92. It is easy to find abuses, but not so easy to suggest a remedy?—I could suggest a remedy.

93. What would you suggest?—I am not going to deliver a temperance address, but I recognise that we, as a people, are spending five millions per annum on a business that is creating most of the cases that go through the policeman's hands.

94. Every three years the public have an absolute right of pronouncing on that very question?—I admit that. It is the most dangerous period for the Police Force, because at every election this matter is brought up, and every case of irregularity is prejudicial to them, I suppose. I was in Clutha some years ago, and the hardest work I saw the policeman doing down there was playing bowls on the local bowling-green.

95. *Mr. Dinnie:* You know it is in the interests of the licensing law and of the licensees for the police to carry out their duties strictly?—I cannot accept that.

96. That is my idea of it?—It is not mine.

97. That the police should be as strict as possible in every way, and prevent all kinds of illegal trading?—I think it pays the other side to keep the police off as much as possible. I take the other view. I have no personal animus to these people, but, looking at it from the standpoint of country, I can see where a tremendous amount of our national money can be saved, but in the meantime I resent the interference of any vested interest with the efficiency of our Police Force, and the Force is in direct antagonism to the liquor traffic of this country.

The Commissioner: You have the opportunity as a legislator to straighten out matters.

JOHN HENRY SWEENEY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 212.)

Witness: I am a plain-clothes constable, stationed at Auckland, and was enrolled on the 1st February, 1904. I was detailed for plain-clothes duty recently. I was first stationed in Wellington, and received 7s. a day; but I had to pay 17s. a week rent. We got no house-allowance at that time, but since the last Commission we have been allowed 1s. a day, and an increase of 6d. a day in pay, which has been a great help. I was offered plain-clothes work, and, thinking it was promotion, I took it, being transferred from Wanganui to Auckland, where I pay 16s. a week rent, and am still getting 7s. a day. I get no other allowance.

1. *The Commissioner:* What did you get as constable?—8s. a day and 1s. a day house-allowance.

2. What do you get for plain clothes?—No allowance. I understand I am on three months' probation. The 1s. a day extra for plain clothes should be given to the men from the start, and they should not be required to do probation at all.

3. When is your three months up?—In about a month.

4. And then you get your 1s. a day?—I do not consider that it is sufficient for an acting-detective, and I think they should receive free material for their plain clothes.

5. What is the general average period of plain-clothes duty before becoming a full-blown detective?—There are instances in the detective branch, Auckland, where men have served seven or eight years as plain-clothes men before receiving the rank of detective. Latterly they have been promoted at three years, but we do not know how long that is going to continue.

6. How long is it since the shorter period was required?—Promotions are going more frequently, but we do not know how long it is going to continue. The other men who have been recently promoted are all dissatisfied with the pay. If I had known as much as I do now I would not have taken the plain clothes. A man is better off in a country station.

7. Did you apply for promotion?—I did not, but I was offered the opportunity when in Wanganui to take plain-clothes work. I was a mounted man there, and better off than I am now.

8. Many men take it because they escape the recruits' routine and every-day police work?—Well, a detective is practically on duty all the time. I like this work very much, but financially I am worse off. I do not like the future prospects, and would prefer a country station.

9. Is there anything else you wish to mention?—I was asked by the other men to mention that an acting-detective received a second-class railway pass, whereas a full detective travels first class.

The Commissioner: There is no reason why acting-detectives should not be placed on the same footing.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] We are arranging about that in the new regulations. What do you think of the detectives' pay, when you get appointed a detective?—It gets better as it goes on, but I do not think the pay for an acting man is enough.

11. You commence at 10s. a day, and 1s. a day allowance?—That is a great help, but how long has a man to wait until he gets it?

12. Every man has to justify his position. You may get 10s. a day pay, 10s. 6d. a week house-allowance, and 1s. a day for plain clothes?—You might have to wait seven or eight years.

JOHN WALTER HOLLIS, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 213.)

Witness: I am a detective, stationed at Auckland, and was enrolled in the Police Force on the 22nd June, 1896.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How soon after that did you commence to do plain-clothes work?—In March, 1897.

2. On your own application?—No, I have never applied for anything beyond promotion.

3. You did plain-clothes duty up to the 1st June, 1906?—After that. I was sent to Coromandel, where I came into contact with Constable Donovan, and we were rather strict about watching the hotels at night. The 1896 election came on, and a candidate put up in the Government interest; in fact, there were two, and one was the local hotelkeeper. The result was that Donovan was promoted to second-class constable, and I was shifted back to Auckland. Donovan was sent to Tolago Bay. At that time he made between £10 and £12 a month extra outside his salary, while I made about £4 a month extra money. We both lost money through being shifted from Coromandel. I was then selected by the late Inspector Hickson for the detective branch, and my records will show that I gave satisfaction in that work. Some time in August of 1896 I had occasion to go with another detective to make inquiries into a matter, and I was left to watch a certain building for a man who we thought was going to return to it. During that watch I saw a burglar coming out of Smith and Caughey's premises, and I secured him after a long chase over roofs. Notwithstanding this capture, I was soon after sent back into uniform, the then Commissioner stating that I had not long enough service to be ranked as detective. So I take it that there was influence brought to bear to return me to uniform duty, and I infer that it was because I did my duty in Coromandel.

4. On account of your working against the hotels?—That is so. Mr. Hickson suggested that I should ask the Commissioner to reconsider his decision, but I declined to do so, and continued doing uniform duty. I have filled every position in the Force excepting that of district clerk. At that time Auckland was rather bad as regards crime and prostitution, but on the advent of Inspector Cullen things were cleared up. I continued in the uniform branch until, I think, 1891 or 1892, when the Inspector asked me to go back into the detective branch, but I told him I was not anxious to do so, as I had been treated so badly before. I eventually agreed, and took up the detective work again as acting-detective, but it was twelve months before I got my 1s. a day. I consider I should have received at from the start. I continued in the detective branch until about three years ago. Commissioner Tunbridge issued a regulation that promotion should count not from the time a man joined the detective branch, but according to seniority in the service, and I naturally took it for granted that I would get my turn according to seniority, and be appointed a full detective. Four men were, however, put over my head who were junior to me in service, and I consider that unfair. I have nothing to say against the men, but if you want an efficient Force you must promote the men who are efficient when their turn comes, and not keep them waiting a number of years, and put others over their heads. I was efficient at that time, and I should have received my rank as detective when I was entitled to it, and before those four men, instead of only three years ago. There was also a sergeant put in ahead of me—Sergeant Siddells, of Wanganui—without any qualifications, as far as I know, for a detective officer. As to Constable Donovan, I worked with him in Coromandel, and we did our duty fearlessly; but I am of the

opinion that he has suffered severely throughout his career since that time simply on account of having done his duty. I think he is a man who has been very harshly treated. I think if we want to get an efficient Force we must treat the members of the Force as men, and treat them fairly, and not let influence step in; otherwise efficient men are apt to get disgusted, or will not put their heart into their work as they should do. We have a certain duty to perform—first to the public, and after that to ourselves. If we are not treated fairly we have a grievance. There is, I think, an undercurrent of dissatisfaction. The last witness has spoken for the acting-detectives. The extra shilling a day allowance is not, in my opinion, sufficient. A detective has to go about seeking information. He has to go sometimes into a hotel, and he must spend something for drinks, even if he drinks lemonade; he cannot stand there like a fool. It would excite suspicion at once. In reference to my own case: if you want to know my ability three years ago, I will call men with whom I have had cases in this city—commercial men and others. I would like to know why men junior to me were passed over my head.

5. What is the remedy?—I think my case should be considered, and that I should be placed senior to those men.

5A. Who are the men?—Fay, Hill, Ward, and Cameron.

6. Is there anything else you wish to add?—In reference to the difference between the pay of sergeants and detectives, I think it is to be regretted that that matter was brought forward in the way in which the sergeants brought it. In Auckland the detectives and the sergeants have always been a very peaceable family. Inspector Cullen will not allow strife to exist between the men. He endeavours to please both branches of the service. I think the public are satisfied, and if we can keep them satisfied that we are doing our duty it is better for ourselves. I feel sure that there is not a more eager body of men in the colony in respect to carrying out their duties than the Auckland members of the Force. I have heard that the same thing does not exist in some other parts of the colony. We are a happy family amongst the detectives, and even with the sergeants we work well. What affects the detectives is the continual shifting about of detectives. At present in that respect we are rather at a disadvantage. We have just lost two men—Detectives Fay and Miller. They both applied for a transfer, I understand.

Mr. Dinnie: One on application, and one for misconduct.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Yes; one for very gross misconduct—misconduct that I would have shifted him somewhere else for. When you cite such an instance, you only weaken your case?—I do not say that detectives should not go from here, but they should not be shifted more than can be helped. A detective has a great knowledge of the inhabitants of a town—more than the men in the uniform branch have. I desire to point out the difference in the remuneration of the sergeants and detectives. I will take two men joining the Force at the same time. Both go along for four or five years. At the end of that time one man gets a little more influence, and he is selected for the detective branch, and the other goes into the country and takes a station, and as soon as he takes over the station he is on equal terms with the detective; his house-rent makes up the difference. The plain-clothes man is at a disadvantage in this respect. He has to get at least two suits a year, costing, say, £10. Then he has incidental expenses. He must be constantly putting his hand in his pocket. The other man gets anything additional between £50 and £150 a year—some stations are worth £130 additional a year. He remains in that station for six years, and that means that he has made £780; whereas the detective is constantly putting his hand in his pocket for expenses, and he may not get promotion for many years. When he is made a detective he only gets 10s. a day, whereas the sergeant gets 10s. 6d. a day. The consequence is that the less intelligent man of the two gets the bigger remuneration. We get no plain-clothes allowance. As soon as a man gets promoted from the rank of constable to detective the plain-clothes allowance ceases, whereas in the case of some sergeants doing office duty the 1s. a day still continues; but not so with the detective. We have to serve three years before we get another 1s. a day. It will be twenty-five years before I get the maximum pay of 15s. a day as a detective. I do not think the position was fairly put by the sergeants. I say we do not get larger pay. They get larger remuneration than we have. I consider that a sergeant up to twenty years' service gets greater remuneration than the detectives. With respect to the competition between the grades, there is no such thing as competition, or should not be. I consider that the best man should always be appointed to the top of the tree, irrespective of grade. Of late years we have not had many detectives appointed to the rank of Inspector. I consider that the men in the two branches of the service should have equal rights to go to the top of the tree. In reference to transfers from one department to another, according to their statement it is impossible—the thing cannot be worked out fairly at all. What the sergeants have said in reference to the larger percentages is, I consider, wrong in most instances. They quote the promotions as though they were going to apply to the whole of the Force, whereas they will only be between the sergeants and the detectives. Then, in regard to the rank of detective, I consider that there are men who joined the service with me who would never have been selected by the Inspector as detectives, and whom I consider to be less intelligent. Yet I am looked upon by such a man—a sergeant—as being subordinate to him. Subordinate in what? Whoever put forward this sergeants' manifesto was, I think, badly advised. We have always been a happy family here, and this is not going to improve the service. The way to get over the difficulty would be this: that instead of having a detective where there is a sergeant in charge there should be a plain-clothes constable or acting-detective, who upon being promoted should be transferred to a city. I consider that a detective should not be under an officer of less rank than a Sub-Inspector. I think it has been made pretty clear that it is necessary for a detective to have a first-class pass when travelling upon the railways, and should travel saloon by steamers. I consider that any member of the Force should be allowed a first-class passage when on transfer. I think the Chief Detective should hold the rank of Sub-Inspector. That would give a larger number of men from which to select the Inspectors. It has

been stated by the sergeants that the rank of Chief Detective can be reached in fifteen years. I am afraid that I shall be much longer in the service than that before I can get that rank—in fact, under the present circumstances, it would seem that there is little chance of me getting it even with thirty years' service. There is no doubt that in some quarters offence has been taken at what Sub-Inspector McGrath said about the detective branch being the right arm of the service. When crime occurs, the detective branch is held mainly responsible for detecting it. A sergeant takes out and brings in his men, makes up his sectional reports, and does his regular hours of duty, and goes home; whereas a detective goes out at 9 in the morning, and sometimes he does not get home till midnight or even later; and we are often sent out to investigate crime, and do not get home to our meals. In fact, some officers say the detective should never be a married man, because he never knows when he can be at home. The detective should get more pay than the sergeant, because his duties and responsibilities are greater. Our duty is to assist the public, and see that there are no complaints; and altogether our duties involve far more responsibility than do those of the sergeant. The Police Force in Auckland has never been so efficient as it is to-day. I consider that an acting-detective should receive the 1s. a day allowance right from "the jump." If I had my time over again I would not join the detective branch; I would rather join the uniform branch. In my own case, I started at 10s. a day, and am now only getting 11s. a day.

8. And the 1s. 6d. a day allowance?—Yes; but I have been thirteen years in the Force.

9. You can rise to 15s. a day, and a sergeant cannot rise to anything like that?—Yes; but I would have to be twenty-five years in the service before I could get it, and a sergeant may be an Inspector by that time. With reference to recruiting, I consider it should be done by the local Inspector, who would have the assistance of both the local branches in his inquiries. The candidate could be medically examined, and his character could be inquired into by one of the Inspector's staff. Then the papers could be forwarded to Wellington, and if the candidate was thought suitable by the Commissioner the recruit could be sent to the depot at Wellington. After a man comes from the depot he might be transferred to the detective office, and be given three months' experience there. That would give him a good foundation before he went on the streets. Then he might be given some experience through the Prisons Department—getting an insight into old and young criminals. After that, if he was considered a fit and proper person, he might become a constable, and be placed on street duty. He could also be given some instruction in connection with the finger-print department of the Force. I do not consider the present travelling-allowance given to detectives, constables, and sergeants is sufficient. As I have already stated, the detective when on duty has frequently to put his hands into his own pockets for expenses.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You consider that you have been badly treated in some respects?—Yes, as regards promotion.

11. Is it fair to say that the detectives and the uniform branch do not work harmoniously in other districts?—I do not wish to insinuate that.

12. Is it fair to suggest it?—No, not between the two branches.

13. What do you mean?—I have only had it hinted to me.

14. Is it right to repeat it if you have no personal knowledge?—I have only had it hinted to me that in some of the offices they are not so harmonious as we are here.

15. You have no knowledge of it?—No.

16. *The Commissioner.*] Hearsay statements are always dangerous?—Yes. If it is thought that I am creating a wrong impression, I wish to withdraw the statement.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] A man may not be qualified for detective duties, and yet he may be equally intelligent with a man who is?—Inspector Cullen has been here for eight or ten years, and I think during that time he could only recommend three or four men for the transfer to the detective branch. At any rate, I am the only man he has recommended.

18. But it does not follow that you are more intelligent than some of the sergeants?—I think the detectives are always looked on as being the more intelligent men. A man to be a sergeant does not want the same intelligence as the detectives.

19. A sergeant is supposed to supervise his men?—Yes; more force of character is required.

20. A detective may not possess that force of character?—That is so, but some sergeants do not possess it.

21. You say that a sergeant's duties are only for eight hours a day?—Yes, as a rule.

22. Perhaps some of the sergeants will be able to say what hours of duty they have to perform sometimes.

23. *Sergeant Sheehan.*] Knowing as well as you do the benefits that a man with a country station has, why did you not apply for the position?—Because I was selected for the detective force. The Inspector asked me to go into the detective branch, and I went in.

24. Which has the most responsibility, a sergeant in charge of a station or in charge of a large portion of a city, or a detective?—The detective, certainly.

25. How?—When there is any large amount of crime in a city a memorandum comes from the Commissioner to the Inspector, and is sent on to the detectives, and the whole responsibility is then thrown on the detective branch.

26. You know very well that a sergeant in charge of a section of men at night has responsibility in respect to a great part of the city?—No.

27. What is he there for?—He is there to look after his men—to see that they are doing their duty; but as soon as a serious crime is committed he immediately rings up for a detective, even if it is in the middle of the night.

28. How often does that occur?—Very often.

29. How often have you been rung up during the past twelve months?—I am a married man, and live away from the station. I cannot be rung up.

30. Sergeants doing sectional work, are they not brought into contact with crime?—We generally find that a report is sent in by the constables when a serious crime has been committed. It is sent in to the Inspector, and it comes on to us in the morning. If it is a serious crime that a sergeant cannot handle, it comes to the detectives to investigate.

31. Do you mean to tell me that sergeants do not arrest for serious crime?—If a thing comes into their hands it is their duty to arrest.

32. How many hours of duty has a sergeant a day?—Eight.

33. Would you be surprised to learn that they have more like twelve hours?—I would.

34. What hours of duty do I do?—I do not know; but you may have to be on duty from 9 in the morning till 9 at night. But you are different altogether; you can be at home in the afternoon.

35. Do you not consider that I have greater responsibility than you?—No, because you have two detectives there.

36. What about managing my men?—They are surely sensible men, and if they are doing their duty you do not want to manage them.

37. I am afraid you have a very poor idea of police duty?—I have done more police duty than you have.

38. *The Commissioner.*] I think it is a matter greatly to be deplored—raising any line of cleavage between the detective and the uniform branch. There is a tendency to do so, and I think it is very deplorable?—Nothing would have been said by the detectives if the question had not been brought up by the sergeants.

PETER JAMES McMAHON, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 214.)

Witness: My name is Peter James McMahon. I am a detective, stationed at Auckland. I was enrolled in October, 1892, and was not long doing street duty until I was selected by Chief Detective Grace, evidently acting under instructions from Inspector Hickson, and was taken into the detective branch. I was sent from the detective office to Waikomiti on special duty in connection with a murder trial. I conducted my business satisfactorily there, and have been kept in the detective office practically ever since. In December, 1897, I was promoted to the rank of detective. During the whole of my detective experience I have practically been stationed in the Auckland District. I have carried out the duties of the office in a very satisfactory manner, and my complaint here to-day is that I have been passed over. I have about seventeen years' service. I was eligible to be promoted to the rank of Chief Detective. I have been passed over. I had done almost three years detective duty before the men who were passed over my head entered the Force. I refer to Chief Detective Broberg. I have no desire to reflect upon him. I know him well, and respect him; but these things cause dissatisfaction. They are acts that do not encourage men. A man is apt to become disheartened when he is passed over in the way I have stated. As regards my efficiency, I am going to support that by evidence of Inspector Cullen, who will speak of the quality of man I am; and also by the evidence of Chief Detective Marsack. Unfortunately, Mr. Dyer, Stipendiary Magistrate, has gone away, but I will produce letters from him; from Mr. Tole, Crown Prosecutor; and from Mr. Reed, one of the leading barristers here. I have served under the late Inspector Broham, the late Inspector Hickson, and also under Inspector Cullen. I have a good character, and have an absolutely clean sheet. When Chief Detective Marsack has been called away on urgent duty I have had to take his place; also, when he has been away on annual leave, I have conducted cases in Court in his absence, and have carried them through in a satisfactory manner. On no occasion has any fault been found with me by either the Bench or the Inspector. On the contrary, I have received their commendation for the work I have done.

1. What age are you?—I am forty-four. As regards pay, I consider that we should start at 10s. 6d. a day, and advance to 15s. 6d. a day by increments, and an increase in the house-allowance; first-class fares on steamers, and that when on annual leave, if possible, we should be allowed to use our pass. I would like the annual leave increased in this way: Up to five years' service, twelve days; over five years' service, fourteen days; over ten years' service, twenty-one days. A somewhat similar system is adopted in the postal service. I might also mention that when the promotion of Detective Broberg took place no inquiry took place as to my ability—that is, no inquiry from the Inspector, Sub-Inspector, or Chief Detective.

2. How do you know?—I asked the Chief Detective.

3. Therein enters the personal element at once. If I were to ask the Commissioner why he did not promote you instead of Broberg he would answer, in all probability, "I promoted the man I considered the most fitted," in spite of your three years' additional service. How are you to get over that if he says he promoted the best man?—If the Commissioner of Police says he has promoted the best man, I should like to know on what he has based his judgment.

4. If I ask the Commissioner, you will have to be satisfied with his reply?—Say a vacancy occurs, have I to go along the line again?

5. I think you will have to rely on your merits and record as a detective when the time arrives?—I have a good record, sir.

The Commissioner: Mr. Dinnie, why did you promote Chief Detective Broberg instead of this man?

Mr. Dinnie: Because I considered he was the best qualified for the position.

6. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] There are certain cases respecting which, if I consider they have not been dealt with equally, I might make a recommendation, but I could not give you that promise. You will have to wait your time?—May I have permission to call evidence of my work?

7. Why should that be necessary? I think a man must stand on his official record?—Mr. Dinnie has nothing to say, I presume, against my efficiency.

The Commissioner: Mr. Dinnie, is there anything?

Mr. Dinnie: I have no desire to say one word against the detective.

8. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] As far as this inquiry is concerned, I must take it then that he passed you over, having due regard to the efficiency of the service?—Then, I still have to go on waiting.

9. It is quite proper that the Commissioner should explain why he did not give effect to what I consider a very important element in considering the question of promotions, and that is the length of service, and it is possible when he is examined that I might ask him that question. I will bear in mind what you now state, and it is possible I may look into the papers relating to your case, and make a special recommendation. I shall also ask the Inspector, and you can ask him his personal opinion as to your qualifications. Do you know anything about this vexed question of the Police Surgeon and the men?—Yes, I know that a considerable amount of unrest exists amongst the members of the Force as regards Dr. Sharman, and they have no confidence in him.

10. That is, then, the general feeling?—To my knowledge, it is.

11. You hear it talked of and discussed?—Yes.

12. Since when did this begin?—I should say it has been in existence for about two years.

13. Has it increased during that time?—It has really not increased. I hear great complaints.

14. It is a personal matter?—It seems to be so.

15. *Dr. Sharman.*] I believe I attended you some years ago?—Yes.

16. Did you make any complaint at the time?—I made no complaint.

17. You yourself have no complaint against me?—Yes; I have no confidence in you whatever.

18. In what way?—I say personally I have no confidence in you whatever, especially since I had a little experience with you in connection with a certain death, and from what you told me subsequently to that death I lost complete confidence in you. There was an inquest into the death.

19. What did I tell you?—You told me that a certain young man died from strychnine-poisoning, but after an analysis it was discovered that there was not a sign of strychnine about the case.

Dr. Sharman: This is rather sprung on me, your Worship. In such cases traces of strychnine may not be found.

The Commissioner: It is just what I expected would happen. I am not going into the question of your qualifications as a medical man, as I felt that this was not the proper tribunal to do so. It is merely a question of a personal nature between yourself and the members of the Auckland Police Force. I saw no reason to question your personal qualifications, and I asked you to avoid such references from the first. I again advise you to do so.

Dr. Sharman: The witness has cast a reflection on me, and I am prepared to disprove what he says.

The Commissioner: I am not going to rehold an inquest held in Auckland by a properly constituted authority, and I am not inclined to go further into this matter.

ALFRED JAMES ROBERTS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 215.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Epsom.

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] How long have you known me?—About six years.

2. Have you any reason to be dissatisfied with me?—None whatever. You attended me when I was ill, and I was quite satisfied.

3. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware of any dissatisfaction amongst other members of the Force?—Within the last two years there has been some dissatisfaction. I have heard that from men about the barracks.

GILBERT RONALD MCKAY, Constable, further examined. (No. 216.)

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] I have attended you on several occasions?—Twice.

2. Have you had any reason to be dissatisfied with me?—Not anything particular. I was a bit at the start, when you attended me first. I was not quite satisfied, and I went to another doctor, and he told me the same as you did.

3. Were you at that meeting of police?—Yes.

4. Did you hear my name mentioned?—No.

5. Were you there from start to finish?—Yes.

6. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware of any general dissatisfaction with Dr. Sharman?—I have heard it often, but I do not belong to the barracks.

7. Is it deep-seated, or merely confined to one or two men?—I could not answer that question. I have been here only fifteen months, but I have often heard of dissatisfaction.

DANIEL MURPHY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 217.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Freeman's Bay, and am in charge there.

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] How long have you known me?—About ten years. You have attended me at various times. I have had no reason to be dissatisfied with you.

2. Were you at the police meeting?—Yes.

3. Did you hear my name mentioned?—Not at all.

4. *The Commissioner.*] How many men were present?—About thirty men. Dr. Sharman was not discussed, and I do not know of any dissatisfaction in the Force regarding the surgeon. I am not at the barracks.

JOHN THOMAS WAINHOUSE, Constable, further examined. (No. 218.)

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] I have attended you on several occasions?—Yes, and I have had no reason to be dissatisfied with you. I was at the meeting of the police, and never heard your name mentioned or your position discussed.

2. *The Commissioner.*] How do you account for the matter having been brought so prominently before me if it were not a general expression of opinion on the part of the men?—It was suggested when that meeting closed that if any one thought of anything afterwards they were to bring it before the delegates, and the delegates, if they thought proper, were to bring it before the Commission.

3. Do you know of any dissatisfaction amongst the men with the surgeon?—When I was in the watch-house there was great dissatisfaction.

4. Is it of a personal nature?—It was general dissatisfaction amongst the men in the barracks.

5. What did it arise from?—I could not say, not having been in the barracks; but I know that it did exist.

JAMES ROGERS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 219.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Eden Terrace.

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] I think you know me?—Yes, but you have never attended me.

2. Were you at the police meeting?—Yes, and I did not hear your name mentioned. I was there from start to finish.

3. *The Commissioner.*] Is there any dissatisfaction amongst the men with the surgeon?—I have heard of it amongst the men, but my personal experience in the matter is nil. The surgeon examined me when I joined first.

GEORGE THOMAS STOREY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 220.)

Witness: I am a constable, stationed at Auckland Barracks.

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] I have attended you?—Yes.

2. Have you had any reason to be dissatisfied?—No; I am satisfied.

3. Do you remember having a conversation with me in Queen Street a day or two ago?—I do.

4. I think I asked you what was the cause of this dissatisfaction?—You did.

5. What did you say?—I said because we have a lot of young men up there.

6. Did you not say that you thought eight out of every ten were satisfied?—I do not remember saying that.

7. Were you at that meeting?—I was up till a quarter to 9 o'clock.

8. Up to the time you left, did you hear my name mentioned?—No.

9. *The Commissioner.*] Is there dissatisfaction respecting the surgeon?—Yes, at the barracks.

10. Is it general, or confined to a few?—About half and half. There are some men who are not satisfied who have never been under a doctor.

11. What is the trouble due to?—I have no idea.

WILLIAM EDWARD HUNT, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 221.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Newmarket.

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] I have attended you on only one occasion?—Yes. I have no reason to be dissatisfied with you.

2. Were you at that meeting?—No.

3. Did you get notice to attend?—No; I knew there was going to be a meeting, but I got no notice of the time.

4. Did you receive any communication at all about the meeting?—No; I heard of it when I was in town.

5. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any dissatisfaction?—Yes; when I was at Newton I heard a lot of dissatisfaction there.

6. Is it general?—Yes, with the men, but only a few men. I have not been in the town lately.

7. *Dr. Sharman.*] Can you give any reason for it?—It was about the treatment that the men were receiving.

8. *The Commissioner.*] A general lack of confidence?—Yes.

JOSEPH LIPSCOMBE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 222.)

Witness: I am stationed at Newmarket.

1. *Dr. Sharman.*] I have known you for the last eleven years, and have attended you four times during that period. Have you had any reason to be dissatisfied with me?—No; I have been quite satisfied with your treatment.

2. Were you at that meeting of the police?—I did not know anything about it until I saw the accounts in the papers.

3. You were never given notice of any meeting?—No.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any dissatisfaction with the surgeon?—Yes, it is talked about amongst the young men who live in the barracks.

5. What is it due to?—I could not say.

EDWARD WILLIAM SHARMAN, Police Surgeon, further examined. (No. 223.)

Witness: I should like to make a statement, sir. I asked a constable to come along this morning, and he said, "Certainly I will. I am quite satisfied." I told him what I would ask him, and he repeated that he was quite prepared to come along. As he was going out of the room he said, "Look here, Doctor, I would rather be left out of the matter; I am perfectly satisfied with you." I then put the question pointedly to him, "Are you afraid?" He said, "I have to get my living in the Police Force." That statement was made in the presence of another witness.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How on earth could it affect his position in the Force to come here and say he was satisfied with your statement? Did he give you any reason?—He told me he had to get his living in the Force.

2. I can read between the lines as well as any man, Dr. Sharman, and it seems to me you are asking me to believe that the superior officers of the Police Force in Auckland are personally opposed to you?—No; I do not ask you to do that.

3. Otherwise how can it affect the constable?—That statement was made in the presence of a third party.

4. What difference can it make to his bread and butter?—He told me he would rather be left out of it.

5. I want to know how it is going to affect that man's living in the Police Force?—I do not know.

6. Nor anybody else. I do not understand that sort of thing at all. It passes my comprehension?—That is the statement he made to me.

7. To what do you attribute this feeling on the part of certain men?—I do not know for certain, but I have certain suspicions, and I am not in a position to prove them just at present.

8. In what direction do those suspicions point?—Possibly I may be able to prove them before this Commission ends.

9. Can you give me an outline? Are they individuals who are responsible for this feeling?—You put a question to me yesterday as to whether I wished to continue as Police Surgeon. I said "Yes," and I do for the present.

10. When I put that question I was arguing that you believed there was an undercurrent of feeling against you?—It is quite plain. I believe it.

11. To what is that attributable?—I am not able to prove it just at present.

12. But you have a suspicion, and that must affect an individual?—It will until I can prove it, or disprove my suspicions. I sincerely hope I shall be able to disprove my suspicions.

13. You make a most remarkable statement that a constable asked you not to call him because he would quarrel with his bread and butter?—I had a witness to that.

The Commissioner: It is a most remarkable statement to make. It is as though some authority and power wanted to get you out of your position as Police Surgeon, and to punish any person who gave evidence that might tend to keep you there. Have you any question you would like to ask, Mr. Cullen? It seems a most remarkable statement?

Inspector Cullen: It is a very remarkable statement, because I do not believe there is a man under me, or my officers, who is the least afraid of me when he does right.

The Commissioner: But Dr. Sharman says the man has actually told him so to-day.

Inspector Cullen: The best thing would be for him to bring this man forward. I think you will remember a constable came here and passed very free remarks about myself personally. Constable McGilp is still in the Force, and I think he will tell you that he had no cause to fear anything. It is ridiculous to make the assertion that there are officers in the service who are so corrupt as to have a down on a constable because he chooses to give expression to his feelings.

14. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Do you wish to say anything further, Dr. Sharman?—Yes, I wish to make an explanation. The other day when I spoke here I was suffering under a sense of injustice, and I made a remark that you, sir, very properly took exception to. That was about the Fifth Standard. I wish to withdraw that remark. And I would like to put on record that, as regards my relations with the Force, from the Commissioner downwards to the men, my connection has been of the most agreeable nature. Official documents will prove that I have always treated the Inspector or Commissioner in a most respectful manner. Their communications to me have been couched in respectful and courteous language. The men have treated me with every respect, and I have endeavoured to deal with them, leaving out the professional side of the question, as gentlemen, and I feel confident I have succeeded. Nobody appreciates the difficulties of the Police Force in Auckland more than I do; but, as far as my observation goes, they carry out their duties efficiently. My duties are, first of all, to attend to the sick members of the Force when the cases are reported to me. I have carried out those duties, and with what result you will see, sir, when you read the report of that inquiry. Secondly, I have to protect the interests of the Government by stopping malingering, and in protecting the interests of the Government I have unfortunately had to report cases of drunkenness also.

15. Recently?—No, sir, but at various times. Speaking from memory, I have had to report men for certain offences, and that has been the end of the matter as far as I have been concerned. Very naturally I have been placed in a rather unenviable position. I have had to report constables for acting contrary to my advice, and in the case of one constable who I reported naturally I can quite conceive it is possible that he might harbour some grievance against me. But I wish it again to be understood that I have no feeling of animosity against any member of the Force, from the Commissioner downwards.

16. Then you have nothing further to say?—No, sir; thank you.

JOHN EUGENE CULLEN, Journalist, examined on oath. (No. 224.)

Witness: I am a journalist, and the editor of *Sport* newspaper.

1. *The Commissioner.*] I shall be glad to hear what you have to say?—My object in coming before the Commission is to, as far as possible, get certain matters inquired into connected with the administration of the Police Department in this city. My first charge is one of favouritism on the part of the police in connection with prosecutions against *Sport* newspaper, of which I am part proprietor. Some months ago the *Star* got up a guessing competition, and advertised it. It was in connection with the English Football Team which toured the Dominion last season. The competition was duly carried out. The proprietors of the paper were not proceeded against, but they were warned not to do it again by Commissioner Dinnie. The *Sporting and Dramatic Review* was prosecuted on eighteen charges for transgression of the Gaming Act in regard to book-makers' advertisements, and was fined on the whole of the charges £1 and costs. The *Sport* newspaper, which was published on the morning previous, contained one advertisement from one firm of bookmakers. It was purchased by the detectives on the same day as Mr. Cleave was fined, and, although the matter decided to be objectionable was withdrawn in our next issue, we were fined the sum of £10 and costs on one charge. In my opinion, this was an endeavour to crush a small newspaper because we had criticized the police.

2. The infliction of a heavy penalty would be nothing to do with the police?—I cannot help but infer that, because it is clear that Mr. Dyer, S.M., must have been approached in some way to inflict such a stinging penalty.

3. I have been a Magistrate longer than any Magistrate in New Zealand, and I would like to see anybody approach me about such a matter?—That may be so, but your Worship has a reputation throughout the country. These facts indicate that favouritism was shown somewhere, and I ask why was the daily paper warned, while our paper was heavily fined? Can Mr. Dinnie answer that?

Mr. Dinnie: I cannot tell you offhanded, as I have not the file of papers here. My recollection is that it was scarcely an offence in the case of the *Star*.

The Commissioner: What paper was fined for betting?

Mr. Dinnie: The *Sporting Review* was fined for betting.

Witness: The Inspector sent us your communication, which stated that the *Star* had committed an offence. This was after the papers had come from Wellington.

The Commissioner: Why was not the *Star* prosecuted?

Mr. Dinnie: It was not the same nature of offence that *Sport* was prosecuted for.

4. *The Commissioner.*] I will call for the papers. (To witness): Is there anything you wish to add?—I have another complaint to make, in connection with a fine inflicted on my paper for issuing a leaflet without an imprint. We were fined £5 and costs. The imprint not being on, the Magistrate, of course, had no option but to fine us; but it is almost a daily occurrence to see similar breaches of the law committed by other printers without any notice being taken by the police. Further, most glaring cases have been allowed to pass by the police, notably in June and July last. Rickards's Cinquevalli hangers had the imprint guillotined off, and the Rickards's Chung Ling Soo hangers had the imprint omitted altogether. We called attention to this matter, especially as the printing was done in Australia, and the scheme of cutting off imprints was no doubt devised to defeat the Customs authorities. We called attention to the matter in *Sport* without anything being done. My next complaint is that the police have interfered with discharged prisoners pursuing honest lives. That question was raised here by the Rev. Mr. Budd.

5. I expressed my opinion on the matter then?—I have no desire to go into it, your Worship.

6. My opinions are held by the responsible officers of police?—Perhaps, then, there will be no necessity for me to go into this case I have particularly in view.

7. I hold very strong views on this question, and in one case I immediately requested the Inspector of Police to deal with it, which he did?—I infer that it is my interference in these cases that has brought the police about me over these other matters.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Would you care to let me have the particulars about the cases?—Yes. There is the case of a young fellow who, no doubt, had had a very bad career, but Mr. Whyte got him a job when he came out on the wharf. He explained to Mr. Birch who the man was, and he could have kept the particulars quiet; but when he heard the full history of the case he said to Mr. Whyte, "When you told me the man had come out of gaol you did not tell me he was one of the biggest criminals in Australasia." The police had interfered with him, and when it was reported to us we went into the matter, and spoke to the Inspector about it. This man eventually got a job in the Government service as casual labourer, and the detectives gave him away to his superior officers, who told him he would have to leave. But he got his job back by means of political influence. He went out to the "trots," and the police took an opportunity to proceed against him for trespass, they having authority from the trotting people to keep off all undesirable characters. This man had been out twelve months, however, and was living a proper life. The first day he was at the races he was seen by a detective, but he was not interfered with, with the result that he went again on the third day. He was then ejected from the course, and prosecuted by the trotting-club for trespass. Mr. Beehan waited on the club, who agreed to withdraw the prosecution; but when the Inspector was interviewed he said he would have to proceed with the case. Our paper took the matter up, and at the finish we had the case withdrawn. He paid £3 3s. costs, and gave an undertaking that he would not trespass any more. The next case is that of another young man who got two years, and after he came out he went back to his work as a carrier, but a detective went to a member of the firm and asked him if he knew who was working for him. The young fellow went to a lawyer, who demanded and got a written apology. The manager believed in giving him a chance, and kept him on.

9. *The Commissioner.*] What have you to say in respect to your complaint as to drunkenness in the Force?—The only reason why I bring these matters forward is on account of the reluctance of other people to come forward

10. I think you ought to give me the details?—I will hand you the names. There seems to be a feeling amongst the men at the barracks that some men get special treatment in regard to drunkenness on beat. One member of the Police Force was seen repeatedly drunk in the streets, and he was drunk about three years ago at the sittings of the Supreme Court, and he was found in the Crown Solicitor's office asleep in the Crown Solicitor's chair when the case was called on. One of the Crown law officials drew a legal gentleman's attention to it, and the case proceeded without the police officer. At the last sessions this man was again in a state of intoxication, and the Chief Detective could speak about his condition at those sittings. Then there is a constable who has been guilty of two offences of drunkenness, but who is apparently able to exercise sufficient influence to still retain his position in the Force, because he is still here. In another case the man was transferred away on account of drunkenness. Another man, for his first offence, which occurred some little time ago, instead of getting the same consideration as the other men, was put out of the Force, and I believe that the Inspector, the Sub-Inspector, and sergeants say that this unjust treatment which has been meted out to this last constable has frightened them all, and they do not know, when any man makes a slip, whether they will not be treated in the same way, instead of getting some consideration. On beat duty this last constable was clean, attentive, and always did his duty well. I was astounded when I heard that he had "fallen in."

11. You cannot say whether this second man was dealt with or not?—I believe it is on the police records.

12. You suggest this as the reason for the difference in the treatment of certain men?—I get to hear of most of the constables. They come to me with the evidence.

13. You know that charges of drunkenness are dealt with by the Inspector?—I know that. If the Commissioner will mete out such treatment to one man he will to another; and he should explain where the influence comes from which brings about this different treatment.

14. I shall ask the Commissioner in Wellington whether there is any cause for the differential treatment, so as to give him the opportunity to give the reasons?—The men I have indicated are all really good officers, although they have erred.

15. What do you call a good officer?—When they are sober. The next matter is that the men give me their confidence as to their dissatisfaction with a number of sergeants who worry and harass them on the beats. [Names of sergeants in question handed in.] The men have frequently complained to me, and stated that they would resign next day owing to the action of these sergeants.

16. In what direction?—The men reckon that the sergeants shadow their movements, and ask certain people as to their whereabouts if they are not in view when they come along. They also allege that the sergeants go round the back streets, and into the dark lanes, with a view to harassing them when on beat, to see if they are on their beats; and if the sergeants meet them on their beats they refuse to believe them. The sergeants also stop in the doorways.

17. Do you know whether that is a general complaint as regards the men?—Some very good officers come with it to me.

18. Why do they go to you?—Because they sometimes think I will put in a bit about it.

19. Do they say they are afraid, on account of these three men, to come before this Commission, although they would like to tender their evidence? Have they told you so?—Yes. One man told me last night that he was afraid to come forward when I referred him to the Commission's notification.

20. You knew the Minister gave a personal assurance of immunity?—Yes.

21. Have you dealt with these matters at all in the columns of your paper?—Yes, for some time; but I thought I might lose the paper and everything. I have now got my house in order, and I am not afraid of anything.

22. I asked Mr. Kettle yesterday, and he denied all knowledge of it—as to the allegation that evidence is purchased by the detectives?—I think this is a serious state of affairs. It is an incentive to direct perjury with a lot of people.

23. I admit that it may be abused, but I doubt that it is carried on to any extent. Have any concrete instances been brought under your notice?—I know of one instance where it was very successful.

24. As a rule, the man whose evidence is purchased is not up to much?—That is so.

25. Is there anything else you wish to add?—I wanted to show that when Mr. Dyer was here it was a common practice for the police to arrange certain cases to be taken before Mr. Dyer, and in the event of counsel applying for an adjournment the police would only grant it on condition that the case was adjourned till Mr. Dyer again sat.

26. You are asking me to believe that Magistrates are lending themselves to a very gross violation of their obligations?—It would be so. I still consider that I was a victim. As to the suggestion that evidence is purchased by detectives, I may add that this opens the door to a very serious state of affairs indeed. Detectives addicted to liquor would naturally get in touch with a very undesirable class, and, assuming that they are purchasing evidence from that class, there is an incentive to perjury.

27. The only question I have to consider is if the police are parties to the suggestion you made a little while ago?—The constables express confidence in their chief officers.

Mr. Dinnie: As regards interfering with criminals, I have no information on that matter at all.

The Commissioner: You would deprecate it?

Mr. Dinnie: Undoubtedly. If any information came to my knowledge the man would be dealt with as he ought to be. As to instructions being given to withdraw the information, I have no knowledge of that.

The Commissioner: I will look into that matter.

Witness: I admit that if some of these individuals do not work they want watching.

Inspector Cullen: We know scores and scores of men who have come out of gaol and who are about Auckland. We do not hunt them down. We have enough to do otherwise, without wishing to follow these men. I do not doubt that some overzealous man, or a man who had not a proper sense of his duties, might once in a while do more than he ought to do in the direction indicated.

28. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] As regards men under the influence of drink being dealt with, I can only say that they are dealt with according to the merits of the case as represented to me? —There are men with two charges.

29. Do you know the details?—The police in the barracks know the cases.

Inspector Cullen: I have no recollection of the third man on the list ever having been charged with an offence.

Witness: The man applied for transfer.

The Commissioner: I will go into those cases.

WEDNESDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1909.

PATRICK JOHN DUNNE, Constable, further examined. (No. 225.)

Witness: I wish to supplement my evidence. On Monday I was asked the question if Dr. Sharman's name was mentioned at the meeting of the Auckland police. I was at the meeting, but I wish now to say that nothing was put to the meeting about Dr. Sharman while I was there. Neither was there any reference to the Magistrate.

JAMES TREANOR, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 226.)

Witness: I am the station sergeant at Auckland Central Station. I joined the Force as a constable in October, 1873, and shall have thirty-six years' service in October next. I was promoted sergeant in 1898, and appointed station sergeant on the 1st February, 1909. I am the junior station sergeant, but the senior in service.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make regarding the Police Force?—I have not had justice in the matter of promotion. My juniors have been promoted over my head, both by station sergeants and some Sub-Inspectors. I cannot understand why.

2. Tell me some of the places you have been stationed at from time to time?—Wanganui, Napier, Waipawa, Woodville, and Auckland. I have acted as Clerk of the Court, and at Napier—where I served for nearly nine years on the second occasion—when the Inspector was ill, the Commissioner was good enough to give me the command of the district for nearly two months. No fault has ever been found with me in any shape or form. I do not attribute my being passed over to Mr. Dinnie, because I do not think he had a free hand.

3. Why do you think you were passed over? Do you think it was owing to political influence?—There has been such a talk about political influence that I concluded that that is the cause, although I have no proof.

4. You think that that political influence would not be exercised against you individually, but rather in favour of others?—I should think so.

5. Where were you transferred from to be station sergeant?—From Napier. I was senior sergeant there. I never applied for promotion or transfer, thinking that, all things being equal, I should get my turn in due course. The Commissioner was man enough to offer it to me, and I accepted it.

6. The first station sergeant was appointed on the 1st March, 1906, and you are his senior by five years?—I believe so.

7. Were you as competent in 1906 as you are to-day?—Yes.

8. How old are you?—Fifty-seven.

9. How old were you when you were made a sergeant?—About forty-six.

10. Did you have any difficulty in discharging the ordinary duties of sergeant when you were promoted?—Not the slightest. There was no man who could travel the streets better than I could.

11. Then, there was no physical disability to prevent your being promoted?—No. I was never ill, excepting on one occasion for a fortnight from influenza in Auckland.

12. Is it your decided and deep-rooted opinion that political influence has been the cause of your being passed over?—I think that is so, and if it be any other cause I cannot really account for it. But I have no proof to offer.

13. Do you wish to add anything?—Sub-Inspector Norwood was promoted a sergeant two years and two months after me, and he is now a Sub-Inspector. Station Sergeant Johnston was promoted to that position over two years ago, and he is my junior in the service by three years. When leaving Napier I was presented with a testimonial from the Law Society. I know I have always given satisfaction to the public and to my officers, while my conduct sheet will speak for itself. I do not think the claims of the Chief Detectives should be maintained; neither do I think the sergeants would care to accept the positions of station sergeants, owing to the heavy duties and the long hours entailed, if they are going to be passed over in favour of the detectives.

14. Unless it was looked upon as a stepping-stone to commissioned rank?—Yes; and I understood that station sergeants would be able to qualify for higher rank.

15. Do you think the appointment of station sergeants has justified itself?—I think so.

16. Do you think it is desirable that the duties of station sergeant should be defined?—I hope they will be defined, as it will be more satisfactory. I see no difficulty in defining them. I have been here six months, and have carried out the duties. My hours are long.

17. Has any difficulty arisen from the fact that they have not been defined?—No. I work eleven and a half hours a day, but my health is good, and I am quite satisfied. My superiors are also satisfied.

18. What do you get as house-allowance?—A free house close to the Police-station.

19. You referred to the fact that the Chief Detectives were setting up a claim?—I do not think that any sergeant, under those circumstances, would care to take the duties of station sergeant.

20. But only one Chief Detective has been promoted a Sub-Inspector during the last ten years?—That is all; but I am referring to the future.

21. That is not anything very dreadful to contemplate as affecting the positions of the station sergeants?—I thought there were more than that, on account of the claims of Detective Herbert, and other Chief Detectives down south.

22. Claims are made everywhere, but we have to look at what has actually transpired?—I consider it an unfairness to the uniform men if the detectives are not to have a turn as station sergeants before being promoted, in order to enable them to get into touch with discipline, the uniform men, and the work generally.

23. How long would you give them?—That would depend on the Commissioner and Inspector.

24. But apart from that, you take no exception to the promotion of the Chief Detectives in due course, provided it is carried out properly?—Certainly not; I have many friends in the detective force, and I have always worked harmoniously with them.

25. Taking the uniform men, how does the present Force in Auckland compare with your experience of previous Forces?—They are inexperienced, most of them, and young men. They know very little of their duties, and it is necessary for me to teach them, and there is more trouble in teaching them than in the case of the older hands. The maintenance of discipline is more difficult with the young men, owing, I suppose, to the advantages of life in the colony. They are not the same as the older ones used to be. They are not amenable to discipline, and they have not the zeal that men used to have in former years. Their physique is very far from that of the men we used to enlist formerly. Any one can see that the physique of the Auckland young men is not what it really should be, or what the physique of the young men used to be in years gone by.

26. To what do you attribute the falling-off in the number of suitable candidates?—To the favourable conditions outside. Young men can earn more money outside. I was told only a few days ago by a surveyor that he could not get labourers under 9s. a day, and the country labourer will get 8s. a day. I feel certain, if the pay were a little higher, suitable men could be found, and they would willingly apply for enrolment in the police. The pay should be raised.

27. How do you find the men in respect to intelligence?—They have a fair intelligence; but even after passing the Fifth Standard I find a great deficiency in regard to spelling and composition, and if it were lowered I consider it would be a matter of regret.

28. How do you find the moral character of the new men?—As a whole, as compared with former years, I think it is equally as good.

29. What do you receive in pay at present?—12s. 6d. I got a rise on promotion to station sergeant of 6d., and a free house.

30. Are you aware of anything affecting the relations between the men in the barracks and the Police Surgeon?—Yes; I overheard them say that they were not satisfied with Dr. Sharman, and I know of one instance where a constable called in another doctor, and was prepared to pay him rather than have Dr. Sharman.

31. Is it a general feeling, or confined to a few?—I believe it is the general feeling, but I have never asked any questions on the subject.

32. Do you know what the cause of it is?—I could not say, as I have not been here long enough. I have asked no particulars.

33. Do you think that no station sergeant should be appointed to that position unless he is qualified to be promoted to the commissioned rank?—I do.

34. And that that position, and also that of Chief Detective, should be the passport to the higher rank?—I think so.

35. Is the gymnasium patronised to any great extent?—Very much. I regard it as a magnificent asset, and a great deal of good work has been done by it for the young men since I came here.

36. You have been in country stations?—Yes.

37. Why should one man, because he happens to be in charge of a country station, earn £150 a year, while another does not earn £10 perhaps?—You refer to the additional emoluments at certain stations?

38. Yes, amounts received in addition to their pay?—Of course, the man who earns such an enormous amount as £150 over his pay has to work very long hours in his own time.

39. You need not tell me what a constable has to do at a country station in the way of actual police duty. I have seen so much of it in my time; and any long hours a man works when he is in charge of a country station is generally to put more money into his pocket?—It so happens if a man has the luck to get such a station.

40. From your experience as a police officer of long standing, what would you say would be the most satisfactory way of dealing with what I consider a very serious anomaly?—It has often been suggested by Inspectors that civilians should be appointed to these places.

41. That is impossible. We must put it on one side. The expense of local administration would not stand it, and the police have to have their time utilised with these other appointments which carry emoluments. Would you do away with all emoluments, or would you limit them, or grade the stations, or how would you deal with the question?—I really have never thought of the matter.

42. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When do you consider you were first overlooked as regards advancement?—About 1901 or 1902.

43. *The Commissioner.*] I understand your grievance was that you were not one of the first station sergeants?—Yes; as some were promoted Sub-Inspectors from sergeants.

44. I was dealing with your position as station sergeant?—I mentioned that some have been promoted to Sub-Inspector, and some sergeants to station sergeants later on.

45. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you approve of the system of promotion by merit and seniority?—Yes. No doubt merit is an important matter.

46. *The Commissioner.*] The opinions as to a man's merit may differ?—No doubt.

47. Then, you must agree with the application of the principle to yourself, or there is nothing in it, you understand. Do you think the principle has not been applied to yourself?—It has not.

48. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Of course, you know there are a great many who come forward and say they ought to have been promoted?—Yes; but I do not hold with senior men claiming promotion unless they have the qualifications.

49. Quite so; but they may believe they have got them, and somebody else may not believe that?—Yes.

50. You have to deal, I suppose, with the inquiries into the character of candidates for employment?—Yes, I have a good deal to do with it.

51. Are they more strictly carried out now than they were some years ago?—Yes, decidedly. Every possible inquiry has been instituted that the Inspector could suggest and the sergeants could make.

52. From the time they leave school up to the time they join the service?—Yes.

53. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction as regards the control of the service?—In so far as my inspection is concerned, or the general administration?

54. The general administration?—I have been under seven Commissioners, and I consider that Mr. Dinnie is as good a Commissioner, and that he administers the affairs of the Force as well, and indeed a great deal better, than some of the other Commissioners, because he has had police experience, and most of the others had only military experience. I think he has done everything he could in the interests of the service.

55. Do you think the efficiency of the Force has been well maintained?—Most certainly.

56. *The Commissioner.*] If that is your opinion of the present Commissioner, then the efficiency of the Force has not suffered by your being passed over; or, in other words, you were properly passed over by the present Commissioner?—I do not hold with that at all.

57. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You do not agree with me in that one particular?—No, I do not; and I would like to know the reason why.

58. You know that we have frequently had trouble with young men joining the service, even if their characters have been good until they joined?—Yes.

59. You know they are led into more temptations in the Police Force than in any other public department—as regards drink?—Yes, especially with regard to drinking—to those inclined that way; but, on the whole, the young men are very temperate.

60. We find exceptions, of course?—Yes.

61. And in all large bodies of men the same thing occurs?—Yes.

62. You know that there always has been and always will be dissatisfaction with regard to promotion?—Yes; we have heard more about dissatisfaction in the way of promotions since this inquiry started than we ever heard before.

63. You know that there have been some people writing to the Press bringing disrepute on the service? Have you seen letters in the Press?—Yes.

64. You know there was considerable dissatisfaction at Napier when you were there?—Yes, some dissatisfaction.

65. But that has since been rectified, has it not?—Yes.

66. The fact that station sergeants' duties have not been defined has not interfered at all with the carrying-out of their duties?—No.

67. It would be difficult to define the whole of the duties appertaining to the position?—Yes. There would be difficulty in defining every detail, but, as far as the performance is concerned, I can see no difficulty.

68. You have had instructions what to do from your Inspector?—Yes.

69. I think you know that the Inspectors were asked to define what the station sergeants' duties ought to be?—I believe so.

70. You have been at Napier and here for some time. You have heard nothing about the "handy" man?—I never heard anything of it until I read of it in the newspapers.

71. And you would not believe it?—No.

72. *Inspector Cullen.*] You were at Napier when I was a sergeant there?—Yes.

73. The practice then was for recruits to be sent from the depot to stations such as Napier, and they were trained under the personal supervision of the sergeant in charge?—Yes.

74. Did not these men turn out good constables?—Yes.

75. And with regard to married constables appointed to the service, do you not think the same principle should be applied to them now as was applied to them at that time—that is, transfer them from the depot to stations such as Wanganui, Palmerston North, Napier, and New Plymouth, and so on where they would be under the supervision of the sergeant and Inspector, instead

of sending them to the large centres where they have to pay high rents and live a distance from the station?—I certainly hold with that.

76. With reference to the definition of a station sergeant's duties, is it not a fact that the same remark applies to sergeants in charge of sub-districts?—Yes, the duties are nearly the same.

77. They are not more defined in the case of sub-districts than in the case of station sergeants?—That is so.

78. One station sergeant has been mentioned: is it not a fact that he had eight or nine years' practical police experience longer than you?—Yes.

Inspector Cullen: The remark applies to many in the Force: that their service in the Armed Constabulary counts.

The Commissioner: They are really their seniors in the police service and experience.

79. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I would like to know a little more about this old system of appointing candidates. To whom did they apply in the first instance?—Sometimes they applied to the Inspectors; and they were not called upon at all times to apply to the depot. The Inspectors had a great deal more to do with them in those days than they have now.

80. Did they go into the depot?—Yes. Some had experience before in the police, and were taken on in the districts by order of the Commissioner after the Inspector had communicated with the Commissioner.

81. What instructions had they in the depot in those days?—Just drill. There was no instruction in police duties.

82. How long would they be in the depot?—Some would be there short periods and some long periods.

83. There was no real system?—No.

84. When was that altered?—When Mr. Tunbridge came here.

85. Do you not think that a man gains more practical knowledge of police duties in a large city than he would in an outside quiet place?—It is reckoned that he would; but I think he would have an advantage in places like Wanganui or Napier, where the sergeant might have more time to instruct him.

86. Do you not think they have better supervision in the city than they would get outside?—Yes.

87. Young men require constant supervision?—There is no doubt about that.

88. And you know that married men are sent to lesser centres after twelve months' service?—Sometimes.

89. And you know that it is advisable to have single men in the barracks?—Yes.

90. *The Commissioner.*] What do you consider the maximum age at which a man should be promoted to be a sergeant?—About forty-five, or probably up to fifty. Some men are better physically than others at fifty.

90a. You open the door to dissatisfaction unless you have a settled age: you think fifty is not too old?—No.

91. You understand that a man requires to be a couple of years on sectional duty?—Yes.

92. Do you think the average man over fifty is capable of it?—No; but there are some who are.

93. You said you wanted to ask the Commissioner why you were passed over?—I do not suppose he would tell me.

94. He will tell you this—the same as he told a man yesterday, and as I should expect him to say: that he considered that he promoted a better man. Do you ask him that question?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I promoted the other man in the interests of the service, because I considered him better qualified.

Witness: In what way better qualified?

Mr. Dinnie: I must not go into details.

95. *The Commissioner.*] I dealt with this matter at some length yesterday. I said that as long as the permanent head of the Department thinks proper to appoint certain men over the heads of others, the appointments are made—and must be presumed to be made—in the best interests of the service. That being so, the implication naturally is that a man better than you in the estimation of the Commissioner was appointed over your head. That is so, is it not?—Very well; I must take it at that.

Mr. Dinnie: I will go so far as to say that I do not know whether you were recommended when I did appoint you.

RICHARD MARSACK, Chief Detective, examined on oath. (No. 227.)

Witness: My name is Richard Marsack. I am Chief Detective at Auckland. I was enrolled in 1889, and was made a detective in 1897, and was promoted Chief Detective in 1904. Two days after I entered the Force I commenced to do plain-clothes duty. I have not done that continuously. Two days after joining I was sent to the detective office at Christchurch. On two occasions I was sent out to country stations to relieve officers either sick or on leave. I was employed in that way for six months at the Bealey and at Rakaiia. I then returned to the detective office. In 1893 I was assistant clerk in the district office. I was promoted to the rank of detective in July, 1897, and transferred to Oamaru. I was transferred back to Christchurch in December, 1897. I was transferred to Napier in March, 1902. I was promoted Chief Detective and transferred to Auckland in June, 1904.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general statement you wish to make?—In regard to the degree of education on joining, I would suggest that recruits should undergo an entrance examination equal to, say, the Fourth Standard. This would not shut out the more highly

educated, and I think the man passing such an examination would insure in many cases a better education than one who passed the Fifth Standard many years previously. I think this would also open the door to some men joining the service who would make good constables. Every constable from the moment he enters the service has the French soldier's idea that he carries a marshall's baton in his knapsack, or, in this case, that he may become an Inspector or Commissioner. But naturally very few can attain to the rank of Commissioner. A great many men, as has been said, may make good constables, but are not fitted to go any further. Then, too, a good many men make good sergeants, but stop at that. Then, in the detective branch there are some men who make good detectives, but who are not fitted to hold superior rank. I think there is one thing that should not be neglected, and that is the training of the men physically. We have a very good gymnasium at the Auckland Barracks. In my opinion, a gymnasium should be established at each of the large centres. And not only that, before a man is regularly taken on as a constable on the beat he should receive physical training as to how to handle men—resisting prisoners. I had an opportunity some few weeks back of watching Constable Skinner, who is a well-known athlete, instructing members of the Force here in holds, grips, and wrestling. He is himself a well-known wrestler. Knowledge and skill in these matters is often useful to a constable when arresting drunken men, lunatics, or people who resist arrest. I think that a course of training in these things should be made compulsory in the beginning; and the training should also be carried on in the gymnasium, in the same way as lectures are given to the men by station sergeants and Sub-Inspectors. This would be a great benefit not only to the men themselves, but incidentally to the public at large, and more especially to the unfortunate men who have to be arrested. If a constable does not know how to handle a man properly he has to use far more force if the man resists—and may do him actual damage—than if he knows how to handle a resisting prisoner properly. And I think it should be compulsory that the men should be kept up to a standard of efficiency and training in these respects. There is one other thing that I would like to refer to—and I am sorry to have to do so—and that is regarding the evidence given by the delegates of the sergeants, and the statement they put in. I think it was distinctly unfortunate that the heading of the statement they put in was “Plain Clothes *v.* Uniform,” and that the whole of the document is a discussion on the merits of the two branches of the service, and the emoluments of each. I have found during my twenty years' experience that that sort of rivalry between the two branches of the Force is one of the worst things that could exist. We are all members of the Police Force, and have been enrolled for the preservation of peace and for the protection of life and property. As the statement prepared by the sergeants has been made public, and has been submitted to the Commission, I propose to review it shortly from a detective point of view, and will point out what I consider some inaccuracies and inconsistencies in that statement. One statement that has been made is that the rank of Chief Detective can be reached on an average of fifteen years' service, and that of station sergeant after thirty-one years' service. I submit that these figures do not fairly set forth the position. There have been seven station sergeants appointed since the rank has been established, and, omitting months, their service averages 29·8 years. Taking the last seven Chief Detectives appointed, their average length of service is 16·85 years. These figures do not differ much from those submitted by the sergeants' delegates; but, again, I submit that they do not prove a great deal. It happens occasionally that a number of men are promoted at about the same time—men of about the same age and service—and naturally afterwards a period of stagnation follows. Now, if we look into the future, supposing the promotion of Chief Detective to commissioned rank be barred, it would be a minimum of eight years; or, taking the term of the five Chief Detectives, an average of seventeen years before any of the present detectives could attain the rank of Chief Detective, which, when added to their service as detectives, would show an average length of total service quite as high as that of the station sergeants. The sergeants suggest that on reaching a given point of promotion the uniform man has to travel round the circumference of a circle, while the plain-clothes man cuts across the diameter; and also that during the latter's short service the detective receives 20 per cent. higher salary, and is generally in a better financial position. Now, I submit that this argument is fallacious. Referring statistically to this point, I may point out that during the past twenty years only one detective has been made an Inspector. The average service of the last seven Inspectors appointed has been 27·1 years. Inspector O'Brien's service was twenty-six years—only slightly under the average. During the same period one detective has been promoted Sub-Inspector—Sub-Inspector McGrath. The average service of all the Sub-Inspectors appointed since the rank was established in 1899 is 25·7 years. Mr. McGrath's service when appointed was twenty-seven years. Referring to the last part of the paragraph, I would suggest that the detectives' 20 per cent. higher salary is only apparent, and does not show the actual position. Take an example of two men joining the service at the same time. A goes into the detective branch, and B into the uniform branch. A, after serving four years, goes into the detective office, where he receives 1s. a day plain-clothes allowance. A vacancy occurs, say, in another four years, and he is appointed a detective at 10s. a day, receiving an increment of 1s. a day every three years to 15s. a day, which maximum it would take him fifteen years to reach from the date of his appointment as detective. He receives 1s. 6d. a day house-rent, which is only about 50 per cent. of the rent he has to pay in a city. B, at an average of seven years' service, gets a country station, where he commences at 8s. a day salary. He has a free house, uniform cloth, and, according to station, he receives emoluments for different offices held, as has been already deposed to by witnesses, ranging between £1 a week to £130 a year, in addition to his pay. Now, I submit that although A's pay is nominally 20 per cent. higher than B's, B's annual income is considerably higher than A's. Later in the statement of the sergeants it is claimed that, because a Chief Detective draws pay equal to a Sub-Inspector, he is of equal rank, &c. Now, I cannot say that I have ever heard that claim put forward before, and the position is, I think, fully laid down in Circular 24-99, P.G., 1899, page 186. Without in any way wishing to detract from the importance

and responsibility of the work of the Sub-Inspector, I would draw attention to the fact that, although, as stated, the Chief Detective only controls some ten men, he, together with his staff, is responsible to the Inspector for the detection of all the most serious criminal work of the district. All reports by police officers as to offences of any importance—and often those of little importance—are referred to the Chief Detective; and even where arrests are made by the uniform branch, should the case show any difficulty, it is at once handed over to the detective branch to work up. Later on, under the heading of “Relative Position of Sergeants and Detectives,” reference is made to the difference in pay between sergeants in charge of sub-districts and the detectives under their control, and the suggestion is made that this is subversive of discipline. I again suggest that this difference in pay is only apparent, and is not real, the allowances to the sergeants quite making up the difference in pay; while the detective, on the other hand, by the nature of his work, has to spend money pretty freely, and is altogether financially worse off than his sergeant. As to the discrepancy of the pay having any bad effect on the discipline of the station, I have never heard of it. I have served under a sergeant myself, and our relations were exceedingly cordial; and Sergeant Sheehan himself insists that his relations with his detectives is of a friendly and cordial nature. I think that all branches of the service should have the opportunity of attaining commissioned rank. When a commissioned officer is required, I submit that he should be selected from the senior non-commissioned officers, irrespective of whether they be detectives or uniform men, and they should be selected according to their ability, tempered with seniority. I submit that ability should be the first thing to be considered. We have to look to the public interests—that should be the first thing. The public will be better served by better men becoming officers. I do not say that a young man who has perhaps recently joined, and who might pass a very flattering examination, should be hoisted over the heads of his elders in rank; but I submit that first of all ability should be considered, and secondly seniority. I do not think that promotion should be through the narrow channel of station-sergeant alone, or even of Chief Detective alone. As regards the promotion of men from the rank of detective to commissioned rank, in other places this system has obtained, and I think with a certain amount of success. There are instances of this in the various States of the Australian Commonwealth. In reference to the statement made by the Rev. Mr. Budd as to the allegation that the police and detectives harass discharged prisoners by speaking to their employers about them, or by making inquiries about them, I may state that his reference to one case is incorrect. It was said that owing to the manner in which the police and detectives harassed a man he committed suicide. In the case referred to the man was wanted by the police, there being a warrant out for his arrest on a charge of forging and uttering. Speaking generally regarding the statements made by Mr. Budd, and also by Mr. Cullen, editor of *Sport*, I may say that during the whole of my time I have never known of a well-authenticated case where a detective has gone to an employer and said, “This man you have in your employ is an old criminal”; nor have they spoken to him in such a way as to cause the discharge of the man from his employment. I submit that there is nothing in the statements that have been made in regard to this matter.

2. I did not understand Mr. Budd to imply that it is the general practice. It was more with the object of drawing attention to the point, so that it should be discouraged?—I simply mention the point because it might otherwise be thought that there had been actual cases of that being done. Detective McMahon has asked me to speak on his behalf. I may say that I have been here five years, and during the last two years he has been my senior subordinate, and frequently during that time I have had perhaps to go into the country for some days, or have been away on leave, and in my absence he has performed my duties, and on my return I have always found the work done up to date.

3. In respect to the promotion of Chief Detective McIlveney, what is the feeling of the Chief Detectives generally as to his appointment? Say he comes up here, what are his relations with you?—He does not come near me at all except in a social way.

4. Is he ever sent up here to make inquiries?—Yes, in this district, but not in the city. He made inquiries in regard to the Greenhead case.

5. What are his functions and duties?—He is instructed to take up particular cases.

6. Take the Greenhead case, why has that not fallen to your lot?—I was only too glad that some other officer handled that particular case, or, indeed, any case of the kind. As Chief Detective, my time is more particularly taken up with Court work, and in regulating the work of my subordinates.

7. It does not lead to any misunderstandings?—No. Personally speaking, I think it was a very good appointment—to have a man at Headquarters for special work—to have an officer there who can be sent to any part of the Dominion.

8. You think this appointment has been justified by the results?—Yes.

9. What about the appointment of Detective Quartermain? We recognise that the finger-print branch has been a very important part of the Police Department, but one or two plain-clothes men have taken exception during the Commission to the appointment of Detective Quartermain to fill the position of detective in that branch on account of his being junior to them?—I have not heard of dissatisfaction here as to that.

10. Do you think it would be any advantage to the plain-clothes branch to give them a certain period of service in the finger-print branch?—Yes. I have one man here who is a photographer, and a great portion of his time is taken up with photograph work. I think if he were to pass through the finger-print branch the instruction he would receive would be of great advantage.

11. Might we put it in this way: that the Chief Detectives might be asked to suggest men having special qualifications who might go into the finger-print branch, with a view to increasing the efficiency of the service? Do you think that would be an advantage to the service?—Yes.

12. You regard that branch as being very valuable?—Yes; it is very valuable to the Wellington portion of the service, the bureau being there. I can quite understand the difficulty of establishing other bureaux. It would be a great advantage to have men trained in this class of work. Sometimes photographs are taken and sent to Wellington, and that not only takes up time, but the results are not always as good as if the men taking the photographs had had special training in the finger-print department.

13. Generally speaking, you think the usefulness of the finger-print branch might be extended?—Yes.

14. I take it that you would not be in favour of having any special grade for detectives—acting-detectives, or detective constables, detective sergeants, detective inspectors, &c.: you would rather have the Force one?—Yes. Perhaps I might be allowed here to refer to another matter. One of the detectives said in his evidence yesterday that he thought the detectives should get the 1s. a day plain-clothes allowance as soon as they are appointed to the detective force permanently. I think that is a very reasonable demand. At present as soon as a man goes into the detective office he loses the extra amount. When a man goes into my office he goes there on three months' approval, and at the end of the three months I have to report on him.

15. What proportion of the men have you discarded?—I have not discarded one yet. I would suggest that on a man going into my office he should have 1s. a day extra, as plain-clothes allowance, but he should understand that his receiving that does not take him out of the probation list; and at the end of three months or six months my report would still go in with reference to his being an acting-detective, or as to his worth.

16. Do you know of any deep-seated dissatisfaction with the Police Surgeon?—Yes, unfortunately, I do.

17. What about it?—Taking my own branch of the service, I know there are several men who would not avail themselves of his services, having no confidence in him.

18. What I am more concerned in is whether that dissatisfaction is generally deep-seated, or whether it is confined to a few men?—I should say it is deep-seated.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the finger-print branch, you think it would be well to train those men who do photography in the various districts?—Yes.

20. Do you not think it would be a dangerous procedure if men were sent out to do this work who had not a thorough knowledge of the finger-print system?—I have not much knowledge of the system.

21. If there was a mistake in the classification the result might be serious?—Yes.

22. As regards promotion, you say that all branches of the service should be considered and dealt with on their merits?—Yes.

23. Of course, combining seniority with merit?—Yes.

24. Then there would be no narrow channels to adhere to?—No.

25. You approve of the present system of promotion—that is, for the Inspectors to recommend?—Yes.

26. *The Commissioner.*] Do Inspectors send in periodical recommendations for promotion from detective to Chief Detectives?

Mr. Dinnie. No, that is not done. We have only promoted one, and he was recommended from the rank of Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector.

The Commissioner. I meant from detective to Chief Detective—that comes from the Commissioner alone?

Mr. Dinnie. That is so.

The Commissioner. The question was raised yesterday as to the respective qualifications of certain detectives, and as to the appointment of Detective Broberg to be Chief Detective. That would be made by yourself—you accept the full responsibility of that yourself?

27. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I do. (To witness): What do you say as regards the discipline and efficiency of the Force at present compared with years gone by?—The discipline here is excellent, and compared with years gone by down south, it is superior to what it used to be.

28. You know there always will be dissatisfaction as regards promotion?—Yes; and not only in this service, but in all others.

29. And no matter how strict the inquiries that may be made about the men entering the Force, there are always sure to be some men who will bring discredit on the service?—Yes.

30. *The Commissioner.*] What do you regard as the qualifications for a Chief Detective, taking merit and seniority as the guiding principle?—One of his most important duties is the prosecution of cases in the Court. He must have a certain range of legal knowledge, especially of the law of evidence, and he must be able to apply that knowledge as the cases come up.

31. Would you regard the qualifications of a man for conducting cases in Court as specially valuable in the case of a Chief Detective?—I would.

32. It is only of late years—since the last Commission, in fact—that the Chief Detectives have been required to conduct cases in Court?—It is only of late years that the material rank of Chief Detectives has been altered.

33. Is Detective McMahon qualified to conduct cases in Court?—Yes.

34. Has he a particular faculty that way?—When he has been acting in Court I have been away; but I know he has carried through one or two fairly intricate cases with success.

35. It is very necessary, you admit, that Chief Detectives should conduct their own cases?—Decidedly. Here a good many of the cases of any importance practically go through our hands. Supposing an important arrest is made by the uniform branch, if it is a difficult case to get up it is handed over to the detective branch, and it is the duty of the Chief Detective to appear in Court. Another qualification a Chief Detective has is to know his men, to feel the pulse of his men, to know who is the best man to put on to certain jobs, and to be a general adviser in the matter of

the direction of the work. We have so large an amount of work here, and Court work, that I hardly ever go out to make inquiries. On a few occasions, of course, I have to do so, but my time is fully taken up.

36. Your duties are administrative?—Yes. A man who is able to take up the duties of Chief Detective must be capable of administration also.

37. *Inspector Cullen.*] I think you were here when Mr. Kettle was appointed Magistrate?—He was here before me.

38. Not long?—I have been here five years.

39. During that time have I ever called upon you, or any of your officers, to report on Mr. Kettle's actions?—No; and I was astonished to hear such a statement during the evidence.

40. You have never heard of such a thing?—Never.

CHARLES WILLIAM HENDREY, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 228.)

Witness: I was enrolled in the police on the 5th June, 1879, and promoted to sergeant in March, 1901. I served for twenty-two years before being made a sergeant, and for eighteen years of that period I was a district clerk under various Inspectors.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did the fact of being a district clerk block your promotion to sergeant?—I was promoted conditionally on my leaving the district office, and taking up street duty.

2. Then, if you had not accepted that condition you would be still a district clerk?—I understand so, sir.

3. Who imposed that condition?—It came about this way: Several men who were junior to me in service were promoted. I then applied for promotion to the rank of sergeant, and Commissioner Tunbridge admitted that I was qualified for promotion, and I think he said—I am speaking from memory—that it was not his intention to promote any clerks to the rank of sergeant, but that if I were prepared to leave the district office, and take up street duty, he would immediately promote me. I accepted this condition, and was immediately promoted.

4. You know that district clerks are promoted and left as they are?—I do.

5. Do you think that that is in the best interests of the service?—The promotion of clerks—or junior constables—to the rank of sergeant because they hold positions as clerks has caused very great dissatisfaction.

6. Then, you are not in favour of the present system?—No.

7. You were promoted to be station sergeant on the 1st March, 1906?—Yes. That was soon after your Worship held the last Commission here. I was one of four sergeants selected. I did not apply for that position; neither did I use any influence to gain it.

8. You were promoted to your present rank on the 1st February, 1909?—That is so.

9. Do you wish to say anything with regard to the Force generally?—I would like to say one word with reference to my position on the seniority list. I do not make any complaint, but I think a mistake has been made which can be easily rectified. As station sergeant, in the absence of the Inspector and Sub-Inspector, I was in charge of the station, and incidentally in charge of the detective department, and therefore I submit that my position was superior to that of Chief Detective, and I should have taken precedence on the seniority list to Sub-Inspector McGrath. I think our positions on the list should be reversed.

Mr. Dinnie: I did not notice that before. It will have to be rectified.

The Commissioner: It can be altered when the list is printed again.

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, no doubt.

10. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] You might proceed now with your general remarks respecting the Force, Sub-Inspector Hendrey?—The chief point I wish to speak about is the lack of good candidates now coming forward. In the course of my experience as station sergeant in the city, and of Sub-Inspector, a very large number of men of splendid physique have made application to me to join the Force, and in most cases they have written to the Commissioner for forms. As soon, however, as they have ascertained the rate of pay they have stated that they could make more outside, and we have lost the services of men who would have made very desirable constables. I consider the present state of things as regards recruits is due to the small pay offered to men who have to perform a very difficult and dangerous duty.

11. Have you any views with regard to the localising of the primary steps in connection with the enrolment of men?—We could not have a number of depots where recruits could go through their initial training, and the training now imparted at the depot in Wellington is of considerable assistance to young men, and they have a most capable instructor there in the person of Sergeant Dart. But I do not think the period of training in the depot now is long enough. He has to turn out a policeman in under two months.

12. They do not propose to do that, but only to lay the foundation of the finished article?—They turn them out with a little knowledge, and that is a dangerous thing.

13. How long would you give them?—Not under three months.

14. Then, you would have to increase the size of the depot?

Mr. Dinnie: Not for three months. That is what I have recommended.

15. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] What would you recommend after that?—I should say that one month should be devoted entirely to setting up drill—squad drill and physical drill. That includes the use of the rifle, which is the main instrument used in setting up drill. It is one of the most valuable aids that could be used in that work.

16. Would you be in favour of giving them rifle practice?—Of course. Unless you have the practice it would be of no use other than as an aid to drill, but it would be a grand thing for the country if it had eight hundred really trained men for an emergency.

17. Would it not form a magnificent nucleus to a Defence Force?—In theory it would, but I am afraid it would interfere with the police work.

18. To what extent would it so interfere?—By taking squads of men out to the rifle range and letting them practice. The practice could be obtained, but I think it would have to be done in a man's off hours.

19. But I would offer special inducements to them to qualify as marksmen?—If special inducements could be offered I think the men would subject themselves voluntarily to training in their own time, and then there is no doubt it would be a very desirable thing.

20. The trend of public opinion now is in favour of universal military training, but that is not worth much unless it includes the practical use of firearms?—I know that in the old days rifle practice was so fascinating that men not only would practice in their own time, but pay for their ammunition.

21. Then, I take it that you see no practical difficulty in the way?—No, sir, providing that the men were not taken off the streets for such work; otherwise the public interest would suffer.

22. Then, we have got to this stage: that you think three months in the depot is necessary?—I think so. There is then the question of the appointments issued to the police—that is, the handcuffs, batons, and so on. They are out of date, and we should be supplied with proper batons and handcuffs. In the course of my police experience I have taken many a thrashing sooner than use the batons I have been supplied with. I would have been afraid to use them. I submit that the baton now on issue [sample produced] is a dangerous weapon, and cannot be used without the liability to inflict serious injury, in the shape of a fractured skull or a serious wound. I have the testimony of hospital doctors that where the modern baton is used they have never known of a fracture. The handcuffs we are now using are also out of date. They are made to fit the wrist of one person, with the result that a man with a small wrist can slip them, and in the case of a man with big wrists, the handcuffs cannot be got on to him.

23. What is used in other Forces?—The modern handcuff, which is adjustable to any wrist. [Sample of handcuffs now in use produced.] I have handcuffed a man who has simply slipped them off and handed them to me.

The Commissioner: What is used in other Forces, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: The one now produced; but each station is supplied with the American handcuffs for escort duty in connection with the conveyance of prisoners. [Sample of American modern handcuff produced.]

24. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] What about the lamps?—That is another very important matter, as in this climate our men cannot possibly carry one of the heavy lamps supplied by the Government. The lamp supplied is too hot, and if worn it would be likely to set up disease. The men here buy their own electric-flash lamps, and the refills also.

25. What is the price of the electric lamps?—You get them charged for about 3s. 6d.

26. The prime cost is about 10s.?—Some have to pay £1 1s. for them.

27. The Commissioner stated down south that he had experimented with a number of these lamps, and found they were not efficient, inasmuch as after a time they lost their lighting-power?—That is the fact.

28. How do you overcome that difficulty?—By getting them charged very frequently. It is a difficulty, I admit. Several kinds have been given to me by importers, and none were absolutely satisfactory.

29. The men, you say, buy their own lamps in preference to using the old ones?—It would kill the man who had to wear it here. I wore the old lamp in Wellington in the summer time, and it has a tendency to make a man sick. It is also dirty. What is done here is that a few lamps are kept at the head station and the water-police station trimmed and ready for use.

30. There is a regulation lamp, but you say it is not efficient?—It is not, and has not been used in Auckland since I have been here. I would be sorry to order a man to carry the regulation lamp, because I should expect him to be sick half his time.

31. I suppose the lamps have been the same for many years?—Yes; but I have been several years in Auckland, and they have never been generally used during that period, and for some time before.

32. If it is necessary that the Force should be supplied with lamps they should be so supplied at the cost of the country?—That is so.

Mr. Dinnie: The matter has been under consideration, and we only want to find a suitable lamp.

The Commissioner: It is rather a serious statement that for a long time past the men have been buying their own lamps. You would not be a party to that?

Mr. Dinnie: I was not aware of it.

33. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] I understand, then, that in Auckland the men are not compelled to use the regulation lamps, but are allowed to use others?—That is the position.

34. That has been the practice since you were appointed station sergeant?—Before I was made sergeant at all that practice existed.

35. What do you think is the average cost to the men of the electric lamp?—I think they require to be charged about once every two months, so that a constable has to pay 3s. 6d. every two months to have his lamp recharged, besides the prime cost.

36. Have you any views as to the present practice of enrolling candidates?—I think that before candidates are enrolled they should report themselves to the Inspector of the district, who should be in a position to supply them with the forms to be filled in, and have power to reject a man if he thought he was not a fit person to be given a form. Then the man should be measured to see if he has the qualifications of height and chest. Then he should be examined by the Police Surgeon to see whether he is healthy. Inquiry should then be made locally as to his character, and the application should be referred finally to the Commissioner to make inquiry in other portions of the Dominion, or outside.

37. Every preliminary should first be carried out, and then the application should be passed on to the Commissioner?—Yes. I suggest the medical examination as a means of saving trouble, because a man might be of absolutely good character, but when he is examined by a surgeon, after the usual other inquiries have been made, some physical blemish has been found which has disqualified him.

38. What do you suggest as the proper procedure by which capable men might be invited to join?—I cannot suggest any procedure other than that the advantages of the service should be placed before likely young men, and to take in local recruits.

39. How are you going to place those benefits before them?—You have eight hundred men in the Force.

40. You would make every man a recruiting agent?—I am certain he would be one if the service were made attractive in regard to pay. The conditions and pay should be posted outside each police-station. But I do not think that would be necessary if sufficient inducements were offered, placing the position of a constable a trifle above that of an ordinary labourer, and when he becomes a probationary constable, to place him on an equal footing with the skilled labourer. I think you would have no difficulty then in filling the Force with very desirable men.

41. Therefore, in your opinion, it is the lack of sufficient inducement in the shape of pay that is the main cause of the serious falling-off in recruiting?—I am sure of it. The casual labourer who has no particular qualifications, and of whom nothing in particular is demanded, gets 1s. an hour.

42. That is the result of industrial awards that govern other occupations. What period of probation do you think would be satisfactory before a man is permanently enrolled?—That is an important question. I think that the candidate from the time he goes into the depot should be on probation for a term not exceeding twelve months.

43. That would make six months for the probation period?—Nine months.

44. If you increase the period of training to three months, it would be nine months on probation?—Yes. I will give you an illustration of the necessity for that. Not long ago I had occasion to suspect a man of leading an exceedingly immoral life here, but, although I was convinced that my suspicions were well-founded, it was nearly five months before I was in a position to make a report to the Inspector on the matter. Now, if he had been a probationer constable the Inspector could have made such inquiries that the man could have been got rid of, as he ought to have been, quite six months before. There are a number of men who have recently come from the depot who have only one or two months' service here, and I would be quite prepared to recommend their appointment to the permanent rank, having shown themselves qualified and competent; but I do not think a man should of necessity remain twelve months on probation. He should justify his appointment as a constable before he is actually appointed, and that may be at any time.

45. Did you ever know that man in the Force here [name handed to witness]?—Yes.

46. He has since been dismissed, and I have nothing to do with the circumstances that led up to that dismissal, but what was his general conduct here?—He was a hoodlum, pure and simple. He did his work fairly well at times, but he was up to all sorts of tricks, and I was exceedingly glad when he left us.

47. How long was he here?—About eighteen months.

48. What was he shifted for?—I think he was transferred owing to some complaints about misconduct.

49. Are you present at inquiries made by the Inspector?—Yes, mostly. There are times when the station sergeant takes the men before the Inspector, when I am engaged.

50. Do you think it would be an advantage if the Inspector were empowered to take evidence on oath?—In certain cases, yes.

51. You must make it a practice, or not at all?—There are many cases such as trifling breaches of discipline where it might not be required.

52. That does not make any difference in matters of evidence. Do you think it would be desirable to have it?—I think it would be desirable that the Inspector should have power to take evidence on oath.

53. What is your opinion as to the reduction of the standard of education for recruits?—I attach very great importance to the standard certificate. One finds that the unruly child who will not subject himself to discipline is an unruly man, and, owing to our educational facilities, most children have the opportunity of passing the Fifth Standard, and some a higher standard. Of course, there are cases where, perhaps from misfortune, or distance from a public school, a child may not have the facilities that are available to the children in the towns; but I think that generally it will be found that the New-Zealander who has not passed the Fifth Standard has not done so because he would not continue at school and conform to school discipline.

54. The Commissioner of Police has said more than once that application forms have been sent out to apparently eligible men, but nothing more has been heard of them, and the presumption is that it is on account of the candidates not being able to fulfil the qualification in respect to the standard of education?—Or the pay that is offered.

55. There is nothing in the paper, I think, to show what they get in the shape of pay?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, it shows what they get for a start.

56. *The Commissioner.*] For a start; but presumably a man who wishes to enter the Police Force would know the pay before he applied, but he may not know the educational requirements?—The pay might deter him, of course.

57. Might not a good man, who might otherwise be lost to the Force, be kept by giving a little more latitude in respect to the educational standard?—Perhaps it is one of those cases where it is inadvisable to have a hard-and-fast rule.

58. I take it that a man who ten years ago passed the Fifth Standard is not one whit better than the man who can at the time of enrolment pass the Fourth Standard?—I quite agree with you. I think a considerable amount of discretion should be left in the hands of the head of the Department. I have known splendid men in the Police Force who have never passed the Fourth Standard, but who have justified their position in every way.

59. I suppose there is no difficulty, as a rule, in giving a man time off when he is exceptionally detained at the Court?—It is always done. We give a man here leave from midnight. That is the greatest length of time he gets off. We send the man who has been at Court the greater part of the day out at a quarter to 9 o'clock, and he is relieved from duty at midnight.

60. What is the average time a man is detained in Court?—Probably half an hour in the case of a man who is dealing with simply a case of drunkenness.

61. What time does the Court sit?—10 o'clock.

62. And he is away by 10.30 a.m.?—Just so. Of course, there are some cases where a constable does not get through until 11 or 11.30 a.m., but the average is half an hour.

63. A constable, of course, who has other cases may be detained in Court the whole morning, and perhaps may have to come back in the afternoon?—A man who has an indictable case does not know how long it might last, because it so happens that he might make an arrest at night in which an adjournment for three or four days is necessary. In that case the matter is put down at the bottom of the list.

64. There is no difficulty in giving relief in cases where men on night duty are required to spend a considerable time at Court next day?—No. The Inspector is most considerate in that respect. A man cannot do duty day and night, and we give him all the time off that is possible, of course, always taking into consideration the public interest first.

65. What are the rules in respect to holidays as regards the commissioned officers?—I do not think the commissioned officers avail themselves of many holidays.

Inspector Cullen: I have never had a holiday yet.

66. *The Commissioner.*] The question has been raised. Have you any opinion on the matter?—I think the members of the Force should have fifteen days' leave a year, and that it should be allowed to accumulate for three years, which would give a man time for a decent holiday to go to any part of the Australian Colonies.

67. Do you think the present holidays are not sufficient?—I certainly think that as regards Sunday leave; our men here—when we are full-handed—receive, I should say, about eight Sundays in the twelve months.

68. Have you ever had a case amongst the men here—in barracks or outside—of venereal disease?—There have been cases.

69. How have they been dealt with?—I only know of one case that came out, I think, during the investigation made by Mr. Brabant respecting Dr. Sharman. I think it was found then that one policeman had been suffering from venereal disease. That is the only instance I know of, although I think that some five or six years ago a constable was transferred from here who it was reported was also suffering from that disease. But I only know of this case from hearsay.

70. Having regard to the efficiency of the Force, how, in your opinion, should a man be dealt with who is found to be suffering from such a disease?—The rule in the old Force was that a man found suffering from a disease brought on by his own misconduct received no pay. I think that was a fair rule. He should receive no pay while he is laid up.

Mr. Dinnie: That is the present rule.

71. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] You think it should be made a regulation?—Yes.

72. And, then, you would not allow the man to remain in the same place?—No. I think he should be transferred. And if I found a constable was even associating or consorting with immoral women I would remove him.

73. If he is suffering in that way, is it not the inference that he has been consorting with immoral women?—That is the inference. If his conduct became a scandal, I think he should be shifted out of the service altogether.

74. The point has been raised elsewhere, and especially in Dunedin, as the result of what unfortunately transpired some time ago—as to the strong feeling on the part of the married men to be required to leave barracks in uniform. What is your opinion on that point?—That does not exist here.

75. Have you any general regulation of that sort?—I know of none.

The Commissioner: Was the practice only confined to Dunedin, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, as far as I know. I do not remember issuing any circular about the matter.

The Commissioner: You might bear it in mind and look it up, because I would like to be clear about the matter?

Mr. Dinnie: I will.

Inspector Cullen: There is no circular on the question.

The Commissioner: Would you consider it as coming within the scope of your duty to require a man to leave the barracks in uniform?

Inspector Cullen: No, sir. I never insist on it.

The Commissioner: Would you consider it within your duty?

Inspector Cullen: I would not.

Witness: That is what led to the police strike in Dunedin in 1877 or 1878.

76. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] There is a very strong feeling on the part of the married men down there at being required to do this?—I was in Dunedin then, and a large number of sergeants and constables refused duty owing mainly to be compelled to wear uniform on all occasions.

Mr. Dinnie: There is nothing serious about it, because in all Forces the men have to go home in uniform.

The Commissioner: You agree with me that it is not desirable that such a grievance should exist in Dunedin if it is not the general practice throughout the Force?

Mr. Dinnie: The question was raised at the last Commission, because it was found that the men were going upstairs into other men's rooms.

Witness: I expect a man to present himself for duty, at the time he has to fall in, properly dressed. Further than that, they are not interfered with. They can go to and leave the station in mufti.

77. *The Commissioner:* Have you a sample of the electric lamp?—Yes [sample produced]. I said in my evidence that I thought the cartridges lasted about two months. I was mistaken. The refills give approximately 1,000 flashes, and last about a fortnight's night duty. Then they have to be recharged, as the flash is so dim as to be almost useless. Every fortnight a constable spends on night duty he has to pay 3s. to get his torch refilled.

78. What is the prime cost?—17s. 6d., but some makes cost less. The one under inspection now is regarded by the men as the best in use in Auckland, and it is used by almost the whole Force.

79. Do they purchase them themselves?—Yes; and consequently have also to get them recharged at their own expense. That has been the practice for some time.

80. What about the baton?—I would recommend the modern one, issued to the American police. It is very much lighter than the solid wooden baton in use here. It has a cane core surrounded by pressed leather, and sheathed with rubber. I submit that the baton in use here is a dangerous weapon, and should be withdrawn. Sergeant McKinnon, of the Thames District, imported one of the latest American batons, and he might be asked to exhibit it when the Commission is in that district. It is the only one here. The effect of striking a man a severe blow on the head with that baton would be to only temporarily stun him, and not to cut the flesh or break the bone. I know of three instances only in Auckland in which men have had to use their batons, and that has only been in cases where one constable has had to contend with several men. [Sample of old wooden baton produced.] I also submit a sample of the most up to date American patent handcuffs, which were purchased by Constable Giles from the Defence store [sample produced].

81. But these are not in use by the police?—No.

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, they are, and a number have been obtained. They are not in general use.

Witness: The men have had to buy them, and a number use them.

Inspector Cullen: Two pairs have been sent to this district.

Witness: These are the handcuffs issued to the men by the Department that we use [sample produced].

82. *The Commissioner:* You think the American handcuff is a very much improved pattern?—Yes.

83. How many are there in the station?—Two, but they are only used for escort work.

84. Is there anything else you wish to mention?—Yes; the question of the clothing issued to the men. The tweed is poor, and of various shades of colour. One sees a constable with a blue jumper and black trousers, or a black jumper and a blue pair of trousers. That matter could be easily rectified so that only one pattern and colour of tweed should be issued to the men. Another matter is the exceedingly inferior class of coats that have been issued to the police of this district in the past. I have had to bring under the notice of the Inspector on various occasions coats issued to the men that were no protection against cold or wet. I have known instances where men have become ill from exposure to cold and wet. These cases have been reported by the Inspector to the Police Store, and better coats have been issued. No fault can be found with the coats now being issued, but I think some system should be adopted whereby an inferior class of coat should not be accepted from a contractor or issued to the men. Some of the cloth of the coats I can only compare to a piece of ordinary blue blanket.

85. Would that be apparent to the salesman?—I should think so. I cannot understand how they could have passed through the Defence Stores. Then, in regard to the gymnasium: the gymnasium is of the greatest assistance to the men here, but I think it could be made more useful by the appointment of an expert to coach the men in wrestling and in physical exercises. I think it would repay the Department. We have at Tauranga a constable named Skinner, who is certainly in wrestling, &c., the best man south of the Line for his inches and weight. He is a splendid instructor, and whilst he was stationed in this district he had nearly every man in the station an efficient wrestler, and that was of the greatest use to the men in carrying out their duties. Some of the men are now in other parts of the colony, and others have left the Force. There is a pupil of Skinner who won the amateur wrestling championship of Canada a few months ago; and another constable in Wellington won the heavy weight championship—Constable Tait; and Constable McIvor is an exceedingly clever wrestler; also Constable Moore and others that I do not remember at the moment. You have a depot in Wellington where you get young men in fresh from the country, many of whom know nothing of wrestling or of holds and grips that are useful to know in police work. They are strong able-bodied young men, but they do not know how to apply their strength in arresting resisting prisoners. In the cases of constables inexperienced in wrestling and holds arresting a prisoner who resists it sometimes happens that the constable himself gets on the ground with his prisoner, and the sight is an unpleasant one. But a good wrestler masters his man in one or two seconds, and gets him out of the crowd, and consequently avoids so much trouble and commotion. I would suggest this: that it would pay the Department to appoint an expert in wrestling as a teacher of physical exercises, to be stationed in Wellington mainly, and to give exercises and lessons to the men in the depot. And during his spare time he could go to the big centres; and if he spent, say, a fortnight at a time at each of the centres instructing the men, it would be most valuable to the Force. The Commissioner was good enough not long ago to allow Skinner to come here from Tauranga and remain here for a fortnight, and at the end of his stay here there was a marked difference in the men.

86. You think it would be worth while to appoint him with a status?—I think so. I am told that in Melbourne they pay a professional man to give instruction in these matters to the police there.

87. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It must be very recently, then?—Yes, that may be so.

88. It might be a temporary engagement?—Yes.

89. *The Commissioner.*] Your suggestion is that this man might be employed at the centres and at the depot?—Yes; he could give the men at the depot a good grounding in physical culture and wrestling. I know that in Wellington the Commissioner was good enough to get £10 allotted for the purchase of mats in connection with this class of instruction, and the result of the instruction given proved very beneficial to the men there.

90. Have you anything else you wish to say?—Only with respect to Detective McMahon's capabilities: they have already been referred to by the Chief Detective. In addition, I may say that I have been frequently in Court when Detective McMahon was conducting cases, and I thought he did so in an exceedingly able manner.

91. Do you consider that that is a very important portion of the Chief Detective's duties?—Undoubtedly.

92. Mainly?—Not mainly.

93. What are the others?—To know his men; to know mankind generally, and to see that the work is allotted to the men most competent to perform it.

94. Then, his duties are mainly administrative?—Yes.

95. With regard to the general conduct of the men here?—In the past we have had a lot of trouble, and so we have within the last three or four years.

96. Trouble arising from what?—The conduct of the men who have been sent up here to perform duty.

97. Young men?—Yes, all young men.

98. What is their average period of service?—Some of them, just soon after they come here.

99. I mean the average period of service after their enrolment: they would not be sent here before doing a certain amount of duty in Wellington?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes; they would be sent to any of the four centres.

100. *The Commissioner.*] One centre might happen to get a greater number of them than the others: there would be men in some instances who had just come out of the training depot?—Yes; there have been some men dismissed for drunkenness who have been only three months here, and their conduct has been wholly unsatisfactory from the start.

101. How do you account for them getting into the service?—I do not know.

102. After exhaustive inquiries have been made into a man's antecedents and conduct, and they have been found satisfactory, how is it that he suddenly develops into a drunkard?—I cannot understand it. It is a difficult question to answer.

103. Do you believe that a man suddenly develops into a drunkard?—No, I do not.

104. Then, in all probability the inquiries have not been as exact as they ought to be?—If you would allow me I would like to qualify the last answer. A man dismissed for drunkenness is not necessarily a drunkard. He gets drunk.

105. He is not dismissed for the first offence?—Yes, in some instances. In some instances men have got a chance given to them after one offence.

106. Why the distinction?—I cannot say.

Mr. Dinnie: It depends on the man and his conduct.

The Commissioner: I assume that these are young men who have just joined the Force.

Mr. Dinnie: It is difficult to tell at once whether a man is likely to make a good constable or not.

The Commissioner: If one man gets drunk and is dismissed, and another man gets drunk and is punished in some other way, how do you account for that?

Mr. Dinnie: One man may be useless and the other may be a good man.

Witness: In the case of the man dismissed for drunkenness, if my memory serves me right, he had been before the Inspector for other offences several times, I understand.

107. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Then, he was not dismissed solely for drunkenness, but because he was inefficient?—Yes; because he was drunk, and coupled with the circumstances.

108. Actual drunkenness while on duty?—Yes.

109. How many cases have you had lately?—The Inspector would be better able to tell you. A great number. We have had more last year than during the eight or nine years that I have been in the district.

110. I have to report upon the efficiency, conduct, sobriety, and morality of the Force, and it is necessary that I should know whether, in the opinion of the officers, there has been an abnormal amount of drunkenness in the Force in the city?—Yes.

111. And you cannot attribute it to anything?—No; unless this: that young men are unable perhaps to resist the temptation that may be put before them.

112. But why particularly of late?—Of course, that is only answered by the fact that we are getting men of less will-power than before; or perhaps the discipline now may be a little more vigilant.

113. But vigilance and discipline would not affect a man's conduct in the matter of drunkenness?—No.

Mr. Dinnie: But when the officers are not so vigilant and discipline is not strict cases might escape occasionally.

114. *The Commissioner.*] I would not call that discipline so much as supervision. (To witness): Why should there be stricter supervision now than previously?—The men we have had recently joining have required more supervision.

115. Do I understand that the supervision has had to be made stricter on account of the conduct of some of the men?—Yes. I say this: that some of the men that have been coming into the service lately have not been as good as some of the men coming into the service years ago. They therefore require more constant and keener supervision. We have many worthy young men here—men I am proud to have under me.

116. And you cannot account for what you have stated, as to the cases you have spoken of?—I cannot. The inquiry into the character and antecedents of candidates in this district is very exhaustive. No stone is left unturned to find if the men have any known vices.

117. The value of the report depends upon the individual making the inquiries?—Yes. I think if the reports could be made by a superior officer instead of by a constable it would be better; but the difficulty would be to find a superior officer to make the inquiries, and he would not have the local knowledge. In many cases a constable's investigations in his own district would be better than those of a sergeant who did not know the people in the district.

118. I suppose offences of drunkenness when the men are on duty are only discovered through the sergeant?—Yes; but sometimes men are discovered when going out on duty to be under the influence of liquor, and sometimes they are found to be under the influence of liquor soon after coming in. That occurred not very long ago; and when the relief was marching from the station a man was found to be under the influence of liquor. Sometimes a man is found drunk in the early hours of the morning, or at a late hour at night. Drunkenness usually takes place at night time.

119. Have any cases been found where liquor has been taken into the barracks?—Yes.

120. How long ago?—I had knowledge that liquor was being carried into the station, and, as a result of a conference with the sergeants, the men's overcoats were examined when they came off duty. In some instances bottles of beer were found in the men's pockets.

121. What was done?—They were reported and arrested.

Inspector Cullen: They were called upon to resign.

122. *The Commissioner.*] Would this be free liquor?—I should say the liquor was given to them by publicans, for some consideration or motive.

123. And brought by the men into the station?—Yes.

124. Anything else besides liquor?—No.

125. How long ago was the last instance of that?—Not many months ago two men were found with liquor, and both were called upon to resign.

126. Does the supervision at the present time secure immunity from that as far as possible?—As far as possible, but it does not absolutely prevent it.

127. Taking your present force of men, there is not much to find fault with?—There is not much to find fault with now in the case of the men at the Auckland Station.

128. You are always liable to find faults in the case of new men?—Yes, the new men are always kept under special observation. That is done with two objects: first, to see if they are deserving men; and also to coach them in the efficient discharge of their duties.

129. The duties of station sergeant have never been defined?—No.

130. Do you think it is necessary to do so?—No.

131. You would rather leave it to the Inspector and Sub-Inspector?—Yes; I have passed through the office of station sergeant myself, and know what the duties are. It would be exceedingly difficult to define them. A station sergeant's duty is endless, and must remain endless if it is to be of any real value.

132. Do you think the position has justified itself?—I think so. I should like to see it extended so that certain stations should have a superior officer.

133. You would have to have a system of senior sergeants, as was suggested by Mr. Dinnie the other day?—I was very glad to hear Mr. Dinnie say that.

Mr. Dinnie: We have not arranged it, but only recommended it.

134. *The Commissioner.*] The system of station sergeants was only an experiment?—Yes.

135. And if it has not exactly justified itself, the intention was a right one?—I think it has justified itself. I think it should be extended.

136. Do you attach any importance to the statement that the members of the Force should have a badge or warrant card, or something of that sort?—I think it would be well perhaps if men in plain clothes had something in the shape of a star, which would be recognised as a badge of office. For instance, only last Saturday night one of our constables had to interfere in a street disturbance in plain clothes, and he was seriously injured. I do not say the wearing of a star would have prevented that, but he would have been able to show that he was a police officer.

137. Taking the four station sergeants, and allowing for an extension of the scheme, would you be in favour of making from them the appointments to commissioned rank?—It was generally understood that in course of time they would qualify themselves for advancement to higher rank.

138. Have you any views upon this question of emoluments and differential treatment?—I think the mere fact of a constable being posted at a certain station should not give him a monetary preference over his comrades in the city and other places where there are no extra emoluments.

139. In very few of these stations where the men earn large emoluments do the men do extra police duties?—Yes; but in some places there is a large amount of police duty. Take Dargaville: there is a very efficient constable there, and he must have a large amount of work.

140. Take Rawene?—The position there would be quite different.

141. How would you treat these cases?—I think on such stations as those, where they have the various offices to fill, I would place men best fitted for the rank of sergeant, and fill the rank of sergeant from the constables who perform the duties at those stations. I think the men must be rather above the average intelligence to satisfactorily perform the duties there.

142. A man may have very few offices and a large amount of emolument?—Yes.

143. It is the mileage that runs up the emolument?—Yes. I have known where a constable has upon one journey made £30—not in this district, but in another district.

144. I have passed many a voucher for £5?—In some of the Taranaki stations that has not been an unknown thing.

145. *Inspector Cullen.*] In the case of many of these mileage vouchers a man has to make many visits?—We are told by actuaries that the Police Provident Fund is not very flourishing. I would suggest that over and above a certain amount the extra money should be paid into the Police Provident Fund.

146. *The Commissioner.*] And let it be quite understood that there was the man's pay and the extra emolument he was entitled to?—Yes. You had it in evidence the other day that a man by accepting promotion would have to sacrifice a considerable sum—additional pay received on a country station.

147. I do not think the system is wholesome, but one has to guard against doing anything unjust?—I think it would not be a difficult thing to grade stations so that certain members of the Force should be sent to certain stations before being promoted further. I do think that as soon as it comes to a man's time to be promoted he should not have the opportunity of saying, "I will stay where I am."

The Commissioner: I think that also, and I think it goes to the root of true efficiency.

148. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards inquiries made into the characters of applicants for the Police Force, are they not more strict now than they have ever been previously?—They are very exhaustive and searching. I do not think they could be keener than they are now.

149. Even under the system you suggest, inquiries would have to be made?—Yes; exactly the same. The only reason why I suggest it would be this: that Inspectors of Police are keen readers of human nature, and I think many a man who might perhaps come to you with a good character would be rejected by the Inspector on sight.

150. I have no objection to a local system of inquiry?—We had one man that one would have thought had stepped out of the pages of a comic paper, and people used to laugh at him as he went along the street. I am sure if that man had come before the Inspector he would not have been approved of as a candidate.

151. You know we have an efficient drill instructor in Sergeant Dart?—Yes; he is a man I have the keenest regard for.

Inspector Cullen: I do not think that candidate was passed by Sergeant Dart, but came from the South African police.

The Commissioner: I am afraid they have got a lot to answer for, judging from the records of some of them.

152. *Mr. Dinnie (to witness).*] You think three months' training would be sufficient for the probation class?—Yes. I think that two months might be devoted to instruction in law and police duties, and one month to drill and teaching the men discipline.

153. And during the whole of the time, might not the men be trained in the use of the rifle?—The rifle is the best instrument you can have for physical drill.

154. That is what I have recommended for physical drill. You suggest a new style of baton. That new baton is not used in any Police Force in the world?—No. It is a very much more merciful weapon than that we have been supplied with in the past.

155. Fortunately, you do not want to use it much in this country?—That is so. I have never used a baton during my long experience. There were several times when I should have used a baton, but I was afraid to. The people here do not require it.

156. You think boxing and wrestling very important for the training of recruits?—Yes.

157. I quite approve of the suggestion of the sergeants; in fact, I have spoken to Constable Skinner about making a special appointment; he would be a useful man?—He is one of the best teachers I have come across. He has a way by which he gets the entire confidence of his class.

158. *The Commissioner.*] What age is he?—Thirty-four or thirty-five years.

159. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards extra emoluments, would it not be advisable to dispense with them altogether?—Why should our men do work for other Departments?

160. Of course, you know quite well that in some districts a constable has not sufficient police duty to keep him engaged the whole time?—Still, all his time belongs to the Police Department, and if he is called upon to act for the Justice Department that Department should pay him a fee. I think that amount should be credited to the Police Department in some way or other.

The Commissioner: That is a different thing altogether.

161. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You suggest that his services should be paid for?—Yes.

The Commissioner: I would go a great deal further than that, and make every Department pay for his services.

162. *Mr. Dinnie.*] We have a man in each district, an Inspector of Weights and Measures, and the whole of his time is devoted to that work, but he is paid by our Department. (To witness): As regards inequalities in rents, what suggestion do you make so as to equalise matters?—I would suggest that the Department purchase a site as near the central station as possible, and build there. The ground-area does not require to be large. If the Department, in the cities, were to build a series of flats, the same as they have in the Old Country, the interest on the amount advanced would be amply covered; and they would have free house-rent.

163. And providing they could not get a piece of land for that purpose, would it do if the Department rented houses, and deducted so much from each constable, so that they would know exactly what they have to pay?—I am afraid that would be too costly. The Government would be charged a little more than a private individual would be charged. I am afraid the Government would be paying £1 for a house that would be let to a constable for very much less.

164. You know the difficulty of getting land, and the expense?—Yes; still, where land is so valuable, you do not want to build a lot of cottages. I think the best way would be to have a system of flats. You would have a second barracks. The places could be made fireproof, and kept separate from each other. I have seen such buildings in the Old Country—for instance, in connection with the late Mr. Peabody's estate; and something could be done here on a smaller scale.

165. *The Commissioner.*] The average New-Zealander is not educated up to a system of flats—he wants a cottage of his own, and some ground?—They would have no gardens. I am sure that a number of our men who have to live in very poor dwellings would welcome a modern flat to live in.

166. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think it is desirable that some arrangement should be made so as to equalise the rents they have to pay?—Yes. It is sometimes hard on young married constables, and if they have sickness in the family they are apt to get behind, and it takes them years to pull up again.

167. As regards Constable Gardner, do you suggest that proper inquiry was not made into his character prior to his joining?—No; I do not suggest that.

168. There is also the case of Constable Ratt, who joined here, and who has left the service. You know his previous history—that he was in the Police Force at Birmingham?—I have heard that. I believe his credentials were very good.

169. Was anything known as to his immoral conduct whilst he was here?—No; never hinted.

The Commissioner. I would not place him in the same category as this man.

170. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I mention this because of the statement made by Mr. Arnold?—As a matter of fact, the husband of the woman he went away with had no suspicion of him, and treated him as a friend. The man used to go to his house and eat the unfortunate man's food, and then dishonoured his home.

The Commissioner. I do not excuse it; but there are two sides to the question. I have been through the papers, and do not regard that as bad a case as some of the others.

Mr. Dinnie. The suggestion that was made was that we knew what his character was before he left.

171. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Did he live in the house?—No; he lived in the barracks: he was simply a visitor.

Mr. Dinnie. I simply wish to show that we had no knowledge of his character.

The Commissioner. I do not think you could be presumed to have such knowledge. Did he resign, or was he dismissed?

Mr. Dinnie. He resigned. This woman left with him, and this came out after he left.

172. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You suggest fifteen days' leave annually?—Yes; I think that would be fair. I understand that in the Prisons Department they get fifteen days, and also the bank holidays added.

173. I am sending over to see what leave is given in the Australian States. As regards promotions, you know there always has been a certain amount of dissatisfaction?—Yes; and, as some one has said, there always will be.

174. You agree with the system of merit and seniority combined?—Yes.

175. And you believe the Inspector should be the officer to recommend?—Undoubtedly.

176. He can get from his subordinate officers any additional information he requires?—Yes, and he has his own knowledge of the men. He meets the men continually, and hears what people outside say about them.

177. As regards the clothing, that has been rectified so far as the colour is concerned?—I do not know.

178. It was a mistake in the company supplying the material. As regards overcoats, I may say that we have a new pattern which we will send out for approval. With the exception of one or two complaints from your district we have had no complaints at all?—A large number of the coats here turned out bad.

179. I do not know how they turned out so bad. In regard to conduct, it is the young men we generally have the most trouble with—just after they join?—Yes; that is why I suggest twelve months' probation.

180. Do you not think twelve months would be rather long?—I do not say that a man should be kept on probation. He should be kept until he has justified his appointment or the reverse. They could be permanently appointed as soon as they justified such action being taken, and that might be in one or two months' time, after coming here.

181. The greater number of officers appointed would naturally create greater supervision?—Yes.

182. And the greater the supervision the more men would be reported on?—Yes. More men have been reported on, and that is no doubt owing to greater supervision. If the supervision had been lax, no doubt some of those men might have escaped.

183. You think it is unnecessary to define the duties of station sergeant?—I do not see how you can do it.

184. I suppose you know of no general dissatisfaction in the service as regards the control?—I know what has been said in the House, and the cause for setting up this Commission. My own personal knowledge is nil.

185. Such allegations being made public, does that cause dissatisfaction amongst the men?—No; I do not see how it should affect a man who is not personally affected by such charges.

186. The fact of letters appearing in the Press: would that cause dissatisfaction?—I do not know what the letters would be.

187. Letters running down the Force, for instance?—It might cause a constable to be dissatisfied with his position if he found the Force run down in the Press,

188. *The Commissioner.*] We do not get much of that sort of thing?—No; we get the highest praise from the respectable portion of the community.

189. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There is no unrest amongst the respectable portion of the community with respect to the Police Force?—No; not against the local Force, at any rate.

190. *Inspector Cullen.*] How many men do you say are in the city who have had over twelve months' service?—Speaking from memory, I should say not a dozen.

191. How many would you say have over six months' service?—The bulk of them have under six months' service.

192. At any rate, a large percentage of the men here have very short service and equally poor experience?—That is so.

193. That, of course, makes it more difficult to carry out the duties here?—Yes, very much more difficult for sergeants and other officers to carry out the requirements of the general public.

194. There are a good many men drafted away from here after twelve months' service to other districts?—Yes; the Auckland District is a sort of separator. They are continually skimming the cream and taking away the best men.

195. *The Commissioner.*] All the more credit to you here?—I do not spare myself instructing my subordinates in their duties.

196. *Inspector Cullen.*] You have not had much experience in country stations as a sergeant?—No.

197. Would you not think it would be better if they left a larger percentage of men here that we had trained?—Yes; it would be better for the public.

198. And better for the men themselves to be left here for a certain time—those that are making progress?—We are a distributing centre.

Mr. Dinnie: Not half such a distributing centre as Wellington. There is a much larger field to cover there.

199. *Inspector Cullen.*] That is just one of the points I dare say Mr. Dinnie and I would disagree on. (To witness): You were here when I came here?—Yes, since 1897.

200. Have you known me to call upon you or any subordinate officers to report on Mr. Kettle, or any other Magistrate?—No. I was amazed to hear Mr. Kettle say so. It is absolutely without foundation.

201. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were a district clerk at one time?—Yes, for eighteen years.

202. Did you find it a great advantage?—The greatest possible advantage.

203. You think a clerical training is important to any one who may be promoted afterwards?—Yes, exceedingly favourable. I think more use could be made of it to the Department. After the clerks have become thoroughly efficient, and have been promoted, I think they should go out and learn other duties.

204. *Constable Dunne.*] How long have you known me as a police officer?—You came from the Armed Constabulary in 1879, and you had then seven or eight years' service. I have had experience of you as a police officer since you came from Mangonui, and you have been at Ponsonby for about eight years.

205. In your opinion, how have I performed my duty since I came here?—In an exceedingly satisfactory manner. I have had no ground for complaint; nor have I heard of any ground of complaint.

206. *The Commissioner.*] Would he have made an average sergeant?—He would.

207. *Constable Dunne* (to witness).] You were two or three months in the office when I was stationed in the country?—Yes.

208. Was my correspondence satisfactory?—Yes, always.

209. *The Commissioner.*] What is at the bottom of this trouble about the Police Surgeon?—This sore has been festering for nearly nine years, and it has been getting more intense year by year.

210. And you think it is seriously affecting the Force?—Personally, I have no objection to Dr. Sharman. He has treated me, and I was quite satisfied with his treatment.

211. I am not concerned with the personal aspect, nor with Dr. Sharman's qualifications. I do not presume to question those; but what I am concerned in is the effect upon the Force?—The effect upon the Force is this: that they have practically no doctor. When I say the Force, I mean the men in the Auckland Station.

212. You cannot trace it to anything?—Yes; I know the whole history of the thing. It was all gone into recently.

213. I do not want that. I will get it elsewhere. Is there any provision for giving the men a Sunday off?—Yes. This last year the average of Sunday leave was better than that of the previous year.

214. Something has been said in different places about local information with regard to officers filtering through to Headquarters: have you any knowledge of persons making it their business to communicate matters from the local office to Headquarters?—You mean the "useful" man?

215. That is a term that I am tired of?—I have no knowledge further than I know as a matter of comment that two clerks were dismissed at a minute's notice from Inspector Cullen's office; and it was rumoured, rightly or wrongly, that they were in communication with the Head Office at Wellington.

216. Was that the ground of their dismissal?—I do not know the ground of their dismissal.

217. They were dismissed from the Inspector's office, not from the Force?—Yes.

218. What became of them?—One is in Wellington, in the Force.

219. How did this leak out?—I was stationed at Newton at the time. One constable was doing police duty in plain clothes. He was dismissed at a minute's notice, so report says.

220. Where were they supposed to be conveying this information?—To the Commissioner's office, or to some member of the Commissioner's staff; but I have no personal knowledge of it. I am only repeating what I have heard.

221. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know how he got into the office at all?—No; I am only speaking from hearsay.

222. Of course, you know I get information from many sources?—Yes.

223. Anonymous and otherwise?—Yes, I have no doubt.

224. And from private individuals?—Yes, I have no doubt you do.

The Commissioner: I should be very much surprised if you did not, judging from the samples one sees at times.

Mr. Dinnie: It is very useful at times, but the difficulty is that one is never sure that it is not actuated by malice.

225. *Constable Donovan* (to witness).] In your opinion, would I have made an average sergeant?—Yes; you have done some very good work indeed.

Mr. James Regan, journalist, attended, and made a statement respecting a warder at Mount Eden Prison who seduced one of the female prisoners. He said the matter afterwards came before the Magistrate—Mr. Kettle—who expressed the opinion that the warder in question had committed perjury, and gave instructions that he should be prosecuted accordingly. A month elapsed before the warrant was issued, and in the meantime the defendant left the country. He suggested that influence had been brought to bear to allow the man to get away. The warder's name was Wrack.

The Commissioner informed Mr. Regan that he would ask the Inspector of Police for the particulars of the case, and it would then become a matter of public property.

THURSDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 1909.

BARTHOLOMEW SHEEHAN, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 229.)

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I notice that you did not volunteer evidence in respect to the two men who endeavoured to do you harm by communicating with the Press. It was in answer to a question from the Commissioner?—Yes.

2. And you said you did not impute any blame to me in the matter?—No, and I do not now.

3. *The Commissioner.*] Where do you suggest that these inquiries came from?—I suggest that they filtered through to the Commissioner's office, and from there they got to the Commissioner.

4. Who originated it?—It came from men at my station.

5. Prompted by whom?—By themselves. They thought that by sending this information to the Commissioner's officers—

6. They would curry favour?—There was one in particular who was a friend of somebody in the Commissioner's office.

7. And they thought that by conveying that information they would ingratiate themselves in the office?—Yes.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Still, it was not at my instigation they communicated with the Press at all?—No; I never thought that. That never was in my mind.

CHARLES WILLIAM HENDREY, Sub-Inspector, further examined. (No. 230.)

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It was in answer to a question from the Commissioner that you referred to the two men who were retired from the clerical offices here?—Yes.

2. I suppose you would not be inclined to divulge who made a representation to you on the matter?—It was no one in particular made that representation. It was common rumour.

3. Thank you. I quite appreciate your action in bringing it forward in this way. Those are the names. [Names written, and handed to the Commissioner, and shown to witness.] One of those men was recommended for clerical work by the Inspector?—I could not say. The first man whose name is mentioned was and is a personal friend of my own. I always looked upon him as a high-class, exceedingly honourable man. The second man I do not know.

4. *The Commissioner.*] What was the object of all this?—I do not know. I am simply repeating to you what was the common gossip of the station at the time.

5. These men were said to be conveying information from the local office to the Head Office?—Yes; to somebody at the Head Office; but whether direct or not I cannot say.

6. You cannot say who the person in the Head Office is?—No.

Mr. Dinnie: What I want to suggest is that it was a personal matter between the two men.

7. *The Commissioner.*] When I put the question I avoided any reference to what has been termed the "useful" man; and I asked you if you knew of cases of persons conveying this information, because the only object of conveying this information was that the person might ingratiate himself with Headquarters?—I think I tried to make myself clear yesterday that I had no actual knowledge.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Simply hearsay?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I suggest that this was a personal matter, and is one that will not assist you very much in your Commission.

The Commissioner: That is a matter for me, of course.

Inspector Cullen was the next witness called. Before he was sworn,—

Mr. Dinnie said,—I might go further and say this: If any reference is going to be made to these men [referred to in Sub-Inspector Hendrey's evidence, given above], I wish to say that they are not here, and I think they ought to have notice. This matter will open up a great principle.

The Commissioner: It entirely depends on how far the Inspector goes in his evidence with regard to them; because I should regard it as a severe blow to the discipline of the Force, and impairing its loyalty, if it could be possible that two constables, or even one, were in the habit of using their position in the local office here for the purpose of conveying information to Headquarters. I should be very sorry indeed to think for one moment—indeed, I never have thought—that you personally would be a party to anything of the sort; but I do think that these men could only do it for one purpose—that is, conveying such information—that it would be to the advantage of themselves. It goes to the efficiency of the Force. However, I would rather not say anything about that now, because the Inspector may go upon the exact lines that Sub-Inspector Hendrey has gone on, and say it was only hearsay. If so, I will practically wipe it off my memory.

Mr. Dinnie: Well, I should call them under any circumstances.

The Commissioner: At the same time, so far as the matter has gone at present, it does not seem to imply any act on your part that need cause the slightest reference.

Mr. Dinnie: No; but I would like every one to be studied, and to have fair play; and these men should have an opportunity of giving evidence.

The Commissioner: If anything detrimental to them is said—one of them is in the Force, and one of them has left the Force—I should consider it my duty to protect their interests, as I have done all through, and I should give them an opportunity of being heard; but my action will entirely depend on what the Inspector says with regard to the whole matter. At present Sub-Inspector Hendrey has not advanced it very much.

JOHN CULLEN, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 231.)

Witness: My name is John Cullen. I am senior Inspector of Police in New Zealand. I was enrolled in 1876, and promoted sergeant in 1878. There were some ups and downs in connection with the 10-per-cent. reduction; there were a number of us reduced in rank, and we were subsequently reinstated in our rank. In due turn I was promoted second-class sergeant, and subsequently first-class sergeant. I was appointed Inspector on the 20th September, 1897.

1. *The Commissioner*.] And you have been continuously since then an Inspector?—Yes.

2. How long have you been in charge of this district?—Eleven years yesterday.

3. What is your strength?—The strength of the district is: One Inspector, one Sub-Inspector, one station sergeant, one Chief Detective, seventeen sergeants, six detectives, five acting-detectives, 127 constables, eight district constables, five Native constables, a Matron, and a Police Surgeon—a total of 172 of all classes, omitting the Matron and Police Surgeon.

4. How many sub-districts?—Hamilton, Onehunga, Whangarei, and then there are Newton, Eden Terrace, Newmarket, and Devonport.

5. How many stations?—Sixty-two altogether.

6. Is that a workable district, in the best interests of the service?—Yes; in fact, it could be enlarged, as it was formerly.

7. You find no difficulty whatever?—None whatever.

8. Would it require, if it was extended to its former boundaries, to be worked in with Sub-Inspectors?—I do not know that this district is suitable for Sub-Inspectors. The centres are not large enough. Take the Thames, six or seven thousand; Waihi, six or seven thousand; Hamilton, three or four thousand; Rotorua, about three thousand; Whangarei, about three thousand; and Onehunga, about three thousand.

9. There is no place like Timaru in the South Island, or Palmerston North in the North Island?—Nothing at all.

10. Have you any general statement to make?—What I propose to refer to is simply in reference to a matter that requires attention in the way of organization.

11. To make the Force as highly efficient as possible?—I may refer to things that may not be practicable, or I may refer to matters that should receive attention. I wish to say, of course, that even if I do refer to things that Mr. Dinnie does not agree with, I am not making the statements in opposition to Mr. Dinnie or anybody else, but I am simply going to make suggestions that I think are in the interests of the Force.

12. If you have not had time to get opinions with regard to the Force as a whole during your long term of office I do not know any man who has?—I have had, in addition to that, nearly seven years' experience in the Royal Irish Constabulary. I have had nearly forty years' experience of police work and discipline. First, in regard to the matter of forms of application for enrolment not being available except at Headquarters, that has already been brought under your notice, and it is not necessary, therefore, to again bring it under your notice. If each candidate applied personally to the Inspector in charge of the district, the Inspector could have him measured for height and chest-measurement. He could form an idea of what the man was like; have a chat with him; and gain some idea of his abilities and mental condition; and then the candidate would produce whatever qualifications or certificates he had with regard to education. The next step, I submit, is that he should be medically examined before the whole of the inquiries are made respecting him. Then he should get a form of application, if the medical officer certifies that he is fit physically for the Police Force. Then he applies to the Inspector, with any testimonials he may have, and the Inspector then would make all possible inquiries in his district respecting the man; and when the inquiries were completed he would send the result and the form of application to the Commissioner, who would have the inquiries continued elsewhere. Then, if every-

thing was found satisfactory, the man could be accepted. I think all communications in reference to the candidate should come through the Inspector in charge of the district. They do not now. I do not know whether any candidate is called on for a medical examination; I do not know whether he passes such an examination. I do not know whether he is called to the depot, or whether any communication passes to him at all. I think the Police Surgeon should communicate with Headquarters through the Inspector of the district. That is not the present system. With reference to the teaching given in the depot, when a man proceeds to the depot I think three months there is quite little enough; in fact, I would be inclined to extend it a little longer, with work on the street, say, in Wellington, with experienced constables, if they could possibly have that. Then, I think that the syllabus in use might be modified somewhat by giving the men more practical police instruction, and a little less statute-law. They may hear a lot about statute-law, but they cannot assimilate it. If there was a system of gossipy, chatty lectures on practical everyday police duty they could take that in and understand it, whereas they are not likely to understand the statutes very well. They cannot grasp them. The syllabus now in use was originated by a lawyer.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It has been varied considerably?—I am glad to hear it.

14. *The Commissioner.*] I have been there, and the questions seemed to be very simple, and not to raise any intricate questions with regard to the construction of the statutes at all?—When the recruits are to be sent from the depot, the married men, I think, should be selected for vacancies in, say, Wanganui, Napier, Thames, Palmerston North, and other similar places. The present system of sending every one to the four centres, I think, should be modified so far as married men are concerned. In the first place, they get cheaper house-rent in the places I have named, and they would get houses more convenient to the station. They would be in personal contact with the sergeant in charge of the station, who would give them instruction on things that a man on the street here would not be likely to come in contact with, say, for twelve months; and there would not be the trouble of transferring these men again after twelve months' service. The cost must be pretty considerable of these transfers. That would mean a saving to the Department, and would not impair the efficiency of the service in the least. This is a matter I know what I am speaking about, as I was in charge of stations such as Blenheim, Timaru, Napier, and Wanganui. Men were sent to me who were greenhorns or new recruits, and I had to train the men at those stations, and I think the men I trained will compare with any men in the service to-day. The sergeant in charge of these stations comes into personal contact with the constables in almost every hour of his duty, and if that man is going wrong at the smaller places he is bowled out much more quickly than he would be in a big place. There is no place where a man can carry on longer in an irregular manner than in large centres where there are a lot of men. In the large centres the sergeant in charge of relief goes on parade just as the men are about to march out; he marches them out, and distributes them on their beats. He visits them periodically—perhaps two or three times a day, and perhaps he does not get the same men under him for weeks or months; whereas in a smaller centre the sergeant takes a more personal interest in the men and their duties. As I said before, the saving of expense is a matter of importance. The next thing I wish to refer to is the class of men who have come into the service. There have been some very fine men come in—a large percentage of them—but still there is too large a percentage of what I would class as undesirables. There is nothing to find fault with in the physique of the men generally. There have been a few whose physique was not what it should be, but taking them as a whole the physique is not so very bad; but the conduct of a good many of them—the new hands, especially those who came from such places as South Africa—outside of the Dominion—has been as bad as it could be. These men were, of course, sent here to get rid of them. There are no what you might call badly conducted men in Auckland at the present time. There are a few who are not up to what we expect them to be; but they are young fellows, and I hope they will turn out all right. I think I can say that there are no men with any bad propensities in this district at the present time.

15. May I take it, then, that you are inclined to think that too much importance is attached to previous service as a qualification for enrolment in the Force?—I think that men coming from such places as South Africa—I understand the Commissioner does not take them now, and I doubt if they should be taken at all. That is my experience of them.

16. You know that the requirements are not so precise in connection with previous police experience?—Some of these men have been soldiers, and a man who has been trained as a soldier pure and simple never makes a very good policeman.

17. May I take it that your experience of the average New Zealand recruit is fairly satisfactory?—Yes; much more satisfactory than those who come from Australia and from South Africa. Then there are some who have been discharged soldiers, and came from the English police, and their conduct in many cases has not been all that could be desired. Constable Ratt was a sample of them.

18. Where did he come from?—I think he was in a regiment for eight or nine years, joined the Birmingham police, and then came out here.

19. What about Gardiner?—He was a New-Zealander, and he was anything but a desirable man; and he was an insubordinate man. There has been a good deal said during the Commission about the clerical staff. I may say that I was district clerk to Inspector Pender and Inspector Broham for about five years. I am not antagonistic to the clerical staff, having been one myself; but I say too much has been made of the clerical staff in the service. I do not think a man should be promoted solely because he is a clerk in the office with ten years' service. If he is promoted, I think he should go at once into uniform, excepting in the case of the clerks in the four centres, where you want a sergeant in charge of the three or four men in the office. A man should not, in my opinion, remain more than three years at that kind of work after he attains the rank of sergeant, because if you keep him too long at clerical work he becomes fossilised, and loses the grip of practical police work, and when he is required to go out on practical police duty he is

absolutely lost for a long time, and is at the mercy of the men, although he might have everything at his fingers' ends as regards routine, prosecutions, and the getting-up of a case.

20. How long have you had your present district clerk?—About two years. I have told him that I thought he was standing in his own light in not going out, and I have advised him to take up street duty for a time.

Mr. Dinnie: So have I.

21. *The Commissioner.*] How would you keep up your supply of district clerks?—It does not take long to become efficient as a clerk.

22. I do not say it does, but it has been dinned into me that it is impossible to train an intelligent clerk under so many years?—If I get an intelligent man into my office, it does not take long for to acquire a good knowledge of office matters. In our office the district clerk takes charge of all correspondence, and opens all letters excepting those marked "Private" and "Confidential," and those that come from the Commissioner and the Chief Detective. Those I deal with myself. Another clerk looks after the accounts, vouchers, and pay-sheets. That work takes up pretty well all his time. Another keeps the records. Well, if I confine a steady man to the accounts, or records, and he cannot become competent in six months, I think he is a duffer, and I would be inclined to turn him out, as there is nothing intricate in our clerical work.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Six months in one branch?—Yes.

24. *The Commissioner.*] Would you make it a matter of ordinary regulation that a man on promotion to sergeant—he being a district clerk—should go out?—After three years.

25. I mean, without leaving it to his option at all?—Most decidedly; but, of course, there are sergeants in Wanganui, Napier, and Greymouth who are district clerks, and I think that is wrong. I do not see why they should be sergeants, and stay in the office. I think they should be out doing their duty.

26. You would not interfere with the old sergeants who are district clerks?—No. I have one in my mind who has been a very long time a district clerk. To my knowledge, he has been in the office twenty-three or twenty-four years, and he would be no use on the streets. I would not interfere with that man, because it is only a question of his remaining there until he gets a pension. Had he been a robust, strong man I would turn him out, and let him do his proper work.

27. Then, would you promote men from the assistant clerks—you must keep up the supply—or would you take them from the smaller districts?—Or from your own office. At the time the vacancy occurred in my office when the present clerk was appointed, I had a man I had recommended for the position, but not for the rank of sergeant. He was quite capable of running my office. He is at the Thames now; so that I could have done without that sergeant at that time. Another matter is that some of the clerks are vain. Certainly they put on side with the sergeants and constables in charge of stations, and I have seen one clerk who even patronised the Inspector.

28. It was said so in Dunedin?—I think the more men you can pass through the district office for, say, two or three years the better it is for the service, and the men themselves.

29. It is very valuable training?—It is the best you can give them; and the more men you can put through the district office the better it will be for the service.

30. That is the opinion I have been inclined to hold too; but it has been rather discounted by the extreme importance attached by some witnesses to having men in the district office who are qualified and experienced. You are going on different lines to other witnesses?—I am going on my own lines. I can quite understand that any officer who has not been a district clerk himself would like to have the most efficient man he could get to carry on his office-work, because he would not know the run of things and the routine.

31. You recognise that there might be some Inspectors who might do very poor work if they had not good district clerks?—I admit that; but, still, if a man is not capable of carrying out one branch of his work in six months, he is no good. If he is not a qualified district clerk in two years he is not worth keeping in the office. The more men you pass through the district office the better it is for the service, and you are going to get more efficient men, because a man in the office sees everything that goes through it; he sees the decision of the Inspector in regard to everything; he sees when matters are referred to the Crown Solicitor or the Law Officers, or the Commissioner. It is a very great experience for him. Of course, there are no men in the service who have such fine times as the officers of the clerical staff. They are generally due at 9 o'clock in the morning, and they are away at 5 o'clock, and have an hour for lunch. In my office they have to come back since the Main Trunk service started to get the mail ready for the express, but they are off every Saturday at 1 o'clock, excepting the clerk who remains to attend to the telegrams, and they need not show up until Monday morning. The record clerk comes back on Sunday to enter up the correspondence that has to go away by Sunday's mail or steamer. The clerks have every night in bed, and never run any chance of being knocked about; so that they have the best times of any in the service.

32. What is the pay?—One shilling additional for plain clothes for seven days a week. The district clerk gets the same—1s.—in addition to his sergeant's pay, and 10s. 6d. a week house-allowance. I notice the question has been raised about putting them on uniform duty.

33. I have rather abandoned that?—I am not in favour of it, although I might say I call out my men on special occasions. On Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve they had to turn out. At big race-meetings they might be required. I do not ask the sergeants, but only the assistant clerks, to turn out in uniform. They have to keep their uniforms and turn out in case of emergency, but beyond that I would not go. I would not turn them into watch-house keepers on Sundays nor anything like that, but keep them on a beat, and certainly keep them a shorter time in the office than they are kept at present. The question of promotions has been a burning one right throughout the service, and in respect to that question I hold views that possibly might not be held by many. To put it shortly, I believe that no man should be promoted until he has passed an examination in practical police work, and the law thereon, and on being recommended by his Inspector.

34. Would you have a physical examination?—I would have a medical examination, to see if he were fit to stand strenuous police duty on the street for, say, two or three years.

35. We hear of one sergeant who lost 2 stone in a very short time?—I dare say, yes. He was new to his work, and possibly he came from North Otago, and this climate would be a bit trying. If he were inclined to be fat it would certainly help to take it off.

36. Is there anything you wish to add?—A good deal has been said about political influence being used to get promotion. I think that if there were a hard-and-fast rule laid down that no man should be promoted until he had passed that examination, and had a recommendation, it would do away with any such suggestion.

37. On what lines would you have that examination?—In practical police work.

38. Who should conduct the examination?—I think the Inspectors would be able to set questions on practical police work.

39. But you would have to have the same examination for the whole Dominion?—Yes; and it would have to be held on the same day in all parts. Then there could be no complaint about favouritism, and some independent man should be appointed to apportion the marks on the papers. I think it would be easy to find a man who would be capable of doing that work outside the Police Department altogether. This examination would apply, of course, to any man before being appointed to the rank of either a detective or a sergeant, as the detective requires to know about discipline, practical police duty, and the law bearing thereon, just as much as the sergeant. For the rank of Sub-Inspector I should be inclined to have a competitive examination. That is the system pursued at Home in the service I was connected with; but no man could go up for examination until he had been recommended by his District Inspector. Then he is examined by the County Inspector for the rank of sergeant, and if he passes is promoted in turn according to seniority. Marks are also given for records of merit. They count for a man in his examinations. But there is no such thing here. If there were certain marks required, and marks for a record of merit were allowed to count in the examination, one could understand what it meant; but I do not know now what our record of merit here means. In the Royal Irish Constabulary you received marks for merit; and, on the other hand, if you had marks of another kind, deductions were made from your examination marks. If you had a bad record, marks were deducted; so that there was an incentive for men to be well conducted, and if they were ambitious. I think there should be an examination for the higher ranks, and whether it was competitive or merely a "pass" examination, there should be such an examination. I think there should not be so many transfers in the service, especially of the younger men. It is a habit of these young fellows to apply for transfers from one cause or another, and they get them at the Government expense. I think such transfers should be at the expense of the applicants.

40. Was not that the rule? It was in some branches of the service?—It used to be the rule at one time that if a man applied for a transfer he had to pay his own expenses in our Department.

Mr. Dinnie: They do now in some cases.

The Commissioner: It is left to your recommendation whether the expenses should be paid or not?

Mr. Dinnie: That is so.

Witness: As to the question of the transfer of defaulters, I do not know whether it is not better to leave many of the defaulters in the districts where they default rather than transfer them to others. A man can be better looked after in the district where his propensities are known than in another district where it takes a long time to find him out. I also think that every report, for or against a man, should be attached to his defaulter's sheet, and that the sheet should go with him to any district he goes to. A man may come to me from another district, and I get his defaulter's sheet. There may be nothing, or very little, against him; yet it would be a great help to me if I saw these papers, as I would then know what sort of a man he was. On the other hand, if there were anything to his credit—where he had done good work—it would be to his advantage to give him the opportunity of seeing the record.

Mr. Dinnie: That would be on his merit sheet.

Witness: There are many things he might do that would not be on his merit sheet, and you have no idea what he has done. There is simply a note on the paper, "For ability displayed in such a case," but that gives you no idea what the man has done, or what his capabilities are.

41. *The Commissioner:* Do you get many of these transfers for offences?—I get my share—some from Christchurch, and some from Wellington.

42. Would you discriminate between offences for which a man should be transferred?—Yes. There are some offences for which a man should be transferred. You might know that a man was carrying on in a way you could not approve of—say, with a woman—and the sooner a man like that is transferred the better, although you could not prove anything about it.

43. Supposing a man is found drunk on duty?—I do not know that that offence should necessitate his transfer.

44. You would keep him in the place?—Yes; I think I would be better able to exercise control over that man than the sergeants over him if he went to another place.

45. You do not think it would be a bad example to the men to keep him in the same place?—I would simply punish him, and keep him there, and I would not be afraid of his example. But if he were a vicious man, I would discharge him.

46. Would you make it a rule that every man who was transferred for reasons personal to himself should pay his own expenses?—In certain cases.

47. You said "carrying on with a woman"?—I would make that man pay his expenses.

48. I think you said that perhaps you could not substantiate it?—Even so. I have a man in my district at the present time. He came here from another district; but I did not know sufficient about his history in the other district to justify my recommending him for promotion, and

I have not recommended him for promotion on that account. However, if the papers were given to me I might feel inclined to recommend it. I am doubtful, because I did not know the man. I think he was transferred from another district because of some irregularities in the accounts at the place where he was the Clerk of Court, or something; but I am only speaking of what I heard.

49. A man might have a serious injustice done to him through not being promoted, or the Force might have a serious injustice done to it, on the other hand, through a certain man being recommended for promotion?—That is so, but if all the papers connected with a case of transfer were attached to the man's defaulter's sheet I would know where I stood; and I know of no reason why they should not be attached. It might, of course, necessitate the making of copies of files that would be kept in the Commissioner's office.

50. But they should be referred to you?—Yes. It would not be much trouble to keep the information up, and I could keep it in my possession, and put it on the man's defaulter's sheet. As long as the men are with me, I keep every report respecting them attached to their defaulter's sheet; but when a man is transferred from my district those papers are detached, because it has been a standing rule—for twenty years probably—that the Inspector has to make no recommendation or suggestion with the man going to another district.

51. Really, then, when a man is transferred the matter is wiped out, although he is transferred for some default?—Yes; unless it is entered on his defaulter's sheet. I have a case where a sergeant was transferred from the south to my district, and there was nothing on the defaulter's sheet to show why he was transferred.

52. How long ago was that?—Two or three years ago. I think you know the case.

53. I know the case, but was it not on the defaulter's list?—It was not on his sheet.

54. That is the man you mean, I suppose [name indicated]?—Yes.

55. I fancy it is. It is a well-known case. I am surprised you were not informed of that?—No papers came with him to me, and I had to get the facts from the man himself. I think a copy of the file in such cases should be attached to the defaulter's sheet.

56. Is there any other matter you wish to speak of?—Yes; there is the question of the police stores, and the promotion of the officer who occupies the position of storekeeper there. I do not know why he was promoted, and I do not see any reason why he should have been promoted.

57. Do you think that this case created dissatisfaction?—It has created very great dissatisfaction. Of course, in going round the district from station to station, I have the confidence of the men in those stations, and they speak freely, and I know that this is a burning question with them—that a man with that service should be promoted. He was in the position of storekeeper when promoted, but they think he should not have been. I do not see why he should have been promoted; and I do not think he has been a success as storekeeper, judging by the stores we have been getting. As the Sub-Inspector told you yesterday, we have been getting coats for the men here that no practical man should have allowed to go out. If he is a competent man, he should not have allowed these shoddy things to go out. Many of the coats were, as the Sub-Inspector described them, nothing but blue blanket, and they could not possibly keep out the water. Then, the waterproof coats fall off the men's backs the second time they wear them. No practical storekeeper would allow them to go out.

58. Have things in this respect improved lately?—The coats have been called in. I sent one of the "blue blanket" coats to the Commissioner, to see it for himself, and the result was that they were called in. I did not send it to the store, but to the Commissioner direct. I do not see why a sergeant should hold the position of storekeeper at all. There cannot be such a lot of work to do there; and if the stores are to be kept as police stores I think that some deserving constable who has been injured in the service, and therefore not fit for hard work, should get the position.

59. Of course, he must have some knowledge of clothing?—He is supposed to. Then, the uniform-cloth that has been coming along has been most unsatisfactory as regards colour and quality. I do not know whether they do it now, but at the time the Defence Storekeeper kept our stores there was a "sealed pattern" of everything—shako, overcoat, mackintosh, and the cloth served out for uniforms—contracted for, and if the contractor sent anything different from the sealed pattern it was quickly returned to him. That is what should be done now. The finger-print branch is a very important branch of the service, and I should be glad to see its sphere of usefulness extended. It is of very great assistance. There should be no difficulty in regard to stationing one of the experts in Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin, the duplicate prints to be kept in Wellington. At present there is a Finger-print Expert and his assistant. The former has been away from New Zealand about six months, his assistant being left in charge; and if he had been taken ill, or had resigned, the Department would have been without an expert.

60. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that there is another one there—a third one?—I never heard of him.

Mr. Dinnie. Then, you are lacking in information.

The Commissioner. I understand there was a constable who attended at the office during certain hours.

Mr. Dinnie. He has been there a long time.

Witness. That means that in due course another constable would be promoted to the rank of detective in the office, and it would bring about dissatisfaction, as in the case of Detective Quartermain.

61. *The Commissioner.*] Then, you think the promotion of Detective Quartermain has created dissatisfaction?—It has undoubtedly. Now that he is a full-blown detective he should be sent to Auckland to take charge of the finger-print branch here, as a sub-branch. Then a smart detective could take his place in Wellington, and acquire a knowledge of the system. He in turn could be sent to Christchurch, and another one to Dunedin. They would form sub-branches of the central department, which would then never be short of experts, because we know there is no

guarantee that one or two men will always continue in good health, or a state of efficiency. It is like the passing of a number of men through the district office for clerical work. The same principle applies to the finger-print department, because the more men who acquire a technical knowledge of the work the better it is for the department.

62. The Commissioner of Police holds very different opinions from you on this matter. I am not an expert regarding it?—Neither am I.

63. He has imbued me with the impression that there is always danger in having branches of this finger-print department?—I do not see it.

Mr. Dinnie: They know the danger quite well in England, where they have only the one centre for the whole of England. They would not have a separate branch for a certain reason.

Witness: I do not say a separate branch, but a sub-branch.

Mr. Dinnie: It is dangerous.

64. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Do you wish to deal with any other matter?—There is the matter of small police districts also. I am strongly of opinion that the present districts should be reorganized, and that such districts as Thames, Invercargill, Greymouth especially, and probably Napier, should cease to be separate districts.

65. As the opportunity occurred, you would simply add these to the larger ones?—Yes; but I do not say that the men now occupying positions in those places of Inspectors should be interfered with.

66. There are nine Inspectors?—There were only seven up to seven or eight years ago. Then Invercargill was created a separate district; and within the last year or two Thames has been created.

67. What was the object in creating the Thames District, particularly?—I do not know; it is beyond me.

68. The question must have been discussed from time to time?—Not with me. I never made any complaint; and there has been none against my administration, as far as I know. The public have not complained that the police-work was not attended to in that district as it should be, and it was a matter of surprise to me when it was taken off Auckland and formed into a separate district without any reference to me whatever. There was no need for it.

69. You never reported on it?—No; and I was never asked to do so.

70. Was that the only portion of your district that was affected? Was any portion of it put on to the Wanganui District?—No; only the Thames was cut out, and I understood the original intention was to create a district at Hamilton.

71. The late Minister of Justice told us that, but that it was found that it could not be worked satisfactorily?—I have a fair idea of what the cause of that has been, especially at Hamilton.

72. The Minister of Justice lived at the Thames, of course?—Apart from that, there is another thing, and I have a pretty fair idea the King-country had a good deal to do with it.

73. The Minister of Justice would have an intimate personal knowledge of the question, I suppose? What had the King-country to do with it?—Well, the liquor trade. The cutting-off of the Thames District I do not think has made a difference to my work of fifteen minutes a day.

74. Then, you say deliberately that, as far as the efficiency of the Force is concerned, it has not helped it?—It has not; and experienced men know that the greater the number of small districts that you have the less efficiency there is. You cannot have efficiency with small districts, and the Inspector in charge of a small district, if he is left there a number of years, has so little to do that he becomes fossilised, and gets out of touch with a lot of the work. Some time ago a suggestion was put forward that when a favourable opportunity arose the Dominion should be divided into four divisions, and that there should be a divisional Superintendent who would take charge of each division. He would be in charge of all Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors in the division, who would communicate with him, but the Superintendent would communicate with the Commissioner. That system would make, I think, for the efficiency of the service, because it would do away with these very small districts. The Inspectors, who would otherwise be in charge of these small districts, should be located at the four centres under the Superintendent, with a district for themselves to look after. In this district you could give an Inspector from Mercer to Helensville, and there would be plenty of work for himself and one Sub-Inspector.

75. I think two Superintendents would be enough?—Well, you know the physical features of the country pretty well, sir. Still, I think one Superintendent should have charge of all the country south of the Waitaki River. Another man would have Canterbury and West Coast (including the present Greymouth District). The Wellington Superintendent would have charge of Nelson, Marlborough, and the present districts of Napier and Wanganui. The Auckland Superintendent would have charge of the whole of the Provincial District of Auckland, including Gisborne.

76. What would be his duties?—He would exercise a general supervision. He would control the accounts, deal with recommendations from the Commissioner for promotions, transfers, the punishment of the men, the maintenance of discipline. He would have to visit the different centres from time to time, and would have plenty to do. But he would be relieved of a lot of routine work that the Inspector in charge of a district like this has to attend to now. When he was called away the Inspector would take his place. He would be the senior officer, and would act for the Superintendent in all matters of routine. Of course, the Inspector should not deal with the accounts, the transfers of men, and recommendations, unless the Superintendent was absolutely out of the district on leave.

77. You would be practically creating four Superintendents, and doing away with four Inspectors?—No; you would still have four Inspectors.

78. You have nine Inspectors now, but you would not want nine Inspectors and four Superintendents?—No.

79. The creation of four superintendencies would have the effect of doing away with four Inspectors?—The Inspectors would become Superintendents. Instead of having nine Inspectors you would have eight.

80. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How many?—Four Inspectors and four Superintendents; and in Invercargill there would be a Sub-Inspector in charge. There would also be Sub-Inspectors at Napier, Wanganui, and Timaru. A Sub-Inspector would be quite capable of managing those sub-districts. I was over five years at Timaru, and also the district clerk, so that I know it pretty well. The district extended then from the Waitaki to somewhere near Rakaia, while the northern station followed on.

81. *The Commissioner.*] With the enormously increased facilities for travelling about, I am not at all sure that two Superintendents would not do the work you want four for?—There were two originally—one in charge of the North and one in charge of the South Islands.

82. But you cannot compare the travelling facilities then and now?—It is much more easy to get about now, but with the increased population there is an increased number of stations.

83. The Commissioner of Police has now to exercise a general control over the whole Dominion?—He cannot go round and visit all the stations.

84. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It takes five years to get round the whole of them?—There are stations in my district that neither yourself nor your predecessor have been able to visit. That indicates that something is wanted in the shape of divisions in which the present smaller police districts would be merged.

85. How many Sub-Inspectors would you want under your scheme?—I do not think you would want a Sub-Inspector at the Thames.

86. *The Commissioner.*] You would have Sub-Inspectors in all places carrying over a certain population?—I should have one at Napier, one probably at New Plymouth, one at Wanganui, Palmerston North, Timaru, Greymouth, and Invercargill. Of course, I know that this scheme would create a lot of discussion and opposition in certain quarters.

Mr. Dinnie. And increase the expenditure?

The Commissioner. Not to a large extent; but that, after all, is not the main consideration.

Witness. The country would be continuously supervised, and the supervision would be better, even if it did increase the expenditure. But I do not think it would, because you would do away with some of the Inspectors. You might have to promote one or two men to Sub-Inspectors. I know the routine from top to bottom, and what the police requirements of all stations are. There are only two places I have not been in—Gisborne and Invercargill—and I am certain that the physical features of the country lend themselves to such a division as I suggest.

87. *The Commissioner.*] I think that is so; but I do not agree with you as to the need for four Superintendents?—That is a matter of detail, but the principle is the same.

88. The North Island is growing so enormously that you might want two there, and one could do the South, if it did not have the effect of creating jealousy between the two Islands?—He would want to be a very good man to take charge of the South Island. It is, of course, more easily worked than the North Island. I know of no district that is more easily worked than Christchurch. You can get to any station from your office in a few hours. Here it is very different. If you go up north you are nearly a fortnight away. Another advantage under my proposal would be that an Inspector under the Auckland Superintendent would take charge of the Superintendent's office, and thereby gain experience that would qualify him to succeed the Superintendent when his turn came for promotion. The duties would be of considerable importance, and, instead of being buried away in places like the Thames, Greymouth, or Invercargill, where he is actually rusting for want of work, he would be always in touch with the work, and handling big matters.

89. There is an enormous difference in the amount of work done here and at the Thames?—There is no comparison.

90. Do you wish to add anything?—Another matter which has caused a good deal of dissatisfaction throughout the service is the promotion of Sub-Inspector Wright, and his retention in the Commissioner's office. As to myself, I have no quarrel with Sub-Inspector Wright. We never had any quarrel; but in the interests of the service I think the Sub-Inspector should not remain there.

91. Would you go so far as to say that you know of no reason, from a police point of view, why the officers in the Commissioner's office should hold police rank?—I know of no reason at all why they should hold the rank of Sub-Inspector. The men in authority should hold the same rank.

92. What is the difference? Has not the Chief Clerk as much authority as the Under-Secretary of any Department?—Yes.

93. Then, you find fault with the promotion of the Chief Clerk to the rank of Sub-Inspector?—Yes.

94. Would you go so far as to say that you think it would be in the best interests of the service if the Commissioner's staff were a civilian staff?—At one time I thought it should not be, but I have modified my views rather of late, in view of what I believe to be the dissatisfaction with the present staff in the Commissioner's office. There is a Sub-Inspector and two sergeants there now, and I think that is not satisfactory. They are doing clerical work, and holding commissioned and non-commissioned rank. Those men should be out doing their duty.

95. Then, you would have a civilian staff?—I would prefer a civilian staff to what it is at the present time; but I think a police staff would be better.

96. At any rate, you are certain that the present position creates dissatisfaction in the Force?—Yes. And it is not discipline to have a Sub-Inspector sending out wires to an Inspector, and giving him instructions. Failing discipline on proper lines, then what should be done is that the

senior officer in the service should be stationed at Wellington, and as soon as the Commissioner leaves Wellington the senior officer should take his place. That is discipline. The Chief Clerk, no matter whether he is a civilian or a police officer, should on no account be allowed to issue instructions to any officer senior to himself. I know that the promotion of the Sub-Inspector and of the two sergeants that are there now has given very great dissatisfaction throughout the service. The promotion of the district clerks has also caused dissatisfaction. These things have created a lot of dissatisfaction in the service, and will continue to do so.

97. And that affects efficiency?—I am sure of it.

98. As to uniforms?—I think the Government should pay for the making-up of the uniforms, and that when a man retires from the service, or is discharged, the uniform should be returned to the Department, even if it has to be burnt. Men should not be allowed to take their helmets and jumpers with them when they leave the service, to masquerade in them, or give them to somebody else to masquerade in them. There should be a statutory provision to punish any man who is found wearing police uniform without authority. There is an enactment to punish people for wearing a military uniform without authority, but it is the more necessary in the case of the police uniforms, because any evilly disposed person might masquerade as a policeman, and commit a crime.

99. Does a constable, on retiring from the Force, hand in nothing?—I make him hand in his shako, although there is no regulation to that effect.

100. Anything else?—No.

101. What about the buttons?—The buttons and cloth are supplied by the Department. The man has a vested interest in what he has made up. He is part owner of the jumper, and that is more than half the uniform. It would be better if they handed in their jumper and tunic. They have to hand in their overcoats now unless they have been on issue a certain time.

102. As to the shakos?—I think they should be done away with, and black helmets substituted.

103. You would not make any difference in different parts of New Zealand?—No. I would have black or blue helmets, of the same cloth as the shako is made of now. They are very dressy, and much more comfortable than the shako, which does not afford much shelter from the sun or rain, while the helmets do. The police could wear white helmets throughout the Dominion in the summer-time, or from the beginning of October to the middle of May sometimes, according to the weather. I should not put the question before the men at all as to whether they would have helmets or shakos. The Department should take the matter in hand. In my opinion helmets are the best, because they are the lightest. Then, as to the question of empowering Inspectors to take evidence on oath in all inquiries before Inspectors, I think that is absolutely necessary.

104. I cannot see the slightest reason for refusing it?—I do not know why it should be refused. There are very few cases in which there are a number of witnesses for or against a man charged with an offence in which there is not lying, and I think that if a man was on his oath there would be less lying. I have had civilians come up and make statements before me that I knew to be absolutely wrong.

105. I think a change will be made?—I do not think there is anything else I wish to say.

106. You have not touched upon one matter of importance at the present time, and that is the falling-off in the recruiting. Of course, the position might become very serious indeed. What views have you on that subject?—At the time the last increase of pay was granted I was strongly in favour of 1s. being granted in addition to the 7s. 6d. I told the Commissioner that I thought it was necessary. I am still of opinion that if the 1s. a day had been granted at that time we would have got a better stamp of recruits, and a better stamp than we are likely to get now.

107. You have to be practical in these things. The question is whether the increase would have the desired effect?—I think there is a great misunderstanding among young fellows about their position in the service if they joined. I think they do not understand the benefits.

108. I was going to ask you later how you are going to bring the attraction of the service before young men anxious to join the Force, because there are no doubt attractions?—Yes, and very great attractions. I may say that there are no men I think in New Zealand who are more looked up to and respected than the country constable, so long as he is a straight-going, clean-living man. He is the general adviser for the whole district, and if any one is in trouble he is the first man they will run to for advice. He has many privileges there too. He has a good house, perhaps of six or seven rooms, and with all conveniences, even to hot and cold water. They have good stabling accommodation for their horses, and have generally a place to keep their buggy. In nearly all country stations they keep their horse and buggy, and drive out the wife and family when they feel inclined. They have a paddock in which to keep their horse; and many of them keep a cow.

109. They are not allowed to keep fowls?—Yes, with permission. You could not allow them to keep fowls where there is a troop horse, but where they keep their own horse there is no very great objection to it.

110. How would you bring these advantages before the youth of the Dominion?—If you could get into contact with them, and point out what the advantages are, I think the result would be good. A good many of the men in the Force are good marksmen with the rifle—as good as you could find in New Zealand, and many of them are good sports all round.

111. You attach some importance to this?—Yes; I attach very great importance to it. I know many of these men go out duck and pheasant shooting. I would not interfere with them in that; I would rather encourage them.

112. Looking at it from a strictly practical point of view, do you think the increase in pay from 7s. 6d. to 8s. 6d. a day, and bringing before them the advantages of joining the Force, would have the effect of increasing the number of recruits?—I think you would get a good many young

fellows to come forward. There is another thing. These men in country stations are getting an allowance for their horse of from £20 to £26 a year. Many of them are Clerks of Court, for which they get £10 a year; and some of them are Clerks of Licensing Committees, for which they get extra pay; and there are documents sent to them for service by lawyers, for which they get a fee.

113. I suppose it is really the drudgery of the first four or five years?—Yes, or what they would call drudgery. They do not look at the advantages ahead.

114. Have you any opinion about the standard of education?—The Fifth Standard is not too low. But I think there should be more latitude allowed in respect of this matter. I know many men of poor educational attainments, some of the keenest and most practical and best workers in the service.

115. Yes; and I know one or two men who can hardly spell words of three letters, and yet they are excellent constables?—Yes; I had one man under me at Christchurch who was very poorly educated, and yet he was the best working and most reliable man on the beat.

116. I know one or two of higher rank to whom that remark would apply?—Yes; they are good-working men. I would not be in favour of drawing a hard-and-fast line at the Fifth Standard. I think that most young fellows who have passed the Fifth Standard leave school at fourteen, and go out to work about the country, and do not read anything but newspapers—and some not the highest class of newspapers; and they lose most of what they have been taught. There is another matter in regard to which I think there should be more latitude. The present standard of height for admission to the Force is 5 ft. 9 in. The best men I have known have been from 5 ft. 8 in. to 5 ft. 10 in. I am not an advocate of big men.

117. Some persons say they would not give a dump for a policeman unless he has a most imposing appearance?—That is all nonsense.

118. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The public like to see a big man?—I am speaking from a practical knowledge of police, and if I were going where there was a “rough and tumble” I would take men of 5 ft. 8 in. to 5 ft. 10 in. before taking men over 5 ft. 10 in.

119. It was suggested to me that in one place there was a man very much below the standard, or he appeared to be, and that people used to look at him in the street, and point him out as a man they would not mind having a “go” at—he appeared small?—A man 5 ft. 8½ in. or 5 ft. 8¾ in., with a normal chest-development, is not a small man.

120. Would you reduce the standard from 5 ft. 9 in. to 5 ft. 8 in.?—I think 5 ft. 8 in. might bring in too many small men, although I know some men of 5 ft. 8 in. who are some of the best men I have.

Mr. Dinnie. We do not adhere to 5 ft. 9 in.; we take men at 5 ft. 8¾ in., and if there was a good man at 5 ft. 8½ in. we would stretch a point. It depends on his physique, &c., otherwise.

The Commissioner. That disposes of it.

Witness. I think if young men in the country really knew what the advantages of police life are after leaving the cities we would have a great many more applicants than we have.

121. *The Commissioner.*] You said that three months’ instruction to recruits was necessary?—Yes.

122. What about the period of probation?—At present a man gets no credit for the two months he spends in the depot.

123. Do you not think it would be valuable to know a little more about a man than can be learned in three months?—I do not say that he should be accepted; but I think from the time of his going into the depot there should be a limit of twelve months during which he should be kept if necessary, and his services should count from the day he joined the depot. He loses two months’ service now. If a man were to give proof or qualifications for permanent appointment in, say, six months after joining the depot, his appointment should be confirmed; but there are others whose appointment might be held over for twelve months, because one man may pick up his duties much more quickly than another. And one man’s conduct may become apparent in the first month; and another man, if he is a cunning man, may not show his real conduct or nature for six or eight months. I should say that twelve months from the time of joining the depot should be allowed in cases where it is found necessary. The Inspector and Sub-Inspector in the centres, or the officer in charge of the smaller towns, if married men were sent there, could report on them periodically, say, every three months, and say how they were progressing, and whether the appointment should be confirmed or not.

124. Do you know of any real grievance with regard to the time that the men are kept about the Courts?—We allow them time off. We cannot allow them the time off they expect, because the number of men at our disposal will not allow us to strip the streets. It is a bad practice to strip the beats sometimes at 12 o’clock at night or 3 in the morning. But as far as we possibly can we meet such cases. If we had sufficient men I should be inclined to do it in this way: If a man has been on night duty, and has had to attend Court for a certain number of days, instead of ordinary “time off,” give him a day off altogether—exempt him from duty. Then you would not strip the beats at night.

125. Are you sufficiently manned?—We could do with a good deal more.

126. With advantage to the public?—Yes; the population here is rapidly increasing. You have been round the suburbs, and you must have seen the great increase in population since you were last here.

127. I understood you to say that there is no provision requiring men to go home in uniform?—No; I would not think of making such a regulation unless I received an order from Headquarters. If an order is issued to me I obey it.

128. A great deal has been said about the claims of the plain-clothes men and the uniform men?—I have never been a detective, so that what I say about the detectives is not said from their

standpoint. I do not think they are overpaid. The sergeants—as has often been said—are the backbone of the Force. The detectives in their sphere are equally as important as the sergeants. You cannot do without one, and you cannot do without the other.

129. You would open the avenues of promotion to each according to his merit in the service?—Yes; the promotion of station sergeants and Chief Detectives in all cases is altogether wrong.

130. What about the station sergeants?—When the station sergeants were appointed, I understood that the men appointed to that position would be the future Sub-Inspectors. That has not been followed. That being so, there may be some station sergeants who may not be considered fit for further promotion.

131. We know, as a matter of fact, that is so?—If that is assumed, I say that the rank of senior sergeant should be substituted for station sergeant.

132. And then make the promotions—with the Chief Detectives—according to merit?—Yes; let them be qualified by examination, and show that they are fit. A man to be qualified should have a knowledge of the law of evidence, and the methods of conducting cases in Court—what acts are necessary to constitute certain offences, and to justify certain prosecutions, &c.

133. Do you think that station sergeants have justified their creation?—We wanted men in the position. We must have men in that position. We cannot carry on the work without it.

134. Looking at the fact that they are not exclusively qualified for higher rank, you say it would be better to have senior sergeants?—Yes; if it were possible you might have more than one senior sergeant to carry out the duties in a place like this. The hours are very long, and it will be necessary in the near future to have two senior sergeants.

135. How many station sergeants have you had?—Two. The question of defining the duties of station sergeants has cropped up; that is a matter that must be left to routine.

136. Do you think it would be any advantage to limit the appointment of station sergeants to those men who would *prima facie* obtain commissioned rank?—I thought at the time that would have been followed.

137. Some of the station sergeants are inclined to make it a grievance that they have not been promoted?—Some station sergeants I have not been in touch with for the last twenty-five years.

138. We will not consider their qualifications beyond the fact that some of them will not be considered fit for promotion to higher rank?—Yes; if you have an examination for them, either a pass examination or a competitive one, you will very soon find out who are fit and who are not fit for higher rank.

139. But would you limit it to men who might be able to pass an examination—even a competitive one—and yet whom you would not select?—Yes; that is another thing I wish to refer to: that the Inspector should be asked for recommendations for men to rank as station sergeants, Chief Detectives, and Sub-Inspectors.

140. You know the commissioned officers are appointed by Cabinet?—Where does Cabinet get its information from?

141. From the Commissioner?—Where does the Commissioner get his information from?

142. Presumably from his knowledge of the men?—He cannot have the intimate knowledge of the men that is possessed by the Inspectors in charge of the district.

Mr. Dinnie: The Inspector has always recommended each man who has been promoted.

143. *The Commissioner.*] Did you recommend the present Sub-Inspector?—Verbally, I did so.

144. *Mr. Dinnie.*] A strong verbal one?—Yes, very strong.

145. *The Commissioner.*] He was recognised as being a man thoroughly competent?—Yes; you could not deny it.

146. Do I understand that you are not called upon to recommend men for station sergeant?—That is so—only for sergeants and detectives, or, at least, acting-detectives.

147. Presumably it is done primarily from Headquarters?—Yes. I think there should be some reference from the Commissioner to the Inspectors in relation to this matter.

148. That is, the Inspectors should recommend the men they think best qualified for station sergeant?—Yes.

149. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think you did recommend those two men in a report—Sub-Inspector Hendrey and another officer?—I have no recollection of it. If I did I was not called upon for a recommendation.

Mr. Dinnie: Anyhow, you submitted one.

150. *The Commissioner.*] Who was the man?—Sergeant Sheehan.

151. With regard to allegations of drunkenness against any of the men, have you any views in reference to these cases?—I suppose you know the procedure, that if a man is drunk the Commissioner deals with it.

152. Yes. What has been the effect upon the Force of the treatment of any cases of drunkenness—I mean the effect upon the efficiency of the Force?—I could not say.

153. You seem to have had an abnormal number of cases of drunkenness within the last twelve months?—Yes; more cases than within the preceding two years.

154. Is it your opinion that it is necessary when you get these cases to deal with them drastically?—Yes.

155. To what do you attribute the abnormal number of cases of drunkenness?—It is hard to say. Some men must come in with a liking for drink. There must be the files dealing with the inquiries. Many of them have passed through my hands. On the face of them, the papers seem very exhaustive; but still there must have been something left unattended to by those who made the inquiries.

156. The value of the inquiries entirely depends on the person making them. Your system may be perfect, but yet break down absolutely in practice?—Yes; but a good many of these drunken cases were those of men from South Africa and elsewhere. They were not New-Zealanders to a great extent. There were some of them, but the others preponderated.

157. Are there special temptations to the men in Auckland?—It is a big place. There are temptations in all big places—more than in smaller places. A man goes out here, and he meets people. Perhaps he goes into a hotel, and is a friend of the barmaid, or has some other friend in the hotel; and they are more likely to drink than if they were in a small town. There is no doubt that drink has come from somewhere into the barracks at night time.

158. You have found instances of liquor being taken there?—Yes, for a long time you could not go upstairs without tripping over empty beer-bottles in the passages. I have counted as many as a dozen and a half coming down stairs in the morning. That is why we had the men searched in the morning as they came in. We felt we were taking extreme measures, but the interests of the service demanded that we should take some such steps. They were steps we did not like to take, but we had to take them in the interests of the service.

159. And this liquor, was it being gratuitously supplied to them?—Yes, I presume so. I do not think they purchased it.

160. They must have got into touch with the licensees?—The explanation of one of the two men who were found bringing in liquor was that a friend got it and gave it to him in the street. The explanation of the other was that a man he did not know brought it to him in the street and gave it to him.

161. There was a good deal of drinking going on in the barracks?—Yes, a good deal; and it is not all stamped out yet.

162. You are exercising strict supervision?—Yes, we are doing our best. I have a reputation down south for being extra strict. I am naturally a strict man.

163. When you found these men taking liquor in, what did you do with them?—They were both called upon to resign. There was no “bones” about it. The Commissioner, as soon as he got the papers, asked me to call upon them to resign, and they did resign.

164. That would have a very salutary effect?—Yes, no doubt. The amount of liquor brought in since then has been very small compared with what it used to be. There are very few men now who go in for much liquor. I do not suppose there are more than four or five men here of whom the service would be well rid. All the others I look upon as being the makings of good policemen.

165. You referred to a certain constable just now [name written down and handed to the Commissioner]?—He was sent up here for street duty, and he remained here on street duty for about a year, and then the man in charge of a district died, and he was transferred.

166. What has been his conduct since?—It has been good. I have asked the Magistrate to whom he has acted as Clerk of Court.

167. Probably he has had a warning, and it has had its effect?—Yes; to my knowledge, and according to the information supplied by the Magistrate, his conduct has been exemplary. He applied for a position out there. I did not know the reason for the transfer, and submitted to the Commissioner that he should get it if there was nothing in the district he came from to justify him being kept out; and the result was he got the transfer.

168. Have you any views on the question of leaving constables any time in charge of stations?—Yes; there are some men whom it would be well to transfer every twelve months, and there are other men whom you might never transfer.

169. You cannot differentiate very well; you must have a rule?—I think the rule should be to transfer a man when there is need for it.

170. You think it should be an open question?—Yes; let every man be dealt with according to the merits of his case.

171. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Transfer him when there is need for it?—Yes; because one man can live in a station all his life, and he will be the same man towards the public.

172. *The Commissioner.*] And another man might not be able to justify his position?—Just so. You might say, “That man has been long enough there, and the place is getting ahead of him. I have a smaller station that would suit this man.” You select a man for a particular station. Right through my district I select men for particular stations. I know the requirements of the stations, and I know the men.

173. Are your recommendations generally approved?—Yes; in reference to men taking charge of stations in this district. There have been some exceptions.

174. Then, there have been special reasons?—Yes; the men were senior to any man I had here.

175. Has it been the practice to give men the option of taking particular stations?—Yes, in transfers. I do not approve of it. It has been the practice to a certain extent, but not to any great extent. There have been cases where it has occurred. I think, also, that a man should be promoted whether he wants it or not; he should not be given the option.

176. These merit lists, you evidently do not attach much value to them?—No.

177. What would you substitute for them?—I think there are certain cases where you should give a monetary reward.

178. They get rewards now?—Yes, in sly-grog selling and other cases.

179. Arresting sailors?—There is not much merit in arresting sailors.

180. But still it represents money?—Yes.

181. The notes in favour have no value?—No; they are not much taken into consideration, and demerits and merits are not. I think they should be.

182. Take a case where a man gets a monetary reward for arrest and conviction of a Chinaman in connection with the opium trade?—I think he should not get much consideration; it has been paid for.

183. From the police point of view, you would not attach much importance to it?—No, because he has got his special compensation for such cases.

184. What cases do you consider should count in the case of promotion?—Detecting crime.

185. That would be chiefly for detectives?—I often recommend detectives in that respect. Records of merit would be more definite and understandable than a note in favour. If a man is given a record of merit you know it is for a meritorious act; for instance, if he stops a runaway horse or saves a person from drowning, these are cases where a man should get a record of merit.

186. Do you attach any importance to the men having identification cards or badges?—If you could get the men to carry them when in plain clothes it would be all right.

187. But they would have to carry them as a matter of discipline?—A young fellow, say, is living in the barracks, and he puts a badge under the lapel of his coat. He has, say, two or three suits, and he might be careless, or would not bother to change the badge from one suit to the other.

188. But he does not forget his cigarette-case or tobacco?—Those are things he would think of.

189. If it was a matter of discipline they would think more about these badges. Do you think it is of any value?—I do not think it is of any value.

Mr. Dinnie: In the Metropolitan Police of London they carry a small leather case with a card inside; on one side is the warrant card, and on the other side is a memorandum book. They always carry them as a warrant of identification.

190. *The Commissioner.*] We had a question raised the other day with regard to the promotion of certain men as sergeants upon the recommendation of the Inspectors. One man was specially referred to as not being recommended by you?—There are the names of two men I did not recommend [names written down, and handed to the Commissioner]. I would not recommend that man [indicating name to the Commissioner].

191. Did you think him fit to be promoted to sergeant?—No.

192. Then, you did not recommend him?—I would not recommend him on any account. I had that man under me as a constable.

193. He has apparently been recommended since by another Inspector; that is why he was promoted?—I do not know what another Inspector has done.

Mr. Dinnie: You are taking the wrong man. It was the other man who was recommended afterwards.

194. *The Commissioner* (to witness) [name written down by witness and handed to the Commissioner]. You declined to recommend him?—Yes; I understand he was recommended by other Inspectors. The man was away from me for twelve months, I think.

195. Do you think he would become qualified in twelve months?—He may have been improved by the change. He was transferred from here because he did not give satisfaction.

196. Give me the history of this man who has been promoted since. Were you asked whether you would recommend him?—I was asked to make a station for him about the suburbs.

197. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Did he apply?—No, it came from you.

198. *The Commissioner.*] Were you asked to make a vacancy for him in a suburban station?—Yes.

199. With a view to what?—In order that he might get more police experience, and qualify for the rank of sergeant.

200. What did you say?—I could not see my way to do one of the suburban constables an injustice by taking him from charge of a station and putting this man in his place for six months.

201. What happened then?—I said so. I heard no more about it; but he got promoted.

202. I only wanted to know what you knew about it?—Nothing more than that. I take no responsibility in regard to that case at all.

203. With regard to this vexed question of the Police Surgeon: what is it all about?—I think you will find it all in the papers and file.

204. I have not seen the report of the inquiry. Why has it been allowed to remain in this position?—It is a thing that has grown. For many years back there has been growing discontent, and complaints from the men.

205. Do you think it is general?—Oh, it is general.

206. And you think it is being made really a question of grievance?—Yes. I may say that I had him to attend to me twice. I make no complaint about his treatment of me; in fact, knowing the feeling amongst the men I had him to attend to me to show them that I at least had confidence in him. There was nothing serious the matter with me. I had another medical man who attended to myself and the family, and that man has attended us ever since.

207. Have you made any representations to the Commissioner at any time with regard to certain stations being supplied with rubber gloves, disinfectants, &c.?—The wharf station and Devonport are supplied with them.

208. You heard Constable Thompson speaking with regard to this matter?—Yes.

209. Do you think it necessary?—Yes, I think these things should be supplied to certain stations, like the stations along the foreshore of the harbour, and Aratapu, Dargaville, and Whangarei probably.

210. It has been urged that certain stations should be supplied with fuel, light, &c.?—I think certain stations should be given a certain allowance for lighting. In most suburban stations, if they have an office—and most of them have—they are allowed so much for gas.

211. At any rate, it is a matter that might be considered?—Yes; it would not add a great amount to the expenditure. The constables do most of their writing at night. A man may be away on duty for a few days, and when he returns he has to work at night to overtake his work.

212. Is much time taken up in doing work for other Departments?—Yes; we have a great many inquiries to make for the Railway, Postal, Old-age Pensions, Inspection of Machinery, and other Departments.

213. There is no equivalent given to the police?—No. I think we should charge them 1s. an hour.

• 214. Or, at any rate, there should be some recognition of these services?—Yes. I cannot understand why the officers of some Departments cannot do their own work.

215. Of course, there are certain inquiries that should very properly be made by the police?—Yes, anything bearing on crime.

216. What about the gymnasium?—The gymnasium is of great advantage to us. You can hardly realise the benefit it is to the men.

217. You think it should be encouraged?—Yes.

218. In every centre there should be a gymnasium?—Yes.

219. It has been suggested that a number of men do not take advantage of it?—That is so, but a large majority of the men here are very keen on it.

220. With the view of increasing the efficiency of the Force, would you be in favour of having an instructor appointed?—He would not have sufficient work here.

221. I do not mean Auckland alone?—You might have to give him a rank.

222. You might as well give him a rank as the storekeeper?—Quite so; and he would be of service to the Department. Constable Skinner, I think, is without doubt the best man south of the Line in this work.

223. What service has he got?—Ten years.

224. You think it would be a valuable adjunct?—It would certainly do no harm.

225. I understand the Commissioner has allowed his services in this respect to be used occasionally?—Yes; Constable Skinner had to come here to attend the Supreme Court, and I asked the Commissioner to allow him to give the young men here instruction for a couple of weeks. That was granted, and with great advantage to the men.

226. Is there any other matter you wish to refer to?—Yes. I would like to refer again to the proposed divisional Superintendents. The Auckland Division, as I propose it, would contain, say, eighty-nine stations and 225 men; Wellington Division would contain eighty-nine stations and 259 men, on the present distribution; Christchurch and Greymouth District would contain sixty-one stations and 167 men; and Dunedin and Invercargill would contain fifty-eight stations and 146 men.

227. Now, about the vexed question of emoluments?—Well, I have views of my own on that matter, and I am not sure whether I expressed them at the Police Commission in 1898. I think I said then that the emoluments, or a portion of them, should go towards the Superannuation Fund which was to be established. There was no Superannuation Fund at that time; but since then, in going round the district, and having gained a wider experience of the men, their duties, and of the hardships they have to put up with in travelling from place to place over bad roads in all weathers, I am rather inclined to think that the labourer is worthy of his hire.

228. But in certain districts it strikes me as being so exceedingly out of proportion to what it is in other districts?—There are some districts that are undoubtedly better than others, like Kawakawa. That is a good district for a constable, as he will get from £60 to £80 a year extra there. He is the Clerk to the Licensing Committee, and Clerk to the Waimate North Court. He gets £15 for each—that is, £30. Then there is the mileage and other things.

229. But there is a constable at Kaikohe?—He is the Clerk of Court at Kawakawa.

230. Why not for the other two also?—It is a departmental arrangement of the Justice Department. When Mr. Northcroft, S.M., was in charge of that district, he and I had a chat about the desirability of establishing the Waimate North Court at Ohaewai, as it would be more convenient and central, but nothing came of it, because he was retiring from the Bench shortly afterwards. Dargaville would be a good station, and Kaitaia, and possibly Cambridge. Te Awamutu was at one time a good place, but it is not now. The constable at Taumarunui makes a fair amount extra also at present.

231. There would be no objection to allowing a man to receive up to a certain amount, but it is the difference between the different stations that strikes one as so enormous?—That is so; but the men at stations like Dargaville and Kawakawa are picked men—superior men in every way, both physically and mentally, and also as regards conduct. They are men who would rise to any position in the service later on.

232. Do you share the Sub-Inspector's views with regard to batons and handcuffs?—Yes; I should prefer the American style of light baton. Some batons we have had, of heavy boxwood, would smash a man's skull. Batons of that kind should not be put into the hands of constables, especially of men of rather excitable temperament, and who might hit harder than they think.

233. You have never represented the matter to the Department?—No; I have never hit a man with a baton in my life. If I really had to hit I preferred to use my fists.

234. What about lamps?—The lamps have not been in use here, I think, for twenty years. Many years before I came here the men found it impossible to carry them in hot weather. I have carried them myself in Dunedin and Christchurch. They stink; and the heat brings on lumbago and sciatica. Men suffer from those complaints who use them. They are also dirty for the clothes.

235. If it is necessary that lamps should be carried it seems rather an anomaly that the men should be required to find them at their own expense?—It is a matter that requires attention. The question of supplying the electric torches has been discussed by Mr. Tunbridge, Mr. Dinnie, and myself, and we have thrashed it out in all its bearings. I think Mr. Dinnie is only too anxious to get these torches if we can get them. The difficulty was in getting refills in the earlier stages of the invention, but I think we can get them supplied now.

236. But, still, the men who carry them do so at their own expense?—That is not right. I think they should be supplied by the Government.

237. With respect to the anomaly in regard to house-allowance, have you any suggestion to make whereby that can be overcome?—I should have as few married men in the cities as possible.

238. One witness stated he would have all married men?—You could never recruit a service with married men.

239. Having single men only in the cities does not get over the difficulty. You cannot expect men to remain single, and if they get married the position as regards house-allowance becomes acute?—I should like to see them shifted out to country stations as vacancies occur.

240. But some of them get married under two years?—Some under twelve months by permission.

241. You cannot keep on shifting them out?—No, because there are no vacancies; but married men are sent to all suburban stations. At Parnell there are two married constables, with a constable in charge. At Ponsonby and Newmarket there are married constables.

242. But about the house-allowance?—The only way is—it is a question of finance—for the Government to acquire a block of land, and build small houses on it, and let the constables occupy them, instead of paying them an allowance.

243. My idea would be more to equalise the rents payable?—One man will not be satisfied with a house that another man is satisfied with when he rents it himself. He may have ideas in advance of those held by a humbler man; or his wife may have high ideas, and she has to be taken into consideration very much in some cases.

244. Is the practice of using the police for detecting certain offences affecting the suppression of crime?—I say that the police are the proper parties to do that sort of thing, and I never employ an outsider if I can possibly help it.

245. And there are certain offences which must be detected?—That is so. Take the King-country: I have not used a civilian or an outsider in detecting cases there for the last eight years. I select suitable men from the police, and they have managed to get their convictions without bringing in outsiders.

246. With regard to small offences like those committed by young constables, for which they are reported by the sergeants, do you always carpet them formally?—Not always. For instance, if a man oversleeps himself he is reported for that, and an explanation is asked for. If his explanation is a reasonable one, I accept it, and caution him to be more careful in future. If it is a more serious neglect, then he comes before me, and he is always brought before me in the presence of the Sub-Inspector and station sergeant—both of them if possible, and if not one or the other is there, and also the sergeant who reported the man. And then the witnesses are called in.

247. A good deal has been said elsewhere, but not here, with regard to a circular prohibiting policemen from applying for positions outside the Force excepting by permission?—I have seen that.

248. Have you any opinion respecting it?—I think that if I saw a position outside the service that I thought would be a better one than the one I held, I should feel inclined to accept it, and tender my resignation afterwards.

249. The argument used by the Commissioner in favour of it is that it is necessary to know what men are likely to be leaving if the opportunity arises for promoting them?—That may be so; but a man has a right to look out for a better situation if he can get it.

250. And he might lose the opportunity if he did not apply for it at once?—Yes.

251. Is the position of assistant clerk in the district office much sought after in your experience?—It is to a certain extent, although I do not get many applications for it.

252. We were told that there were only eight applicants for it?—There are not many. I think the Inspector in charge of the district should have the selection of his own clerks.

253. From amongst his own men?—Yes; so long as he has suitable men in his district.

254. Have you asked for appointments of men you thought suitable?—Yes; I have two men in my office at the present time recommended by myself.

255. And you have had no difficulty with them?—No.

256. Reference was made yesterday to the case of a prosecution for perjury. The person who brought it up said that the prosecution was unreasonably delayed, and so the man got away: do you know anything about it?—Speaking from memory, because the file is not here now—it has been away for some time—I cannot say whether a prosecution was directed or not.

257. What is your practice when a prosecution for perjury is instituted or ordered?—That case was the Wrack case, and I cannot say without the file whether a prosecution was ordered.

258. Mr. Kettle assures me it was?—Of course, the police were not there at the time to attend to the statement. Then the evidence had to be collected.

259. That has nothing to do with the laying of the information. You see that the mere direction by the Magistrate relieves you of the responsibility for the prosecution?—I do not know. Nothing came to me as to this being a prosecution.

260. The direction is generally given in open Court. In my Court I issue instructions for the arrest of the man and for the laying of the information on the charge of perjury at once?—When the evidence in this case was collected it was referred to the Crown Solicitor to advise whether there was a case to answer.

261. I do not think that is the right practice. This is the only class of offence that I know of where the question of a prosecution is left to the discretion of the Magistrate?—We followed the usual practice here. I am not in Court always, but, speaking generally, I think the police are referred to to look up the case.

262. That is a different matter: I speak of a case where a Magistrate directs, on giving judgment, that a prosecution for perjury shall be instituted?—I think in any case that where a direction has been given by a Magistrate to lay a charge of perjury it should be sufficient. We have had several.

263. It raises a feeling of criticism when a direction is given for a prosecution, and a month is allowed to elapse before the warrant is issued, and then it is found that the man has cleared out?—That is so.

264. Are you in a position to say what the delay in the issue of the warrant was over?—Without the file, I could not say. The file can be got, and laid before you.

265. Within reasonable limits you would admit that it is the duty of the police to carry out the instructions of the Magistrate?—Undoubtedly. It was a most difficult case from beginning to end.

266. I suppose there is no obligation on your part, as far as you can see, to appear in Court in uniform?—I do not know of any. As you know, my duties are supervisory and administrative.

267. It does not appeal to you, but the point was raised here?—I do not see what I can do by going to the Court in uniform. I do not conduct the prosecutions. I did appear in Court here for nine or ten years, but since the Sub-Inspector has been here he has conducted the cases in Court, and I have not appeared in the Magistrate's Court in Auckland. I appear in some of the country Courts in important cases where the Crown Solicitor is not employed, but it is on rare occasions. I do not see that I can facilitate the proceedings in the Court merely by appearing there in uniform.

268. Has there been any attempt at any time to bring political pressure to bear on you, or is the suggestion even warranted?—When I came here first many people used to come and see me, and wanted me to do things which I would not do; but once the people began to know me they knocked it off, and now I do not have anybody coming to me.

269. Everything connected with your administration is done through the legal channels?—That is so. If a man wants me to do anything outside my duties I listen to him, but I do not do what he wants, and I think the public know that. They do not come near me now, but for the first two or three years after I came here it was a common thing for one person or another to come and strive to get me to do this thing and that.

270. Do you think that political influence obtains?—I can only go by repute. We hear a lot about it.

271. But you are not able to crystallize it?—No.

272. You heard Mr. McGowan's denial of it on oath the other day?—I do not know; you hear all sorts of influences are at work—political, religious, and society.

273. Evidently it was thought worthy of inquiry, because it is one of the orders of reference; and I can only inquire; but I cannot get direct evidence of it?—I do not know why I should seek either political or society influence. Parties attempted to use me in time gone by, but for the last eight or nine years I have had no trouble in that way at all, and they let me alone now, because I think they know I am not amenable to influence of that kind.

274. You heard Mr. Kettle raise the question as to whether you had not asked your subordinates to furnish you with reports with regard to Magistrates. There was an impression apparently that he was referring to himself, but he assures me that his own position was not in his mind. He wishes to make it clear that he had no reason to say that you had ever called on your subordinates for any expression of opinion with regard to his judicial acts, but you have done so with regard to other Magistrates. Have you?—I have not with reference to other Magistrates; certainly not.

275. To another Magistrate?—But may I ask what is the groundwork of his suggestion?

276. I want to clear up this matter, because it is only fair to Mr. Kettle, and it is possible that some action of yours in the past may have given colour to what Mr. Kettle touched upon. Now, this document has been placed in my possession—a document purporting to be a copy of a letter written by you to Sub-Inspector Mitchell—I suppose it is in the form of a circular—dated 1st March, 1900. I do not know where it has come from so far as the person who gave it to me is concerned [paper handed to witness]?—May I ask where this came from?

277. I can tell you from whom it has come to me?—Yes.

278. From Dr. Sharman?—I would ask you to ask Dr. Sharman to give evidence as to where he got it from, and from whom.

279. I do not know whether he would be prepared to say where he got the document; but I want to know whether this was sent out on your own motion, or was it instigated by your superiors?—That document is a copy of an alleged copy.

280. If you say it was under instructions I shall accept that assurance, and carry the matter no further?—Assuming the document is correct.

281. And it was done with no improper motives at all?—If I called for a report of that kind it would be by the instruction or the suggestion from a superior.

282. It struck me that a detailed document like that would not be issued by you on your own motion?—Assuming I wrote that, it would not be on my own motion.

283. It is nine years ago?—I could not tell you if it came even through my hands nine years ago.

284. I think the foundation of Mr. Kettle's suggestion must be this document?—Possibly; but this is an extraordinary thing for Dr. Sharman to do. Assuming it is a copy of a State document—because the inference is that it is a genuine copy of a State document—I think it is an extraordinary thing that a man occupying the high position of Police Surgeon should surreptitiously get possession of a copy of a State document and hand it to the Commissioner for the purpose of having it brought out here.

The Commissioner: I do not attach very much importance to the matter myself after this lapse of time one way or another.

Dr. Sharman: It was not given to me surreptitiously.

The Commissioner: It was given to you by an officer of police, Dr. Sharman?

Dr. Sharman: It was given to me by an ex-officer of the Police Force.

The Commissioner: And that man is not now in the Force?

Dr. Sharman: Oh, no; and was not in the Force when he gave it to me.

The Commissioner: Was he in the Force a long time ago?

Dr. Sharman: I could tell you within a month; one year ago.

285. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Somebody must have hoarded it up in a very careful manner for eight years, Inspector Cullen?—I think so myself. I was told no longer ago than yesterday that the information came from an officer of the Department.

286. I should have taken no notice of it if it had not been that a Magistrate who occupies a similar position to myself raised the question of the tendency on your part to question the judicial acts of Magistrates. I should say at once that it was a highly improper thing to do if it were done, and it is as well to have it cleared up; so I asked you the question to give you an opportunity of denying it?—With reference to Mr. Kettle himself, I understood when he gave evidence the other day that he was referring to something that was supposed to have appeared here respecting himself. He assured me to-day that I had misunderstood him. I can say now on oath that I have never called for any such document respecting Mr. Kettle, and that if the document is a correct one it was done by the instructions of somebody else.

The Commissioner: I am going to leave the matter there, because that particular Magistrate is not brought into it in any shape or form.

287. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Do you know the men who were supposed to be conveying information to Headquarters?—The information respecting both those men is known in the Commissioner's office. There is a complete file in each case, and you will see the facts there.

288. I have power to call for them?—It would be better to call for them there; but, speaking from memory, I suppose one of them is five or six years ago, and the other is going on for two; but the files speak for themselves.

289. It is a question of loyalty?—Yes. I recommended one for a position myself, and the other was sent here from Wellington, and certain things transpired, and I lost trust in both. If I trusted a clerk in my office, and I was satisfied he was acting disloyally, I would say at once, "I cannot keep you here any longer."

290. The man has left the Force?—He is in a position now. He is a good man.

291. What about this man who is still in the Force? The man who is disloyal once may be so again?—Both are intelligent officers—men of rather superior education, and the above man was led into it, I am afraid, by a clerk they had in the Commissioner's office at the time. One of them is out of the service; the other is now in the service, and is an intelligent, smart officer, but he has qualities that I should not care to have in a man in my office. He is a good clerk, and will make a good officer in the service.

292. *Mr. Dinnie.*] One of those men is out of the service now?—Yes.

293. As a matter of fact, he was recommended for the position by yourself?—Yes.

294. As regards the other man, do you remember that you applied to me confidentially for a clerk?—I believe I did. I did not think I had the man here that I could take in. There might be men who would be capable of doing the duties, but they were not men I would select for the office.

295. And after this man had applied, on your recommendation, or that of a Sub-Inspector, his application appears to have been noted for the first vacancy. After that you applied to me for a clerk. He had previously been told that he would get the next vacancy?—I do not know anything about that.

296. I referred the telegram to Inspector Ellison?—I do not know. I got the clerk.

297. I mention these particulars to show you that he was appointed?—The man came here.

298. Do you know that the man had not been long there in Wellington?—Yes, from the time he joined.

299. Do you know that he had not seen any of my clerks at all?—I was told by the late Sub-Inspector that he was sent here.

300. By me?—No; I do not think you would be guilty of any such thing. I do not say you sent him to me for the purpose of keeping touch with your office.

301. I do not think you thought that at all. At the same time, I want to show you that the clerk had nothing to do with being transferred here. I simply minuted your application to Mr. Ellison, and asked him to send a man up, and he was sent accordingly?—Yes.

302. And you recommended, after three months, that he should get the clerical allowance?—Yes.

303. Hence he gave you satisfaction?—He was using documents.

304. That was all subsequent to your recommendation, and after he had been with you three months?—He was taking charge of the office, and using documents he should not have had.

305. So that it was on my minute or telegram to Inspector Ellison that he was sent to you?—Yes; because he was reported for certain conduct, and you punished him on that. That showed me clearly you punished him rather severely, and it also showed him clearly that you were not a party to what he was doing.

306. He is now an acting-detective, I think?—Yes; he is a very capable man, if he could restrain himself in certain directions.

307. *The Commissioner.*] You know just as well as I do that a man who is not trustworthy is not capable. Either you trust him, or you do not?—That is so.

308. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You will hear about his character when the Commission goes to Wellington?—A man may be a capable detective, or do his work well outside—

309. Who is not trustworthy?—Who will otherwise fail in the office.

310. I am afraid we would differ. As regards applicants for the Police Force, you say that it would be better if application forms were sent out from the districts?—Undoubtedly.

311. And that inquiries should be made after a medical examination?—Yes. That should be made before any inquiries are made, because you save so much time and expense.

312. That is, as regards your own district?—Yes.

313. Then, should the file be then sent to Headquarters?—Yes, go to the Commissioner.

314. So that he can see that full inquiries were made in every district?—It would rest with him where he sent it then.

315. *The Commissioner.*] You think it would save the Commissioner of Police a lot of trouble?—It would save everybody a lot of trouble.

316. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Then you suggest that the whole file should be sent back to you?—I did not suggest that.

317. I think so?—No.

318. You want to clear your own district of the matter first?—Yes. When you had completed the inquiries, and accepted the candidate, and placed him on the list as a candidate, then all communications relating to him should go through the Inspector, because you know that the notices do not go through me.

319. I warn him to attend?—No; they do not go through me.

320. You think that three months would be sufficient time in the probation class?—In the depot?

321. Yes?—It should be the minimum. I would like to see more.

322. You know that vacancies are always occurring?—I know that.

323. You do not know the system that obtains for instructing the men?—I get into conversation with the recruits at times when they come up, and they tell me what goes on.

324. Of course, Sergeant Dart will thoroughly explain the system when he gives his evidence?—I have a high opinion of Sergeant Dart, and my wonder is that he stays in the Force. I think he would do much better outside.

325. *The Commissioner.*] There must be some attraction in the Force after all?—Yes.

326. *Mr. Dinnie.*] And Sergeant Dart is able to see that there is something possible before him?—No doubt there is, if he stays.

327. As regards married men being posted to out-stations, you know there are a few vacancies in the outer stations?—There must be a fair number of vacancies occurring at Wanganui, Palmerston North, Napier, Gisborne, and Masterton.

328. Do you know that we have quarters for single men at each of those places?—Perhaps.

329. And do you not think it is advisable to have a single man or two at all stations in case of immediate necessity?—You could have a single man as well as some married men.

330. I suggest to you that there would not be many vacancies. We keep them filled as it is?—But the present system is to send all the married men to the four centres.

331. We must do that if there are no vacancies outside?—I think there are vacancies from time to time outside; it would save money, and the men would be just as well trained.

332. In the case of some of the outer stations we found the rents were higher than in the cities?—I heard about the Napier rents. I resided there for seven years, and I cannot understand how they have gone up so high.

333. *The Commissioner.*] It was an eye-opener to me?—It was also to me, because I had lived there, and I took that statement with a certain reservation.

334. They gave actual figures?—The people must be living on Bluff Hill, instead of on the flats in the town.

335. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards men coming from South Africa and Australia, and joining the Police Force here, it is true, is it not, that they have not turned out very well?—Very ill.

336. And I have had to stop taking them on, because I am not satisfied with the results?—Those men have not turned out well.

337. You think too much is made of the clerical staff?—I do.

338. I think you agreed at one time, and your Sub-Inspector, that district clerks should hold the rank of sergeant?—In the four centres only.

339. I understood all over?—No; I never held that opinion.

340. The position is practically the same, although there is not so much work?—There is no comparison at all.

341. The same work, but not so much of it?—It is the same work to a limited extent only, because you cannot possibly get the same amount of work at a place like the Thames. What does he find to do there? He would not have two hours' work a day there.

342. There is only the one man there, and here you have a number?—I know. I have been at the game myself, so that I know.

343. Do you know what they do in other Forces in respect to the promotion of clerks?—I know that where the Force is very large promotion is given to the clerks.

344. Even in the Royal Irish Constabulary?—They are not promoted so quickly there as out here.

345. I may say they are, to my knowledge?—They are! In the first place, they have to pass an examination.

346. I agree with you there?—There is no such thing as promoting a man until he has passed the examination.

347. They get earlier outside?—Yes; but they test them first at different stages. Their numbers now run into something like sixteen thousand men. There were about thirty-five County Inspectors, and about 150 District Inspectors.

348. There are more than that now?—No.

349. *The Commissioner.*] You want to confine these sergeants to the uniform branch?—Yes.

350. Which would do away with some of the objections to the promotions?—In Ireland they do not keep the man long. He is sent to uniform duty.

351. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know the assistant clerks are not sent out on promotion. Only one has gone out on promotion, and he had the required service?—Yes.

352. They might have a training in the office, and send them out afterwards?—Three years.

353. But the Inspectors want well-qualified men, and efficient men?—The Inspectors in the four centres want a sergeant in charge of the office.

354. You want to retain that sergeant as long as you can?—No; I do not want him to sacrifice himself on account of his proficiency.

355. You like a confidential man to deal with?—I like to have the selection of the man myself.

356. Do you think the clerical training is of practical value, in view of promotion afterwards?—It is the very best of training. I think that the officer who has gone through the district office as clerk is far better qualified to deal with the work that falls to his lot in after-life than the man who has never been there.

357. I suppose you believe in the present system of promotions, and you think that every Inspector ought to recommend for any rank whatsoever?—I think he ought to.

358. For every rank?—Up to the time a man is promoted Sub-Inspector, and after that it is time he is qualified for the higher ranks.

359. And after being recommended he should have to undergo an examination?—Yes.

360. Both medically and educationally?—Oh, yes.

361. Likewise the detectives?—Certainly.

362. You know that we have got the thin edge of the wedge in as regards the educational examination, but you think there ought to be a further compulsory examination, and a proper authority to conduct the examination of these men?—The marks would have to be apportioned on the papers set by men quite outside the Force, so that nobody could suggest that it was not done impartially.

363. You approve of the present system of men having to attend classes after they are posted?—Yes; I was the originator of the class system in New Zealand, after Mr. Tunbridge came here.

364. It has stopped again?—It has; we cannot keep it up very well.

365. It was not satisfactory?—No, and we had to drop it. I could not give the time to it that I liked. There was no Sub-Inspector here then. The sergeants could not do it when they were on night duty, and ultimately they tried to keep the classes together on a Tuesday afternoon.

366. *The Commissioner.*] There is no reason why it should not be tried?—No; it is done in the Royal Irish Constabulary. There you have these lectures daily.

367. *Mr. Dinnie.*] So that the men have no occasion to complain that they have not opportunities of gaining knowledge?—In Auckland the police have opportunities their fellows have not, because we have the library; that is not known in other places in New Zealand.

368. They have a library in some places, but not as good as this?—We get that out of a special fund.

369. As regards the transfer of defaulters, it depends entirely on the misconduct as to whether the man is transferred or not?—Yes.

370. You would not recommend transfer after a certain period of service in the district?—It would all depend on the man himself.

371. You could not fix the time at five years?—No; you could not fix a limit. If you did you would run the country into endless expense, and decrease the efficiency of the service, because if you sent the man to a new place it would take him twelve months to pick up the district.

372. As regards sending the files of a man's transfer, there is no objection to that, and you can always have them if you apply for them?—I think it would be better to send a copy of any file in your office to attach to the defaulter's sheet.

373. That would be rather a large order?—It is easily done; it is only a question of typing them. They should accompany a man as long as he is in the service.

374. In case a man gets drunk, or under the influence of liquor, it is sometimes advisable to transfer him to where there is no publichouse?—That depends on circumstances. If he is frequently seen in publichouses, the sooner he is got rid of the better. I hold strong views on the question of drinking amongst policemen.

The Commissioner. You do not hold them stronger than I do. I believe a sober police is a necessity.

375. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Taking the Force as a whole, I think you will say it is a very sober one?—Yes, no doubt.

376. If you compared the defaulters' sheets with those of any other Force, you find it is a sober Force?—It is one of the things I strive to impress on each batch of recruits—to keep away from hotels, from drink, and, if possible, to be total abstainers.

377. You know that the same advice is given them by me when they are sent out?—They got it again when they come here.

378. As regards the finger-print system, of course you are not thoroughly versed in that system yourself?—Just what I read up.

379. And you know that it is dangerous to have a certain amount of training without being perfect?—I did not say that the men should be sent out with only a certain amount of training; but take Quartermain, I think you will admit that he is now qualified, and you would send him out to give evidence as an expert.

380. Yes; you can do that in his case?—If that is so, why should he not go out to another city, and take in one of your most intelligent men, and put him through the same course?

381. Do you not know that everything has got to be classified and sent to one depot?—I know that, but you can have copies.

382. Oh, no! you could never have a system like that. Ours is complete as it is, and instead of the different Police Forces in England each having a system of its own, they have the perfect one at Scotland Yard, and everything goes there. You want to know the system thoroughly before

you can give an opinion on it?—I reason it out this way: If two men who knew nothing at all about the subject a few years ago are now experts, surely we have men in the service equally qualified to become experts also.

383. That is not the point: the point is about the classification and the filing of the documents?—We should have men who would be able to do the classification, and we would not be at the mercy of two men, because something might happen to both of them.

384. But there are men there waiting. They are at Headquarters, and I have a man training now?—I say that a young constable should not be selected for that work, but an experienced detective. An intelligent, experienced detective should be taken in preference to a junior constable to be trained.

385. The proofs have got to be retained there?—Retain the lot there; but there are numerous instances where many a finger-print is left, and it would be a great advantage if they could be looked up by an expert at the time.

386. I am quite satisfied with the one I have?—I am quite satisfied that he is highly capable, but I would like to see a greater number in the Force equally capable.

387. But what is the use of it to people outside?—It would be of great use.

388. Then you do not know what the system is. In regard to the division of the districts into four, you would have four Superintendents: how many Inspectors?—Four.

389. How many Sub-Inspectors?—You would want a Sub-Inspector at Auckland and Wellington, as well as an Inspector.

390. So that, taking it all round, you would want a good addition to the staff?

The Commissioner: No, because the four Superintendents and four Inspectors would take the place of the nine Inspectors.

Mr. Dinnie: What about the Sub-Inspectors?

391. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Would you reduce the number of Sub-Inspectors?—You might not want a Sub-Inspector at Christchurch and Dunedin for some time.

392. Your time is fully engaged here?—Yes, fully. I devote my whole time to the service, so that I have no time to myself. I do not take time to myself. There is no day that I do not take a turn through the town.

393. The only place you do not attend is the Court?—I sometimes go there—probably I want to see one of the clerks or the detectives.

394. *Mr. Dinnie*.] As regards the work of the Chief Clerk, you think, in my absence, the senior Inspector or Superintendent should be in Wellington, and act in my absence?—Yes, in routine matters; but he would not interfere in administrative work.

395. At the present time you know the Chief Clerk takes the routine matters, and sends the letters on to me?—There is delay there.

396. You would prefer that the senior Inspector should do the work instead of the Chief Clerk?—He should sign the papers. The clerk does the clerical work, and writes the minutes.

397. In regard to Head Office staffs, I shall show the practice in Great Britain and in other colonies. I may state that the question arose in Scotland, and it was decided that police clerks were the best?—The difficulty of having them there is that they get into intrigue.

398. *The Commissioner*.] Having rank, they get into intrigue?—That is the objection I have.

399. You think helmets are preferable to shakos?—Yes.

400. Do you think the standard might be lowered to the Fourth?—I do not say it should be, but I say there should be power to take a suitable man on who has not passed the Fifth Standard.

401. You think it better that Inspectors should be empowered to take evidence on oath?—Yes.

402. You are in favour of senior sergeants in place of station sergeants?—Yes; and have a score of them or more.

403. The gymnasium is a very useful institution?—Yes; I would like to see one in every centre; and, where possible, provision might be made for the playing of hand-ball.

404. As to Constable Foreman, are you prepared to recommend him for promotion?—I was prepared to recommend him for promotion.

405. But you did not recommend him?—I told him that if he was willing to transfer to Newton I would recommend him for promotion to the rank of sergeant; but he said he preferred to remain where he was.

406. Is Constable Beddek, at the Thames, a man you would recommend for promotion?—No. I have known him for a considerable time. He is not a suitable man.

407. What do you think of these two men [names written down and handed to witness]?—As to the first, I was asked by an officer before he got his present position what I thought of his qualifications, and I told him I could not recommend him. He was not recommended by that officer, but the officer who succeeded him recommended him.

408. I think you have gone so far as to tell me that you would not have him under you?—Yes; I would rather be without him.

409. Have you anything to say about the second man?—I should not care about him. I know the first man well, and if I had my way he should not be in the service.

410. I should very soon put him out?—He is not the only one of that stamp in that particular branch of the service.

The Commissioner: It does not say much for the branch, then. I hold that there are things of that kind that want reorganizing. I think that men have got themselves appointed who should never have been anything but constables.

411. *Mr. Dinnie*.] Still, the work of the detective branch has been carried out very efficiently?—Yes, in Auckland. I have been here for eleven years. I cannot speak of the other districts.

412. You leave every Inspector to speak about his own men?—I know that branch, and most of the men in it; and a good many of them should not be there.

413. You know that the annual returns show that 95·63 per cent. of the cases have been satisfactorily dealt with?—I have not gone into the percentage.

414. That shows a good return over the year?—Yes, a very fair percentage.

414A. I think Mr. Arnold said that he did not believe that there was anything in the regulations which would prevent the divulging of departmental information?—I should be in favour of sacking every man who divulged departmental information.

415. *The Commissioner.*] You must have loyalty. You cannot do without it. As regards Constable Ratt, you know the police had no information here with regard to his immorality whilst he was here?—None whatever.

416. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards extra emoluments, do you think they should be dispensed with altogether?—No.

417. Do you think we should allow a certain amount under circumstances?—I do not think I would touch them. I do not think there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to that in the Force.

418. It would create dissatisfaction if we altered it?—Yes.

419. As regards the perjury case, you do not know when Mr. Kettle gave directions for the prosecution?—No, I could not say.

420. It was really a Prison Department matter?—It was connected with the Prisons service.

The Commissioner: The point is whether the directions given by the Magistrate were carried out by the police.

Mr. Dinnie: They would be at once.

The Commissioner: I will look up the file.

Mr. Dinnie: Yes; that will disclose everything.

421. *Detective McMahon* (to witness).] I have been under your supervision for about eleven years?—Yes.

422. Do you consider that I am qualified to fill the position of Chief Detective?—Yes; I should have recommended you for it if I had been asked.

423. *Constable Donovan.*] During my time under your supervision, have I not done my duty to your satisfaction?

The Commissioner: The point is whether you are qualified to act as sergeant.

Inspector Cullen: I recommended him.

424. *Dr. Sharman* (to witness).] I attended you on two occasions?—Yes.

425. The first was a trifling illness, the next was a dislocation of the finger?—Yes.

426. And I called Dr. Lewis in?—No; he is my family doctor.

427. I met Dr. Lewis in your presence?—No. You diagnosed my finger as broken, and it was treated as a broken finger for two or three weeks. Dr. Lewis was away home in the Old Country, and I was not satisfied with the way it was progressing, and as soon as he came back I went to see him. He asked me about it, and I told him how the accident happened, and said I supposed it was a broken finger; and he said it was not only broken, but it was dislocated. He then took me to Dr. Purchas, and the finger was examined under the X-rays, and a photograph taken of it, and it was found that Dr. Lewis's diagnosis was correct. The finger now is deformed.

428. I never met Dr. Lewis in conjunction with you?—No.

Dr. Sharman: I think you are mistaken. (To the Commissioner): It does not impair my efficiency.

429. *Dr. Sharman* (to witness).] From time to time you have forwarded memos. to the Commissioner in reference to me?—If so, they will be on the files.

The Commissioner: The contents of the memos. cannot be of any value until I have seen them. I am going to call for the files.

Dr. Sharman: There is one of the names I mentioned at the inquiry that has not been brought up; I wanted to mention it.

The Commissioner: If the person holding the inquiry did not go into it, I am not going into it now.

Dr. Sharman: As a matter of fact, dereliction of duty was suggested, and I wanted to deal with that.

The Commissioner: I am not going into any matter of that sort.

430. *Dr. Sharman* (to witness).] Have you ever given instructions, either verbal or written, that I should not be called in for police cases?—Certainly not.

431. If ex-Constable Brown is prepared to swear that you did, are you still prepared to swear that you did not?—I certainly would.

432. If ex-Sergeant Kelly is prepared to swear on oath that you issued instructions to that effect, do you still say "No"?—Certainly.

433. If ex-Sergeant Walker is prepared to swear that on oath?—I say no such instructions have been issued, and I do not care who you bring here.

434. If an ex-Sub-Inspector is prepared to swear that you issued such instructions, do you still deny it?—Certainly.

435. This was held over at the other inquiry. Certain statements were made, and I placed them before the Commissioner of Police. I wish to make the point quite clear: that in prosecuting inquiries in reference to the circulars alleged to have been issued by Inspector Cullen in reference to myself, one of my informants told me that that is not the only circular that has been issued by Inspector Cullen about different people. He said, "I have a copy of a letter written in reference to the person mentioned here," and I said, "Give me a copy." This was, I think, after the other inquiry. I wish to ask Inspector Cullen this question: Did you issue any circular or memorandum to the effect contained in this letter?

The Commissioner: He says he has no recollection of it, but if he did so it was under instructions.

436. *Dr. Sharman* (to witness).] You have no recollection of it?—No; I cannot recollect what occurred nine years ago. If you had all the correspondence that passes through my hands daily you would not be able to do so—you would not remember such a thing. Before the inquiry your excuse was that you had no memory.

437. Have you ever given any instructions, written or verbal, in reference to the point mentioned in this circular?—I say I cannot remember.

Dr. Sharman: I will hand this to the Commissioner.

The Commissioner: I cannot accept this. It is against the rules of evidence.

Dr. Sharman: I took legal advice on the point.

The Commissioner: I do not care twopence what legal advice you got. I rule in this place as to what I shall do with documents, and I say under any circumstances I would not admit a document of that sort. It clearly cannot be an accurate document, because it is abominably spelt and written, and I cannot accept it unless I am satisfied that the original is not in existence.

Dr. Sharman: I was advised to put it in.

The Commissioner: I cannot accept it.

Dr. Sharman: I will not pursue the subject any further.

438. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I think all your recommendations were carried out in regard to promotions?—Except in Donovan's case, and that was some time before you came to New Zealand.

439. *The Commissioner.*] What has created this apparent feeling between you and Dr. Sharman?—Dr. Sharman has very rarely spoken to me for two and a half years. Dr. Sharman has been very tactless. That has been the great cause of his trouble—his want of tact in dealing with the police. He came into my office some nine months ago, and tried to wrangle with me for three hours. It was 11 o'clock when he left, and the burden of his remarks was that he hated me as the devil hates holy-water.

Dr. Sharman: It is one man's word against another. I say that is absolutely false, on the face of it.

The Commissioner: I am only concerned in the aspect of it as it may affect the efficiency of the Force. It is a most deplorable thing that the Inspector of Police and the Police Surgeon should be upon these terms.

Witness: I have come in contact with Dr. Sharman as Inspector of Police. I thought he was not attending to his duties. There were numerous complaints, as you will see when you go through the papers. If the men's interests are neglected by the medical officer—as I think they are—I think it is my duty to step in and safeguard them.

The Commissioner: I do not dispute that; but it is a very unfortunate thing.

440. *Dr. Sharman* (to witness).] My official communications with you have been couched in proper terms?—I have no complaints to that.

441. Is there anything in the Police Regulations that makes it incumbent on me to have any intercourse with you except officially?—No.

442. Am I obliged to recognise you socially?—No, I do not want you to.

443. When I come to see you officially, do I not treat you with respect?—You do not come to see me officially. I have not seen you officially for three years.

444. Have you ever requested me to come before you officially?—No.

Dr. Sharman: I have always endeavoured to conduct myself as a gentleman should do.

The Commissioner: I think it is a great pity that these relations should exist, and I certainly am not going to allow the wrangle between you to continue before me.

JOHN EUGENE CULLEN, Journalist, further examined. (No. 232.)

Witness: I banded in the name of a certain constable in connection with a statement I made the other day, but I made a mistake as to where the offence I complained of was committed. It was not committed at Auckland, but at Palmerston North, and the man has been punished. Sub-Inspector Hendrey made a statement yesterday as to liquor being taken into the station by constables. He said it was obtained from hotels, but he did not know with what motive. Now, I have seen numerous cases—not recently certainly—quite as bad as those he indicated, where members of the public have supplied the police with beer on their beat.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Had given it to them?—Yes; put it in their pockets. In fact, one constable was carrying a bottle of stout, and while he was walking up the street with the sergeant the cork came out of the bottle.

2. You wish me to infer that any liquor so supplied to the police is not necessarily supplied by publicans, but by the public?—That is so.

3. Is there anything else you wish to mention?—As to my statement with regard to police interference with discharged prisoners, I wish to say that, although I know it is done, I do not think it is done with the knowledge of the persons who are responsible. It is done by overzealous people, but perhaps not with the intention of injuring the individual.

4. I have already expressed my strong disapproval of the matter?—About Constable Donovan's case. At the period he mentions I was at Coromandel on business, and recollect seeing him, and the publican told me that he did not think he would get his license if Constable Donovan remained there. Steer came out for that seat in opposition to Mr. McGowan, the late Minister of Justice, so that it is obvious that attention would have to be paid to Steer's wishes if he retired. Steer had a great meeting the night he spoke.

5. You think, then, that what the constable told us is correct, and that he was removed from Coromandel on account of his zeal in connection with a certain hotel?—I have no hesitation in saying that, and every person in Coromandel at the time thought the same thing.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The question of Constable Donovan's removal occurred many years ago?—Yes.

7. As regards the *Star* being cautioned in respect to some alleged offence, that was nothing to do with your matter at all, but a different offence entirely to the one you were fined for, if it were an offence?—We were warned not to commit the same offence.

8. Do you not know that there was some evidence lacking in the case of the *Star*, and that the prosecution could not take place—the offence had not been completed?—The evidence was there, and the advertisement was published.

9. Quite so, but it required more than that for a prosecution to succeed?—Why did you say the prosecution was not to be proceeded with?

10. Because the evidence was not complete enough to secure a conviction?—Why were we warned if it were not an offence?

11. Had the newspaper completed the matter, and we had got the additional evidence required, we might have been able to proceed?—A prohibited man would be prosecuted for going on licensed premises.

12. That is a different matter?—I think the law was twisted because it was a powerful daily, and we were a struggling weekly trying to gain ground.

The Commissioner: I have already said I will go into the papers relating to the case.

Constable BASIL JOHN PARSONS, Russell. (No. 233.)

The following suggestions were received from Constable Parsons, who is stationed at Russell:—

Duty in small towns: Some annoyance would be saved where a sergeant and constable are stationed together if the sergeant did some patrol duty—that is to say, he should enter in the station diary of duty the hours he patrols, as well as the hours the constable patrols. By this means it would be no longer necessary for the constable to be responsible from 9 o'clock in the morning till somewhere about midnight, with intervals for meals. As matters now stand, it seems as if it rested with the sergeant in charge whether he does anything more than office-work, which need not average more than an hour a day. If the constable he had was a sober, steady man no trouble would occur. I am aware that there are very few stations with only one sergeant and one constable.

Rewards: That some arrangement be made that either the Crown Prosecutor or Stipendiary Magistrate hearing cases in which rewards are given divide them between those who are entitled to share.

Travelling: That it has been asked by one witness before the Commission that detectives travel first class. If this is granted I think this should apply to all the Force; otherwise it would appear as if detectives ranked as commissioned officers, which would not improve the relations between the preventive and detective branches.

Pay: That the Commissioner take into consideration, when the subject of pay is before him, the fact that the occupation is more dangerous than any other Government one; that in many other branches of His Majesty's service the pay allowances are better and the duties less arduous and responsible; and also that both the constable and his wife are barred from carrying on business.

Promotion: That every man before being promoted to the rank of sergeant should be required to have passed an examination in all law a knowledge of which is required by the police.

Headquarters and district office staff and police store: That this should be a separate branch, with the district clerk receiving a sergeant's pay, and the second clerk the full pay of a constable. The others might be cadets, who, if physically fit, might eventually be sworn into the police when old enough. The district clerk himself should be taken from the Force after he had served a certain number of years to qualify for that position. That the defence store also act as the police store, in a similar way to the Government Printer issuing all stationery. Or, if it is held necessary to have a separate store, that one of the senior constables who have been long in the service, and is perhaps not quite so active as he was twenty or thirty years ago, be promoted to fill this simple position. The rest of the Force would not then be so likely to feel resentment as at the promotion of a junior man.

ROTORUA, MONDAY, 6TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

ARTHUR SKINNER, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 234.)

Witness: I am a constable stationed at Tauranga, and am in charge there. I joined the Force on the 1st September, 1899, and have been ten years in it. I got charge of a station in March last. I have been in the clerical and the detective branches of the Force.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you voluntarily take up plain-clothes work?—Yes

2. For what reason?—I got married, and was very little at home; so I thought a position as a country constable would be more comfortable for my wife, and I have had no cause to regret the change.

3. Is there any evidence of a general character that you wish to give?—I wish to speak solely with reference to the physical training of the Force, and I appear here as an expert in physical culture, having won over five hundred prizes in open contests, and sixty gold medals for championships. I have competed against most of the leading wrestlers in New Zealand and the Commonwealth, and also against four world-champions, and I have only been defeated once in the last twelve years. I hold two world records.

4. How old are you?—Thirty-five. When I was in the depot I instructed my fellow-probationers in physical culture, and since then I have instructed hundreds of members of the Police Force. In 1906 a physical-culture class was established in Auckland by Inspector Cullen, and I was appointed the instructor. The improvement in the men was so marked that the class received the commendation of leading citizens, and, in my opinion, the members of that class were as fine a body of men as ever wore the uniform, and subsequently four of them won the highest honours in the athletic world—not only the New Zealand championships, but one man won the championship of the Glasgow Police Force, while another has just won the middle heavy-weight boxing championship of British Columbia. [Photographs of athletic class taken in 1906 exhibited.] Shortly afterwards I was transferred to the Wellington district office, and, at the request of the men, I started a physical-culture class on similar lines to the one at Auckland. Its work was favourably commented on by the newspapers. [Extract from *Evening Post* to that effect read.] I continued to instruct that class until I was transferred. Shortly after my transfer to Tauranga the Inspector of Police arranged with the Commissioner that I should go to Auckland, and put the men through a course of instruction. I was there three weeks, and they made considerable improvement. It has been stated that most of the men joining now are a lot of “wasters,” but I have not found them so, a great many of the Auckland police being men of fine physique; but they lack a knowledge of the art of wrestling. It is a most important art for a policeman to know. Many street disturbances are caused through the inferior handling of prisoners, with the result that both the constable and the prisoner get knocked about; and therefore a knowledge of wrestling is of the greatest service to members of the Force. I found that the gymnasium at Auckland was very well patronised by the men, and it occupied them in their spare time, and kept them off the streets. In Wellington there is no exercise-room; and the recent disturbance in the Wellington streets, in which three constables were mixed up, is the result of the want of some place in the barracks where the men can obtain recreation. I recommend the establishment of a gymnasium at each centre. If forty men were enrolled, of equal physique, and twenty were sent to Wellington and twenty to Auckland, notwithstanding that the Wellington climate is a rougher one than that of Auckland, in two years it would be found that the Auckland men had preserved their physique better than the Wellington men, simply because Auckland had a gymnasium and Wellington had not.

5. What was your previous occupation, before you joined the police?—I was a miner, and general hand connected with mines.

6. Where did you get your knowledge of gymnastics?—I started practising when I was twelve years of age, and I have made a special study of physical culture. I have taught men who are now professors of the art, and making their living at it.

7. You think that a properly equipped gymnasium is almost a necessity in every centre?—Yes.

8. And you think that the men take sufficient interest in it to justify special attention being given to the matter?—Yes, provided the officers encourage them.

9. Do you think that a gymnasium on the lines of the Auckland one would be sufficient?—Yes; it is a large room, where they can wrestle and box and amuse themselves. It is not necessary to be up to date, as long as there is room space.

10. How long would an instructor require to spend in a centre to be of any practical benefit to his pupils?—Two months; but if the men were taught in the depot they could practise themselves a good deal at odd times; but at present they are not taught anything. Exercise is not much benefit unless it is backed up by instruction.

11. You think that if you were appointed physical instructor, two months in each centre would be sufficient?—I think so.

12. I suppose that your teaching-capacity would last beyond your physical ability?—My physical ability is as good now as ever it was.

13. You are not going to live for ever?—The man giving the instruction will never have the same influence over his men unless he can generally beat them.

14. How many years of training-capacity do you think you have in front of you?—I could not say.

15. Assuming it was found advisable to give special attention to this branch of instruction—and it appears not to be a very expensive matter—you consider that you can do good work in that connection?—Yes, and well.

16. You would rather be doing that than be in charge of a station?—I would, because I take great interest in this work, and have made a hobby of it and a study; but I did not come here to give evidence with a view to having an axe to grind.

17. I quite understand that, and I am glad to have your evidence, because your name was brought prominently before me in Auckland in connection with the services you have rendered, and evidently the Commissioner of Police must attach importance to the matter, because he gave special authority to you to go down to Auckland?—Yes; I know he does attach importance to the question.

18. I suppose you do not want any elaborate equipment?—A very simple equipment is required. I have done all I indicate with the dumb-bells, wrestling-mat, boxing-gloves, and clubs.

19. And you think the matter of such importance as to justify my drawing attention to it?—Yes.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think I spoke to you some time ago about appointing an instructor?—Yes.

21. Do you think that if a gymnasium were built on the drill-ground at Wellington, and an instructor appointed there, and the recruits were instructed for three months, that that would give them a good start?—It would be a very good start, and have more effect on them than later on, when they had learnt bad habits.

22. And not only the recruits, but the men in Wellington could also attend?—Yes.

23. Do you think you could train men who could instruct the others?—I have trained two men here who are quite able to instruct any other men in New Zealand.

24. So that by instructing a man thoroughly, he would be able to go to another district and instruct the men there?—Yes.

25. I suppose you know that the difficulty is to provide the building?—I know that has been the trouble all along; but I think that the display we gave was the means of our getting the gymnasium in Auckland.

26. You consider it a great benefit to the men to have an instructor to give them physical training?—It is a very great benefit. I speak from experience; and when I was doing street duty, if I knew there was a good man standing close to me, I was very much better pleased, because I felt we were both safe, and the public were safe also.

27. We have not very many serious riots in this country?—No.

JAMES SELLARS WILLCOCKS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 235.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Whakatane, and I was enrolled on the 2nd December, 1899. I am in charge of the station, and have been there three and a half years.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How long was it after you were enrolled before you got charge of a station?—I have been in charge now for nearly six years.

2. Is there anything of a general nature you wish to say?—I wish to mention the question of the pay of police Clerks of Court. In Whakatane, for this year, up to date I have issued over 130 complaints in connection with criminal and quasi-criminal work, whereas in Tauranga they issue only about half that number, and there is a civil Clerk of the Court there getting £220 a year. The policeman who acts as Clerk of the Court gets but £10 a year. It appears to me that it would be better to pay them the same amount as they are paid for work in connection with the inspection of factories—on the amount of work put through.

3. Do you not recognise the fact that all this work is being done in police time, and that the constable is given this work because he has not enough ordinary police work to occupy all his time?—I do not hold that view.

4. I am only suggesting that that is the practice?—It seems to me that with so much more work, and with such a large district as I have there, a man must be overworked.

5. Your police work must either suffer on account of the other work or you have not enough police work to do: is that it?—Or else a man is overworked. For instance, I have to go to Auckland to attend the Supreme Court, and I have to attend to the arrears of work when I come back. But I have generally got three times as much Court work to attend to as I have of police work; and probably, too, there is enough work to keep me going as hard as I can go for a month.

6. What is the amount of your average emoluments for the year?—About £70—£10 for Clerk of Court, £15 for Agricultural Department work, and about £30 mileage. Then there is another £4 for the Inspectorship of Factories. The work is so heavy at times that I have to engage a Native constable to serve a good many summonses; and besides that, I have to keep an extra horse.

7. What do you think should be the remuneration?—There are Clerks of Court with only about twelve complaints going through their office, and yet they get the £10. A man who is putting through twice as much work as an ordinary Justice of the Peace clerk should get more than £10 a year.

8. I suppose you know that that would result in a very considerable difference of treatment in regard to men in different stations: you would have some men getting £10 a year and others getting £20 a year: you would almost have to grade the stations?—Yes.

9. You know that at some stations the emoluments are large and the police duties almost nil?—The extra emoluments are all very well in an isolated district, but a man has to work for it.

10. What are your police duties there?—I have a big district, with a white and Maori population of fully four thousand.

11. How often does the Court sit there?—Monthly. There is a good deal of criminal work. Last year we had twenty cases of theft, and there were several Supreme Court cases.

12. Have you a Native constable there?—Yes; he gets £40 a year. He is supposed to make inquiries amongst the Natives, and to assist me at sports gatherings, and on Saturday nights, when there is a crowd about.

13. Does he wear a uniform?—Yes, at particular functions.

14. Who supplies it?—He had to get it himself. He got it because he thought it would have some effect on the Natives.

15. Is he really a useful man?—Yes.

16. He is very cheap at £40 a year?—Yes, he is worth more.

17. There is certain police work you can give him?—Yes, Native work.

18. What is the Native population there?—From two to three thousand. It is a large district, and is practically the outlet for the Urewera country.

19. Is there anything else you wish to mention?—Yes; with reference to the capture of Ellis, alias McKenzie, in 1904. There was a reward offered in the *Police Gazette* of £400 for information leading to his arrest. He had been at large for between nine and ten months. I started to make inquiries for him about the middle of November. The reports on the file will show the first report I put in. At that time Detective Broberg, Constable Butler, and Sergeant Baskiville were making inquiries for Ellis in the Ormondville district—the next district to where I was stationed. I was expecting that he would probably eventually come into my district. [Witness stated the part he took in the search for and capture of Ellis, as set forth in his reports on the file.]

20. What is your complaint?—That I did not get a fair share of the reward. I not only gave as good information as any one—probably better—leading to the arrest, but I took part in the actual arrest of the prisoner. Yet Detective Broberg got twice as much as I did, and Constable

Butler got the same amount as I did. At the time Sergeant Baskiville said it was very strange that Constable Butler got the same as I did. [At witness's request, the reports and memoranda on the subject were read.]

21. I will look into the papers bearing on this subject. Is there anything else you wish to say?—Yes; I wish to refer to a point that has already been brought before the Commission, and that is, in regard to the detectives and the uniform branch. A sergeant commences now at 10s. 6d. a day; and a detective commences at 10s. a day, and goes on by increments up to 15s. a day. The pay of a detective is practically better than that of a sergeant. Young men are drafted into the detective office. And once a man is sent out into the country he never gets an opportunity of being a detective, or very seldom. The men in the detective branch now claim that the Chief Detective should have the same claim for promotion to Sub-Inspector as the uniform men. There are five Chief Detectives, and about fifty detectives and acting-detectives, and plain-clothes men. There are only four station sergeants, and that is the only channel through which the uniform men can be promoted, and they number about six hundred. Besides that, the channels of promotion in the plain-clothes branch are open much younger than in the other.

22. Have you never applied for plain-clothes duty?—No.

23. Did you ever want it?—I left it to my superior officers. And as to political influence, when I see a member of Parliament I actually shun him. I believe in every man going on his merits.

24. I can see no objection to a man applying for plain-clothes work?—I feel that there are a great many men out in country stations as good as I am, and their qualifications very seldom reach the Commissioner.

25. Do you mean to say that you never applied for plain-clothes work, or never wanted it?—I do not say I never wanted it; but if the channel had been open a few years ago, I would have accepted it.

26. Have you applied to the Inspector?—No.

27. I cannot see the slightest objection to that?—I do not expect that I am in the running for being promoted a sergeant for some time to come.

28. Would you expect the Inspector to know the qualities of every man as a detective?—I think the Inspector should know every man's ability, and should report accordingly. He is the best man to judge in everything.

29. Even though a man is out in a country district, and has never had detective work?—He would have considerable knowledge of that man before he put him into a country district.

30. He may never have come into his district?—Some Inspector would know about him.

31. In reference to the capture of Ellis, do I understand that your complaint is not that you did not receive sufficient so much as that the other men received more than they were entitled to compared with yourself?—Yes; that I did not receive my proportion compared with what the others received.

32. So that if you had received nothing and the others had received nothing you would have been satisfied?—Yes. The Government offered a reward of £400, and only £200 has been paid out.

33. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You seem to be somewhat dissatisfied?—I thought I did not get the same treatment as the others got.

34. You seem to have a somewhat jealous disposition?—No; I fight on my own merits, and do not ask any one to assist me.

35. Supposing no reward had been offered in this case, would you have done your duty?—I would have done the same as I did.

36. It was your duty to try and capture Ellis?—Yes.

37. Simply because another officer got the same amount as you, and you did not think he should have got so much, you believe you were not properly treated?—Yes; that is the position.

38. You are complaining because you think this man got more than he ought to have received?—I think every man ought to be treated fairly; and I did not consider the allocation of the reward was fair, in view of the services rendered.

39. You are receiving £70 a year beyond your pay?—Yes.

40. And you think that is not enough for the work you do?—I am working morning, noon, and night.

41. Have you made that representation to the Inspector?—Yes; I have spoken to him.

42. You have made no report on the matter?—No.

43. Whakatane is a very small place?—If you go by the returns you will find there is a good deal of work there.

44. Would you care if a Clerk of Court were appointed?—I would be glad if a Clerk of Court were appointed. I am getting £10, and am doing fifty pounds' worth of work.

44A. He might take over the Bailiff's work too?—No, he could not.

45. You do the Clerk of Court work with the outside work there too?—Yes.

46. He might be able to do it, because he would not have the police work to do. At any rate, you should make a report on the whole of the circumstances.

The Commissioner: We shall have to get out a return, and see what all this work is. Whakatane must have increased enormously since I was there.

47. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say the Inspector is the proper officer to make recommendations in respect to the promotions of his men?—Yes.

48. Do you know that he does report annually?—I do not know.

49. He does report annually, and he recommends those he thinks fit for plain-clothes promotion and other appointments?—I would like to call the Inspector, to speak as to my qualifications.

50. I am not saying anything about your qualifications. No doubt you are on the list, and will receive promotion when your time comes. As regards plain-clothes duty, you have not been

recommended?—What I feel is this: that the plain-clothes men have the advantage at the present time—that is, if they are going to be promoted right on to Sub-Inspector.

51. *The Commissioner.*] There has only been one promotion in ten years?—But they are clamouring now.

Mr. Dinnie. The Chief Detectives may not be expecting to be promoted further. It is by merit, and not because they are Chief Detectives.

52. *The Commissioner.*] You mentioned the question of station sergeants. In all probability there will be an alteration there, and certain senior sergeants will be appointed, when promotions will take place?—That would make a great difference.

53. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You are not otherwise dissatisfied?—I do not want to be promoted over the head of anybody else whose qualifications are above mine.

54. You believe in the present system of the Inspectors recommending for promotions?—Yes, and I am quite prepared to wait until the Inspector recommends me.

CHARLES O'REILLY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 236.)

Witness. My name is Charles O'Reilly. I am a constable, stationed at Opotiki. I was enrolled into the Police Force in 1874. I am sixth on the list of seniority.

1. *The Commissioner.*] We are faced with this position at the present time: There is very great difficulty in recruiting the Force with the right stamp of men. What do you think that is due to?—The pay. Men joining ought to start at 8s. a day, and after about four years ought to get an increase to about 10s. a day, to get the proper stamp of men.

2. You think then they would be likely to come forward?—I do.

3. Do you think the standard of education has anything to do with keeping them back?—No.

4. Have you ever been recommended for promotion?—Yes; I think, by Inspector Emerson on one occasion for advancement as a constable; but not recently, as far as I know. I never made any application for myself.

5. You have been quite content to be in charge of a station?—I have never asked for anything, and have never got anything.

6. What Inspectors have you been under of late years?—Inspectors MacDonnell, O'Brien, Cullen, and now Kiely. Men are apparently not promoted after a certain age.

7. How old are you now?—About sixty.

8. You could have been promoted many years ago; now it does not trouble you. How long have you been at Opotiki?—About nineteen years. I would not accept promotion now unless it was an Inspectorship.

9. Are you ever applied to by young men wishing to join the Force?—Very rarely. I have only been applied to for information on the subject on two or three occasions all the time I have been there.

10. Presumably the average country young man is satisfied with his position as it is?—The pay is not sufficient to attract them.

11. But there are prospects in the Force. We heard of a case where a man got £130 a year above his police pay?—I would not average £6 a year extra.

12. You are Clerk of Court?—I look on that as salary. I mean bailiff work.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you feel that you can perform your duties as independently now as when you went there first?—Yes.

14. *The Commissioner.*] The question has been raised whether a man should be allowed to remain at a station more than a certain number of years. You have not become fossilised?—No; some men might be left in a place for many years, and others should not be left there very long.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You want some help there now—an additional constable?—I do.

16. *The Commissioner.*] Have you a Native constable?—Yes.

17. What sort of a man is he?—Not of much assistance. I think another ordinary constable should be sent there.

The Commissioner. That is under consideration, I suppose?

Mr. Dinnie. Yes.

JOHN WATT, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 237.)

Witness. My name is John Watt. I am a police sergeant, stationed at Rotorua, in charge of the sub-district. I was enrolled in 1888, and promoted sergeant in 1904. When I was promoted I was sent to Newton, Auckland. I did sectional duty for eighteen or nineteen months.

1. *The Commissioner.*] I understand that your health is not very good?—No; I got scarlet fever helping a little girl out of a train, and four days after recovery I got influenza, and I have been in bad health since.

2. Have you any general remarks you would like to make?—I think candidates for the police should be twenty-five years of age before they are enrolled. I think they should hold Fifth Standard certificates. During the time I have been in the Force I have been Clerk to the Magistrate's Court, Bailiff of the Court, Receiver of Gold Revenue, Mining Registrar, Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages, Deputy Registrar of Old-age Pensions, Clerk of the Licensing Committee, Inspector of Factories, Inspector of Sea-fisheries, Crown Lands Ranger, and have held a number of other appointments. I have often felt the need of a higher standard of education. I think to secure this a higher rate of pay is necessary.

3. What would you start at?—I think 1s. a day above what is given now. When I was stationed at Ahaura the Midland Railway was in course of construction, and the navvies were getting 3s. a day more than I was getting, and they had no responsibility. I had £7,000 a year passing through my hands.

4. That had nothing to do with your position as a constable?—Yes; but I am speaking with regard to the responsibility. I think promotions should be made on merit alone.

5. Without any regard to seniority?—Yes.

6. That is rather a big order. You say that whatever a man's service might be he should be promoted because he may have exceptional merit?—I think if two men had the same qualification, then, of course, the senior man should be promoted.

7. Of course he may, but that is not the way you put it: you said promotion should be solely by merit. You would put a man with two years' service on the same footing as a man with fifteen years' service?—I do not believe in old men being promoted.

8. It is not a question of old age: it is a question of experience. You cannot make an experienced man out of a young man of short service. What you want is experience and merit as well?—My experience of the way we are at present is that a man is run out before he gets promotion.

9. What do you consider the maximum age at which promotion should be given—that is, having in view the work he had to do?—Say forty or forty-five.

10. After you get to forty, every years makes a difference?—Forty-five years.

11. You would not promote any man over the age of forty-five years?—I think much younger men should be promoted.

12. The question is whether you would promote a man a sergeant over forty-five years of age?—I think men like Constable Thompson, of Dargaville, and Constable Willcocks, here, would be capable men.

13. What service do you think a man should have to qualify him for promotion to sergeant?—I think as soon as he shows he is qualified for promotion he ought to be promoted.

14. Surely you must admit that a man must have a variety of experience before he should be promoted a sergeant?—Yes, after he has gone through street and station duty, and shown that he is capable of being promoted.

15. As a rule, a man has four or five years' experience before he is put in charge of a station?—Yes.

16. You would give him two or three years in charge of a station, so that comes to some ten years before he would have promotion?—Yes.

17. You think that Constables Thompson and Willcocks should be selected for the position of sergeant?—Yes.

18. They have not got ten years' service?—No.

19. How about the men who have longer service—say, fifteen years—and who are just as capable men?—I would promote the men with the longer service.

20. Is there anything else you wish to say?—I know of no mismanagement having taken place in the Force. I have always been well satisfied with the officers under whom I have served; and I am sure I have always done my best to preserve the discipline, sobriety, and efficiency of the Force. There is one other matter I would like to refer to, and that is with regard to Dr. Sharman, the Police Surgeon at Auckland. He attended me. He treated me very well, was attentive, and came often to visit me.

21. You understand that there is no question as to his qualifications. He is a duly qualified and registered medical practitioner. The only question, as far as I am concerned, is whether there is a strong and deep-rooted objection to him personally on the part of the men at the Auckland Station, and whether there is sufficient reason to make a change. You know that dissatisfaction exists?—Yes.

22. What is it based on?—I could not say.

23. You know that some of them pay other doctors rather than employ him. There may be absolutely no foundation for their objection, but still you say you know it exists?—Yes; a great many of them say he is not the kind of doctor they wish to have.

24. Still, your personal experience is one of complete satisfaction?—Yes, he treated me very satisfactorily.

25. What is the difficulty in recruiting at the present time a suitable class of men?—On account of labourers and others getting more money, through a general rise in wages throughout the country.

26. Do you think raising the pay would induce a better class to come forward?—I do.

27. And you would not interfere with the standard of education at all?—Not so long as it is the Fifth Standard, or something equivalent.

28. When you were first promoted to be sergeant, were you physically capable?—Yes; I was one of the leading football-players in New Zealand.

29. How long is it since you have been in ill health?—I was in a riot eighteen years ago, and was knocked about.

30. But you were not promoted to be sergeant eighteen years ago, but five years ago. What was your physical condition then?—When I was promoted I was not fit.

31. I am very much inclined to favour the suggestion that every man, before being promoted to sergeant, should undergo a physical examination, to see if he is fit to carry out the arduous duties of sergeant. You think if you had been subject to a medical examination before being promoted you would not have passed?—I am positive of it.

32. Then, you took the promotion although you were aware you were not qualified?—Yes; I thought the work might be lighter for me.

33. Who recommended you?—I was in the Auckland District. It would be Inspector Cullen.

34. Was he aware of your physical condition?—No.

35. And as far as you were aware, the Department knew nothing?—No.

36. But you knew you would have to do certain sectional duty: how did you expect that to be lighter? Sectional duty is very heavy in the cities?—Yes, it is heavy, especially at Newton.

37. And plenty of other places besides. How did you expect to become better off by being promoted to be sergeant in the matter of your physical condition?—I thought the work might be lighter, and that I might be sent to a station.

38. Do you think your promotion to be sergeant has caused your health to still further suffer?—No; I am sure it has not.

39. What is your age?—Fifty-four.

40. Then, you were forty-nine when you were promoted?—Yes.

41. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You would not care about going in for football now?—No.

42. The question of a pension would have arisen if you had not been promoted, and you would have been entitled to so much pension?—Yes.

The Commissioner. The main point is that he would not have been promoted if a medical examination had taken place.

Mr. Dinnie. Quite so; but the further question arises whether a man, if he is entitled to promotion, should be kept back.

The Commissioner. He himself admits he was never physically capable of discharging the duties he was called on to fill.

Mr. Dinnie. That is best known to himself.

The Commissioner. But it emphasizes the necessity of a medical examination.

43. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You think that candidates ought to be twenty-five before they are taken on?—Yes; lots of young men have not much knowledge when they join at twenty-one.

44. Do you not think that young men are much more easily trained to discipline than men who have seen a good bit of the world?—Yes; they are then capable of being well trained.

45. Later in life they get to know too much of the world?—They know often too much for training then.

46. You were perfectly satisfied with Dr. Sharman's treatment?—Yes.

47. And you would have him again if he were available?—He was not my choice.

48. *The Commissioner.*] Would you take him by choice?—No.

49. Why not?—On account of what I heard from those men who knew him best.

50. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You should not listen to everything that is said about a man. He attended you, and gave you satisfaction?—He was the doctor I had to go to.

51. He gave you every satisfaction?—Yes.

52. *The Commissioner.*] You think that because he is objected to by the police it might affect his qualification in regard to attending you?—I do not think that.

53. You would not have him because other men objected to him?—They were men who knew him a long time. I have heard lots of them talking about him.

54. You think that it would greatly destroy his usefulness if complaints were being made about him?—No; I thought that when the men spoke against him there was perhaps some truth in it.

55. *Mr. Dinnie.*] This feeling has been in existence a long time?—Yes.

56. *The Commissioner.*] Is it fostered or encouraged by the officers?—I do not think so.

57. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Of course, you know that the great majority of the men there are young men, who know nothing about Dr. Sharman?—Yes.

58. Do you think it would be advisable to reduce the standard of education to the Fourth instead of keeping it up to the Fifth?—No; I think the Fifth Standard should be maintained.

59. Do you not think that we lose a good many recruits of the farming class who would make very good constables, but who have not passed the Fifth Standard?—I know that I felt the want of a better standard of education. I passed the Fourth Standard.

60. *The Commissioner.*] I suppose you were well enough educated to make a good sergeant?—I have done a lot of work.

61. And you might have been lost to the Force if the standard you had to pass had been higher?—Perhaps.

62. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Education does not altogether make the man?—No; I think some men with a Third Standard certificate are far better than lots of men with a Sixth Standard one.

ERNEST GERARD, Official Assignee, examined on oath. (No. 238.)

Witness. I am the Official Assignee for the northern district, and in that capacity I come into contact with the police in different parts. I do not know anything about the men on street duty, but for nearly fifteen years I have come into contact with them in Wellington and Auckland, and also with the men who are in charge of country districts, and the sergeants in charge of sub-districts.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How do you find things?—I find the police a very desirable class of men, thoroughly reliable, efficient, tactful, and business-like.

2. Are their reports reliable?—Yes.

3. What about the standard of education?—Some of the men in charge have a fair standard of education. Of course, we cannot all have the benefits of a high standard of education. I am a university man, and it is no advantage to me to-day. My commercial education has been of greater advantage to me.

4. Do you travel about the country much?—Yes, all over the province.

5. We are faced with the fact that the right class of men are not coming forward as recruits at present. What do you attribute the falling-off to?—I think it is the pay. I do not think it is right to employ men as constables at a lower rate of pay than ordinary labourers get.

6. But there are advantages in the Force afterwards?—Yes; the tradesman is also better off afterwards. After he has learnt his trade he can go into business for himself.

7. Do you think it is the low rate of pay that is the main factor in the recruits not coming forward?—It keeps men off who might otherwise come forward. As to the question of the standard of education, I do not think there is much in that contention, and, after all, what is the difference between the Fourth and the Fifth Standards?

8. Do you know what the difference is?—I do not think there is very much difference, as far as the practical work is concerned.

9. And you think that for all practical purposes the Fourth Standard is quite as good for police purposes as the Fifth Standard?—I believe there are better tests that can be applied than a mere examination test as to educational fitness only.

10. And you would have that test made elastic, so as to take advantage of the personality of the men?—The stamp of the men and their family history seems to be very important factors.

GEORGE GARDINER MENZIES, Engineer, examined on oath. (No. 239.)

Witness: I am a Road Engineer, at Rotorua. My son, Claude Hamilton Menzies, applied to be enrolled in the New Zealand Police Force in May, 1904, and was rejected, but ultimately he was accepted. He is now waiting until the Commissioner chooses to employ him. I gather from the reports of the Commission that many constables who do not bear the best of reputations have been enrolled in the Force, and that the Government have some difficulty in obtaining the right class of men. I do not know why my son was rejected, and should like now to be told.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You surely would not take up the attitude that the Commissioner of Police had to take anybody who applied, no matter whether he considered them suitable or not?—Not at all; but it is due to me and the public to be told the offence he is charged with.

2. But supposing he has not been charged with any offence, but that he is simply considered unsuitable?—I think reasons should be given for his rejection.

3. Well, you were told that the Department did not think he was suitable for enrolment?—I do not think that is a proper reason. The constable who reported on his case said he was not a proper person. He told me with considerable vehemence that my son was not suitable.

4. Is he in constant employment now?—Yes.

5. Does he still wish to join the Police Force?—I never wanted him to join, but now I want to know why he was refused.

6. Then, you are satisfied with the present position, seeing he has not been enrolled?—Not at all. I am delighted that he did not join; but I am not at all satisfied with the action of the Commissioner in rejecting him without giving the reason, and on the report of one constable. I referred the Commissioner to two constables who I understood were hostile to my son, but I think they gave him a most excellent character. Any person who has been rejected for the public service should be told the reason why.

7. I cannot agree with you at all?—Is one constable to be allowed to condemn the character of the whole community?

8. How do you know it was a question of character? Has the Commissioner ever told you?—I am not quite sure about that.

9. Would you compel the Commissioner to tell you the reason?—If you read the letter you will see that he has put him on the list for employment.

10. But at that time he says he does not consider his qualifications sufficient?—I would like to know why his qualification is not sufficient.

11. As long as he does not injure any one by his rejection of an applicant, what does it matter?—But he has injured me.

12. He has never said anything against your son's character?—My son has been pointed at by a number of people as a police "reject," and some of my other sons have been said to be the "reject." That rejection is still standing.

13. How does it affect your son if it is not on the ground of character?—I do not know.

14. There are men rejected every day, but not on the ground of character?—It seems to me a most unwarrantable thing that at any time one man can take away the reputation of a person when fifty-five other people would be willing to testify to the contrary. I am now quite willing to leave the matter in your hands.

15. We differ as to the absolute power of the Commissioner of Police to accept or refuse candidates for the Force, and I would not force upon him any one he did not think was qualified in all respects?—The Commissioner has no means of knowing, excepting from the reports of his underlings.

16. Then, you want to force men into the service who the Commissioner says are not required?—I do not, but I think this is a proper case where an open inquiry should be held. I was promised an inquiry, which did not come off.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What inquiry did you expect?—To see whether my son was capable or not.

18. That has been done over and over again?—I was not there.

19. How old is your son?—Twenty-nine; he was twenty-five then.

20. By what right do you claim to know the reason for his rejection?—The right that a father has who takes an interest in his son's welfare.

21. You have no right to know anything about it?—I say I have; it has affected me materially.

22. *The Commissioner.*] The appointment held by the Commissioner of Police gives him the absolute right of accepting or rejecting a candidate?—Then, he should be deprived of it.

23. Evidently there is something behind this matter?—That is what I say.

24. The question is, have you a right to know, for this reason: the power is vested in the Commissioner of Police, and it must be exercised at his personal discretion?—I admit your contention, but I consider that the Commissioner has got too much power in that respect.

25. Every man who applies for enrolment in the Police Force must run the risk of rejection?—Some reason should be given.

26. Your evidence is recorded, and will be made public, but the matter does not come within the scope of the Commission; I have no authority to interfere with the discretionary powers vested in the Commissioner of Police by law?—I may say that I had an interview with the Commissioner of Police, who gave me every courtesy; but, at the same time, I think he did not exercise that care, judgment, and research that he should have exercised under the circumstances.

27. Are you not allowing yourself to be influenced by what you hear outside?—No.

28. You referred to Constable Moore telling you certain things?—I went and asked him.

29. Are not you allowing yourself to be influenced by that?—Yes.

30. The Commissioner of Police does not cast one word of reflection on your son?—Perhaps you might peruse all the papers.

31. I have perused them all, and there is not one word there that can be regarded as a stigma on your son?—I think there is. When my son made application I saw Constable Moore in Whangarei, and I told him he had applied. The constable said, "A fine young man like that will get in"; but before the Monday he had sent in an unfavourable report to the Commissioner. He told me he did. I asked him to show me the report, but he refused. I think some better method of selecting candidates should be adopted.

32. What would you suggest would be a better method?—The Resident Magistrate of the district should be the person referred to in the matter, especially in country districts.

33. How can the average Stipendiary Magistrate be as well acquainted with what is required of a candidate as a man who occupies the important and responsible position of a Commissioner of Police?—He would know the boy locally.

34. What else would he know?—He would have some experience, or opinion, as to his fitness.

35. But would that opinion be worth as much as that of the Commissioner of Police?—I really think it would.

36. Well, I am a Stipendiary Magistrate, and I should not set my opinion for one moment in respect to this matter against that of the Commissioner of Police, who has a full knowledge of what is required, and has the material before him. I do not know anything about your son, but I am perfectly satisfied that the Commissioner must have had strong reasons for rejecting him. I am very sorry that I have to decline in this case to go into the question of the rejection of applicants for the Force, but the matter does not come within the scope of the Commission?—I consider it is a matter of public importance.

37. Why do you not petition Parliament?—I saw the late Minister at Wellington, and he told me he did not think I ought to see the papers, and it is possible I may petition Parliament yet.

38. How long have you been in the public service in New Zealand?—Twenty-four years.

39. Do you think the public service could possibly be carried on if every man were allowed to see the departmental records?—I would make no report against an officer unless I showed it to him.

THAMES, WEDNESDAY, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

THOMAS HENRY HELLYER BEDDEK, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 240.)

Witness: My name is Thomas Henry Hellyer Beddek. I was enrolled in the Police Force in 1884, and was placed in charge of a station about eleven years ago, at Hikurangi, North of Auckland; and have relieved at other stations. First of all I was stationed for a couple of months at Wellington, when I first joined; was transferred to Ashburton: was there about three years; from there was transferred to Waimate, South Canterbury; from Waimate was transferred to Timaru: remained nearly eight years there; from there was transferred to Hikurangi; and was from there transferred to Shortland, Thames.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How is it you were so long in getting charge of a station?—I was Inspector of Factories, &c., at Timaru, and have been an Inspector of Factories ever since.

2. Have you ever applied for a station?—I am in charge of Shortland.

3. Is there anything you wish to say to the Commission?—I have had twenty-five years' service, and have practically a clean sheet. I have received a good education, am the eldest son of a colonel in the army, and feel it very much that I have not received promotion—for what reason I cannot say. I have always done my duty well. I have a large family—nine children to keep—and the pay of a sergeant would be very beneficial to me now. I may state also that I have been left solely in charge of the Thames Station for months at a time. Before the arrival of the Inspector and Sergeant Darby I ran the station for a month, satisfactorily so far as I know.

4. Is it true that you have never been satisfactorily reported on by your superior officers?—To my knowledge, not by one superior officer, Inspector Cullen.

5. Why?—I have no idea.

6. Had you served under him to any extent?—Only a few years at Hikurangi. I knew him as a second-class sergeant in the south.

7. How old are you?—Forty-five. I am the youngest man in the Force with my length of service.

8. Are you physically sound?—I am.

48—H. 16B.

9. What is your weight?—About 16 st. 5 lb. I was educated at one of the best colleges in England.

10. The reason you appear before the Commission is to urge your claim for promotion?—Yes.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you cannot give the reason for your not having been promoted?—Except what Inspector Cullen said.

12. Is that your signature [document shown to witness]?—It is.

13. Have you seen that file?—Yes. I have not seen the whole of the file. This is all foreign matter altogether.

14. You saw this report of mine?—Yes.

15. Does it not give a reason?—It gives your reason.

16. You said you knew of no reason?—The reason given is not true.

17. *The Commissioner.*] What is it?—It says that I am not active enough. I think if I am Inspector of Weights and Measures, and perform all the other duties I have to perform, that a little bit of energy is required to do that.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Will you look at this report of one of the sergeants?—I knew he would not report favourably of me.

19. Would you ask to see Sergeant Sheehan's report [report handed to witness]?

20. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any reason why these two men should not report favourably of you?—I did not get on well with Sergeant Sheehan. As to the other man, I do not know the reason.

21. As to Station-Sergeant Darby, how is it that he reports unfavourably of you?—I cannot say the exact reason, unless it is vindictiveness altogether.

22. No man is vindictive to another without some reason?—There must be something I do not know.

23. Do you not know the reason why?—I do not know the reason. He has often spoken of me to Mr. McGowan.

The Commissioner.] Mr. McGowan would not interfere with the internal management of the Force.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think you have sought influence?—I have never gained anything by influence.

25. *The Commissioner.*] Who do you say spoke to Mr. McGowan?—Sergeant Darby said he had spoken to Mr. McGowan on my behalf.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you not spoken to Mr. McGowan yourself?—Yes.

27. It has been of no benefit to you?—No.

28. *The Commissioner.*] Of course, you know this resolves itself into a personal question?—Yes.

29. I do not wish to refer specially to the details set out here. Some of these officers certainly do not think you are suitable in any way for promotion. You know the details?—Yes, I have seen the reports.

30. What about this beer-drinking: is there anything in that?—What is that?

31. One man says you are too much given to beer-drinking?—I do not think so. I have never been spoken to about that.

32. Do you drink beer?—I take a drink of beer occasionally.

33. I do not want to bring up personal questions, but you have raised the question of your fitness for promotion. I shall leave out portions of the reports, but one officer says you are inclined to laziness, and generally perform your duties in a very perfunctory manner, and although nominally in charge of Shortland you will take no responsibility, and that all the work is done from the Thames Station?—It is not true. I deny that *in toto*.

34. You knew the late Sub-Inspector Gordon?—Yes, very slightly.

35. He says he considers you most unsuitable for promotion?—He did not know me. He may have heard something, and perhaps he was going on that.

36. In fact, he said if you were promoted he hoped you would not be sent under him?—He may have said so.

37. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have been under Inspector Cullen?—Yes, five or six years.

38. In the face of all these reports you would not expect me to promote you?—I do not think you should only look at those reports.

39. *The Commissioner.*] How is the Commissioner of Police to know unless he acts on the reports of his officers? How could the Commissioner possibly do otherwise than pass you over? Those reports may be untrue—I am not dealing with the merits of the reports—but the Commissioner now asks you to say how he could promote you after receiving those reports from your superior officers?—After seeing the reports there, I could hardly expect the Commissioner to promote me. I quite agree with him. But the Commissioner does not know me. On the face of it, I could hardly expect the Commissioner to promote me.

40. Later on I will ask Inspector Kiely and Sergeant Morgan with regard to your qualifications?—Sergeant Morgan has known me for over twenty years. I have been asked to act as a delegate for the men, and to bring the following matters under the notice of the Commission: (1.) That the rate of pay should be 8s. a day, and increased periodically by 6d. until 10s. is reached. (2.) That married constables should receive 1s. 6d. a day house-allowance. (3.) That free uniforms be issued, and two pairs of boots every twelve months; and that rubber gloves and disinfectants be provided by the Department for the use of the police when recovering dead bodies. (4.) Eighteen days' annual leave, to be allowed to accumulate for three years. (5.) That free passes for the railway be issued to the police. The annual leave usually comes at a time when they cannot take advantage of excursion rates. (6.) First-class steamer fares be granted to the police and their families when on transfer. (7.) We consider that no constable should receive promotion to

sergeant until he has been in the service at least fifteen years; and that constables of twenty years' service should be called senior constables, receive 1s. a day extra, and be allowed to wear a badge of distinction. It is impossible for all constables to receive promotion, and this would remove the stigma that might otherwise be cast on them through having been passed over. (8.) The travelling-allowance should be at least 8s. a day instead of 6s. a day.

ANDREW MORGAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 241.)

Witness: My name is Andrew Morgan. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Thames. I was enrolled in the Force in 1881, and was promoted sergeant four years ago. I was three years a constable before I was put in charge of a station. I did sectional duty for three years, and got promotion when my turn came.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You have known Constable Beddek for some time?—Yes; I first knew him eighteen or nineteen years ago, and met him casually, and then lost sight of him till I came here. I have been here fourteen months, and I have seen a good deal of him during that time.

2. What is your opinion of his qualifications for promotion?—I have had no opportunities of judging. He is in charge of a little suburban station, Shortland. His principal duties are acting as Inspector of Factories, and in connection with old-age pension work. Really nothing critical has yet cropped up to give the Inspector or myself an opportunity of judging his qualifications.

3. Still, you have had a lot to do with him. I would very much rather not have to ask you these questions, because I know how disagreeable it is to have to express your opinion on a man unless that opinion is absolutely favourable. But here is a man making a grievance of the fact that he has been passed over for promotion. Therefore it resolves itself into a personal question. And he distinctly raises the issue in this way: he wishes me to understand that the adverse reports which have been made against him have been prejudiced reports. That being so, he is quite entitled, if he can do so, to show that those reports were not perhaps in the best interests of the service; and, on the other hand, that he is a man well qualified for promotion?—I am going to be very straight. Beddek is a man of good character, and a man I have a very high opinion of, but I do not think he would make a good sergeant. I say that without any feeling, because he knows that I have no feeling against him.

4. You say that with a due regard to the interests of the service?—Yes; and to show that I am favourably disposed towards him I may state this: Some months ago a man approached me with regard to Constable Beddek. In the course of conversation I said I had no official knowledge, but I understood there were some adverse reports against him, and he was probably aware of them. I was asked whether there was any chance of getting any recommendation from Inspector Kiely or myself. I explained that Inspector Kiely was placed in a rather awkward position, because, although he might be favourably disposed towards him, in face of the reports of officers who had known him for a number of years, he would have to be very careful; but in the course of a little time perhaps he would be able to give him a good character. The matter stopped at that. Some little time ago Commissioner Dinnie was here, and Constable Beddek had an interview with him. When he returned from the Commissioner he seemed pleased, and said that Mr. Dinnie had told him that he would perhaps be able to give him charge of one of the gaols—at Oamaru. In the course of a little time Mr. Dinnie telegraphed, and asked if Beddek would take charge of the Oamaru Gaol. Beddek declined, and seemed very indignant about it. I said, "Beddek, I do not think you treated the Commissioner properly." He said he ought to have got promotion. I said, "Ask the Commissioner for promotion, and you will get a direct answer to the question." There were others present when I said that to him. He asked me if I would draft an application for him. That is the application that was sent to the Commissioner, and he got a reply. Beddek is incensed at me now because I did not recommend him in the first instance. I did what I could, and interested myself on his behalf. Before I close this matter, I would like to say this: that I would very much like to see the Commissioner do something for Beddek. There is no doubt he is in many respects a superior man, and has been well brought up. No doubt he has allowed this feeling to grow up to such an extent that he is a misery to himself and everybody connected with him. He has a large family of small children, and his wife is not strong. I am satisfied that my Inspector will bear out what I have said. The question of drink has been raised. I have never seen Beddek under the influence of liquor, and whatever he may have been in the past I do not think he is addicted to liquor now. He is a decent, kindly fellow; but this feeling has got the best of him, and I am very sorry that I cannot say what I would like to be able to say—that I think him a superior man in every respect.

5. At the present time there is a difficulty in getting recruits to come forward for enrolment in the Force—there is a great falling-off in the number of applications?—I think Mr. Dinnie was grasping at too much; he wanted a great big lot of men, superior to any Police Force in the world. We know that the young colonial is not very amenable to discipline. If you could get the first year or two over, they would be better.

6. Have you ever been applied to by young fellows who desired to enter the service?—There are various causes that tend to keep away applicants.

7. Do you think the standard of education has anything to do with it?—I would not make a hard-and-fast rule in regard to the education test.

8. Would you approve of a period of probation before enrolling candidates?—Yes; say, six months—three months in the depot and three in the street.

9. What is the conduct of the men in this district?—They are very well conducted.

10. You have no trouble in the way of drinking?—No; they are good steady workers. You could not wish for better. They have the interests of the service at heart.

11. Have you any opinions on the vexed question of the difference between the plain-clothes and the uniform branch?—No; there is a jealous feeling in all military associations.

12. How old were you when you were promoted?—Fifty-one years. The statement made in the evidence given at Dunedin that I was fifty-five is incorrect. I wish to thank you, sir, for the kindly remarks you made concerning me at Dunedin. I was not fifty when Mr. Dinnie first offered me promotion, but for domestic reasons I declined it then, but accepted twelve months later.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your Inspector recommended you?—Yes.

14. *The Commissioner.*] What is the maximum age at which you consider a man should be promoted to be sergeant?—I did not find any physical difficulty. But I would not advise any man over forty-five to take it on; at the same time, if a man is willing to take it, I would not exclude him up to fifty. I saw where one sergeant said that a man ought not to be allowed to refuse promotion. I do not agree with that, unless the interests of the service are likely to suffer.

15. That is the very point?—Here is the position: I know that the interests of the service would not suffer from my not accepting promotion.

16. That will not hold water for one moment. There is no use talking like that. I consider, without flattering you, that you had exceptional qualifications for promotion, and I consider that if you had refused promotion it would have been a distinct loss to the efficiency of the service.

Mr. Dinnie. I must differ from you in regard to the principle involved there.

The Commissioner. I know you do; but that is the attitude I am going to take up, and shall report accordingly to His Excellency the Governor. (To witness): That is the position, sergeant, and it is therefore useless your addressing me on the subject.

Mr. Dinnie. I agree in the case of an exceptionally good man.

The Commissioner. I started by saying that I considered Sergeant Morgan had exceptionally good qualifications.

Mr. Dinnie. I quite agree with that. There may be some men who are only fitted to be sergeants, and there is no harm in overlooking them.

17. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] A great deal has been said about shakos and helmets: what is your opinion on that matter?—Commissioner Tunbridge called for a vote on the question. I voted for the shako; but I would reverse my vote now.

18. Are rubber gloves provided for this station?—No. The last body I dealt with I handled with a fork.

19. You should represent these matters: if you think them necessary you should ask for them?—It will not be long now before I ask for them.

20. With regard to the extra emoluments in certain country stations, it has been suggested that the difference is so great it is almost necessary to deal with the matter in some form or other. One man told us that when he accepted promotion he was getting £130 a year over and above his police pay?—I do not think they should be taken away from these men.

21. It is not proposed to take them away entirely, but to allow a man to receive a certain amount?—I would not curtail them. I would make periodical changes: transfer the men to other stations. I know of one man in charge of a station who only gets a very small sum extra: I would transfer him to a good station.

22. You were a long time at Christchurch: do you think there is need for a gymnasium there?—I do not think there is any town that requires it more than Christchurch. The town is flat, and the men do not get proper exercise. I always impress on the men the importance of keeping themselves fit physically by taking physical exercise.

23. You think that in every centre there should be a gymnasium?—Yes.

24. Do you agree with the proposal that there should be an instructor?—One witness said in Auckland that it was in the interests of both the prisoner and the arresting constable that the constable should know how to handle a man properly.

25. The less the arresting constable knows of how to handle him properly the more rough he is likely to be?—Yes.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know there is a gymnasium at the Auckland Station?—Yes.

27. It is intended to get more if we can get the money?—Yes.

28. Do you think that certain communications that appear in the Press tend to prevent men joining the Force?—Yes.

29. Do you know from whom these communications emanate?—No.

30. As to the inquiries into the characters of men applying for admission to the Force, do you know that they are stricter than they used to be?—Yes.

31. Have you had a number of inquiries to make yourself?—Yes. I was surprised when one came back to me the other day. I had occasion to report a little adversely upon a man from statements made by an ex-employer; and I have since found that, as a result, inquiries are being made in England about the man's previous career.

32. You know that the inquiries are more strict now than they used to be?—Yes; but you will get a bad man in occasionally, no matter how strict the inquiries may be.

33. Do you think the education standard might be lowered?—No, I would keep it at the Fifth Standard; but I would make the rule more elastic.

34. What do you say as regards the efficiency of the Force at the present time compared with former years?—It is very good.

35. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction as regards the present control?—I have no grievance. But if you take the seniority list and it is found that a senior man is passed over by a junior man, and the senior man is taken up and promoted a little later on, that causes some dissatisfaction. Constable Beddek spoke about recognising the service of senior constables. The scheme is mine. After a constable has done twenty years' service I would certainly give him 1s. a day extra to make up for promotion not coming to him at a time when he could have accepted it.

If that were done it would go a long way towards satisfying old and deserving men who have passed the age when they can receive promotion. They could be sent to Kaiapoi, Akaroa, and similar small stations where there are two constables. I think there are about ninety men with twenty years' service.

36. You would not promote them now?—No; I would make them senior constables. I would create a new rank.

37. Take Constable Leahy, of Oxford?—I would make his pay the minimum pay of a sergeant, and I would put a chevron on his arm.

38. You think that would do away with the dissatisfaction?—I think it would allay a lot of it. There are several old members of the Force that I would like to see get the extra pay.

39. These men, if they had been promoted in their turn, would have been promoted before I came here?—Yes; I cast no reflection on you. I am simply making what I think is a good suggestion.

40. You would not promote them or put them on the street, because it would not be in the interests of the service?—It would not be a kindness to do it. I do not think there would be any difficulty in adopting my scheme.

41. You know that some men, even though their characters were good when they joined the Force, subsequently bring discredit on the Force?—Yes; there are good, bad, and indifferent in all organized communities. You can weed out the undesirables when you find them, but you cannot help them getting into the Force.

42. *Inspector Kiely.*] Referring to Constable Beddek, I think we have had conversations from time to time as regards his qualifications for the rank of sergeant?—Yes.

43. And when I was recommending constables for promotion, I think I took your advice?—I have no recollection.

44. We discussed Constable Beddek's case?—Yes; and I know you would have been very pleased to have done something for him if you could.

45. *Constable Beddek.*] You referred to my taking over Oamaru Gaol?—Yes.

46. Do you remember my reasons for not taking it?—You said it was unsuitable to go there with a family of growing girls.

47. Do you think I would gain anything by going there—to a gaol in a no-license district?

The Commissioner: What has that to do with it.

48. *Constable Beddek.*] Because there are no prisoners there. (To witness): You said that I am a man of excellent character?—Yes.

49. You also said you have never seen me with the slightest sign of liquor?—I say so again.

50. *Mr. Dinne.*] Under the present system it is hard on the married man from the time he joins the Force until he gets a station?—Yes, if he has two or three children.

51. That is the time they want help and additional pay?—Yes, in the shape of rent. I notice that it was stated in evidence in Auckland that the discipline at Auckland is superior to anywhere else in the Dominion. I want to combat that statement on behalf of the officer I recently served under. I cannot allow Auckland to take the pride of place. In Christchurch the discipline is excellent. The Inspector there is an able man and a good disciplinarian, and he looks after the place well. They certainly had an able Sub-Inspector, now Inspector Dwyer. I am not saying anything against Auckland—I think it is splendidly managed, and that Inspector Cullen is a splendid man; but I cannot allow Christchurch to be put in second place.

SAMUEL FLAVELL, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 242.)

Witness: I am a police constable, in charge of the station at Waikino. I was enrolled on the 5th March, 1895, and got charge of a station in August, 1899.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before the Commission?—In the first place the question of promotions. Junior constables are being promoted over the heads of senior ones. All things being equal, the senior men should get the preference, but as things are now men are promoted to the rank of sergeant who have had very little more service in the Force than I have had of station-charge duty.

2. You think this creates dissatisfaction?—It is doing so throughout the Dominion.

3. *Mr. Dinne:* How do you know?—I hear the men speaking about it, and I am speaking on behalf of the others. Men of over twenty years' service, who have given satisfaction, have been overlooked.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Of course, you know that the recommendations are mostly made by Inspectors?—Yes, by the Inspector to the Commissioner of Police.

5. How do you account for the claims of these men having been overlooked?—Political influence must be used.

6. Is there anything else you wish to mention?—We also consider that the travelling-allowance is insufficient. Men get now 3s. a day for seven days, and I think they should be paid actual travelling-expenses. It costs me 6s. a day when I am away, but when a man goes to the Supreme Court he is allowed 6s. for the day and 4s. for the night.

7. Have you ever applied for and been refused your actual travelling-expenses?—No; I have always followed the rules. When I have been away for a day and a night and have asked for the 6s. it has been allowed. The house-allowance for married men in the towns is not sufficient. A married constable is allowed 1s. a day, but it costs him just as much for rent as the sergeant, who is allowed 10s. per week. One cannot get a house under from 15s. to 17s. 6d. a week, so that a man is out of pocket. I think we should be allowed at least 1s. 6d. a day or 2s. for house-allowance.

8. House-rent has gone up enormously?—Yes; about 8s. or 9s. a week since I was in a city. Another matter is the question of the promotion of constables from street duty to out-stations. I consider there should be a grading of stations, and that a constable going from street duty to the charge of a station should start with a small station at first, and gradually work up to a better one. For instance, if a station which is put down as a good one becomes vacant I apply for that station, but perhaps when the appointment is made one sees that a man who has not got six years' service is appointed over a man who has over ten years' service. In such a case the appointment should go by seniority alone. I understand the work of a Clerk of Court, as I have been in touch with one at each end when I was in charge of a station, and could therefore take a better station, and do the work well.

9. Would you take into consideration the emoluments of a station?—They are very little.

10. Some are very large indeed?—Some are, and the prospects would encourage a constable to study Magistrate's Court work.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know the system of recommending men for promotion to the charge of stations?—I have never heard of it.

12. Is it for the Inspector to recommend?—I cannot say how it is done.

13. Should not the Inspector recommend?—You would think so.

14. Would not he choose the best man?—He can only speak of a man in his own district, but if the appointment is outside his district—

15. Then the other Inspector recommends?—The other Inspector might have a man that the Inspector in this district does not know anything about.

16. That Inspector would know his qualifications?—How is one Inspector to know what appeals to another man in another district. The Commissioner would be the one who would be able to pick the man out.

17. It goes through the Commissioner now?—Yes, finally.

18. As regards promotions, you think they should be by seniority and merit combined?—Yes.

19. What cases do you know of where a senior man has been overlooked while a junior man has equal qualifications?—A constable who was in charge of a station was shifted from that station to another, and thence to street duty. He was only on street duty a short time when he got charge of an important station. He went up for his examination and failed, and now he is promoted to the rank of sergeant.

The Commissioner: Just write his name down [name handed in].

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know whether you have been recommended at any time for advancement?—I do not know. I have never attempted to use influence myself, although the present member for the district and I were boys together.

21. Taking the case we have heard of to-day—Constable Beddek—he has used influence on two or three occasions, but it has not been successful: what do you say to that?—Every man is not successful, but in that case apparently the other man was successful.

22. Does that prove that influence obtains?—I did not hear Constable Beddek's evidence.

23. He said that he himself has sought influence in two or three directions, and it has not been successful: what do you say to that?—I could not say anything.

24. Does that look like influence obtaining?—It seems he used influence, but it has not been successful.

25. But you are suggesting that it is successful, and I want you to prove a case?—I cannot prove a case. We hear so much talk about it, and reference was made only the other day that influence is being used.

26. You know that men get actual expenses that they incur, according to regulation?—I could not say further than what I have done myself.

27. You know that by the Police Regulations actual expenses are allowed?—According to circular, we used to be allowed 7s. a day; but that order was cancelled.

28. I am talking about actual expenses: you know the regulations provide for that?—There is a regulation.

29. You know the system of recommending for promotion: that the Inspectors recommend every year the men they think fit for promotion?—Yes; but it seems a strange thing how the man I have mentioned ever got it.

30. He must have been recommended by his Inspector?—Possibly so.

31. There is no question about it. I can show you his name on the list of recommendations, but I cannot show yours?—Of course, I am not looking for the stripe myself; but I think I might have a better station than what I have now.

32. Have you applied for it?—I was offered Tauranga.

33. Perhaps your Inspector did not think you fit for it?—I could not say.

34. *Inspector Kiely.*] You were appointed to a station some six or eight months ago where there was a second constable, and you refused it?—My reason was on account of the delicate state of my wife's health. When I applied for a transfer I mentioned that I wanted a station where there was a doctor. Tauranga is a long way back. That was the station offered me, but I did not think I was bettering myself by taking Tauranga.

35. Did you not on one occasion ask the Commissioner to appoint you to a suburban station?—I did.

36. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It is very difficult to find a suburban station?—I asked for a suburban station, or one near Auckland, and since then a station has become vacant near Auckland, but it was filled by another constable.

THOMAS BENJAMIN MILES, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 243.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Waihi, and was enrolled on the 1st July, 1904. I am a delegate from Waihi Station.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to say?—There is dissatisfaction over the allowances. I think that constables should receive the same travelling-allowance as other members of the Force—8s. a day. The constables get 1s. 6d. and the detectives 2s. for meals. I think we should be granted free passes on all Government railways, and first-class tickets for our wives and families by steamer when on transfer. We also ask for 10s. 6d. per week house-allowance, a free uniform, and two pairs of boots per year.

2. Have you got free quarters where you are?—No.

3. Are you married?—Yes.

4. What is your rent?—Ten shillings per week. It is a fairly good house, but a long way from the station. When in Auckland I was only receiving 7s. a day for the first twelve months, and I paid 14s. a week rent. As to uniform, we get one tunic in eighteen months and two pairs of trousers. The tweed is a black colour on one occasion, and blue the next. We would like to get the two pairs of trousers and the tunic at the same time. Men on joining should get 8s. a day, with a rise of 6d. every two years.

5. What were you doing before you joined the Force?—I was for about three years at the freezing-works at Petone.

6. What were your average wages then?—Four pounds a week for the nine months they were in operation during the year.

7. You think the pay is not sufficient to attract recruits?—No; apart from any advantages that might exist. As to travelling-expenses, supposing a constable is relieving a man who is away at the Supreme Court, the former only gets 3s. a day allowance, while the man who is at the Supreme Court is allowed 10s. I think 6s. or 8s. a day would not be too much. It does not matter how long a man is away from his station at the Supreme Court, his 10s. a day is going on all the time; but the other man has also his wife and family to keep, and gets only the 3s. a day. At our station there is a good deal of relieving duty to do. As to promotions, there have been one or two instances in which men have been promoted to the rank of sergeant who have not been physically fit for the position. After doing very little street duty they have knocked up.

8. Give me the names of some?—One man in Auckland did not do more than six months' duty. He was laid up the rest of the time, but he got a good station over the heads of eight other sergeants. I was in Auckland at the time, and I heard a good deal of adverse comment about the matter.

9. Is that the only instance you know of?—There was a similar case where a man went back to the rank of constable.

10. In the case you particularly refer to the sergeant has admitted to me that he was not fit to be promoted at the time. I asked him the question, with a view of emphasizing my opinion that no man should be promoted to be sergeant until he has passed a medical examination?—The recruits in the depot at Wellington are supposed to pass a certain examination after being there about eight weeks. When I went into the depot there were eight men, and another man came in a week later. But the Force was short of men in Auckland at the time, and the man who went into the depot last only stayed there a few weeks when he was sent to Auckland. In consequence, he is senior to every other man who was in the depot at that time, although he joined a week later.

11. Had he had previous service?—No.

12. Do you know why he was selected to go to Auckland?—I understood he was sent there because they were short of men.

13. But why he particularly?—I do not know. I cannot tell why he was sent there over the heads of men who were senior to him. With regard to the question of the clerks, there have been several cases of men doing street duty for a few weeks, and then going into the district office and one or two similar jobs.

14. Do you know that clerical work is not sought after in the Force?—I think it is. I was in Auckland for some time, and a good many men were anxious to get into the clerical branch.

15. Did they apply for it?—I cannot say.

16. The Commissioner told me recently there were only eight applications from the whole Force for employment as clerks?—When I was in Auckland I got leave about once in three months, but those men are off nearly every Sunday.

17. And you think the position would be sought after?—I do.

18. The men must be specially qualified?—That is so; and we read in the papers that the clerical positions are very responsible ones, and should be filled by tried officers who have proved themselves.

19. The Inspectors recommend men for employment in the office?—That is so. I suppose they would have to be recommended; but surely in a district like Auckland there are some men of probably two years' service who might do for the position.

20. But they probably have not the educational qualifications?—They have all to go through some examination, and to hold some certificate.

21. Apparently the cry has been that they require men of exceptional qualifications for the district office. However, you think there should be a better selection made, and that men are available?—I think so.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you made any representation of your views on these matters before?—No.

23. You have harboured all these matters up to now?—These are not my own ideas. I have been appointed a delegate from the Waihi Station. These are the views of several men.

24. You spoke so feelingly that I thought it came from yourself?—No, sir.

25. Do you not think that all these representations should be made through the proper channel?

The Commissioner: I cannot allow any question as to the right of the men to come before this Commission, Mr. Dinnie.

Mr. Dinnie: I want the men to know that there is a regulation which permits them to represent any grievance they have to the Department.

26. *Inspector Kiely* (to witness).] When you refer to clerks, do you refer to the district clerk in each office, and do you think you should be placed on the same footing as him?—No.

27. To only the assistant in the district office?—Yes.

28. Are you not aware that the district clerk has the handling of the accounts, the correspondence, the clerical work, and that generally they hold a very important position?—Yes; and it should be arranged that those men should be paid accordingly, and so have their services recognised. But I am comparing the position of the assistant clerk with that of the men outside; the assistant simply stops in the office and gets his promotion in due course far ahead of the man who is out in the streets in all weathers.

29. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you been overlooked at all?—Never.

TIMOTHY JAMES CUMMINGS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 244.)

Witness: I am a police constable, stationed at Waihi, and joined the Force on the 1st February, 1904.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are you speaking as a delegate, or on your own behalf?—For myself.

2. What do you wish to say?—With regard to uniform, I should like to see a uniform colour of tweed served out.

3. That matter has been attended to?—The house-allowance is not sufficient. I am a married man, and have free quarters at Waihi; but it affects others. Prior to going to Waihi I paid 10s. and 11s. rent a week. I do not consider the police pay is sufficient. Before I joined the police I always received 8s. a day.

4. You must have foreseen some advantage, or else you would not have joined?—That is so.

5. Do you think the pay is affecting the number of suitable applicants for the Force?—I do; it is too small on joining. I also think we should get two pairs of boots a year free, as it is an expensive item.

6. What does it cost to make up the uniform?—About £2 5s. for the suit.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have made no representations in respect to the uniform before?—No.

WILLIAM HECTOR MCKINNON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 245.)

Witness: I am a sergeant of police, in charge of Waihi sub-district. I was enrolled in the Force on the 21st October, 1881, but I had previous service. I was promoted to sergeant on the 1st March, 1903.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you done sectional duty?—I have—for three years, in Auckland.

2. What age were you when you were promoted?—About forty-two.

3. The Sub-Inspector in Auckland said you were one of the few men in the Force who had a special baton?—I did not bring it with me, but I will send it to you at Wellington. It is one of Detective Bain's patent batons. It is a very good baton, and I much prefer it to the regulation one. There is a guarantee sent with it, that it will not fracture the skull, or do any bodily harm, although it has the desired effect of knocking a man out.

4. Are there any general remarks you wish to make?—I have no grievance, but I would like to mention the question of the promotions to the higher ranks. It appears that the detective department is now having the better of the uniform branch. That is because the Chief Detective is the senior man to the station sergeant, which is the recognised channel through which promotion to the commissioned ranks follows. The Chief Detective attains to that grade after an average service of about fifteen years, but the station sergeant does not gain his position under about thirty-one years' service; and if the Chief Detective is eligible for a Sub-Inspectorship, it means he would become an Inspector and be in charge of a district in a few years. So that on account of seniority, but not length of service, it is clear that in the near future there will be a preponderance of commissioned officers with detective training and service only. The detectives are not subject to the same discipline as the uniform men, and could not maintain discipline accordingly. With reference to the promotion of sergeants and an increase of pay, I would like to see the rank of senior sergeant instituted, to apply to all stations where there are not less than four men; and about four sub-stations, I think, would come under this heading. The senior sergeant should be in charge in such cases.

5. You mean, do away with the rank of station sergeant?—Yes, and increase the pay. Start, say, at 13s. 6d., and go up to 15s. 6d. a day. I would also like to see the rank of senior constable instituted, with a small rise in pay, the latter to be, say, 10s. or 10s. 6d. a day, with one stripe for constable in charge of stations where there are two men besides the one in charge. I think the pay of the police should be raised all round, as I feel sure it is the cause of better men not coming forward for the service. In Waihi the average wage for miners is 12s. a day. I think a constable's pay should start at 8s. a day, and go up to 10s. a day. The house-allowance should be increased to 1s. 6d. for constables and 2s. for sergeants and detectives per day. A good deal has been said about the position of the district clerks. I fail to see why district clerks should not be promoted to the rank of sergeant, as, under the present conditions, there are no other means of raising their pay, and they certainly have important duties to perform. Without there is a special grade for them, there are no other means of paying them salaries equivalent to the work they are doing.

6. Would you advocate as a matter of principle increasing a man's pay by giving him extra rank?—It is the only way these men can be paid. Sergeant Bell, in Dunedin, Sergeant Ellison, in Wellington, and Sergeant Bulford, of Auckland, were all district clerks, but they held rank as sergeants.

7. It has been suggested that the district clerks who are sergeants should be compelled to go out and do police duty for a certain time?—If that were done it would be very wrong to appoint them sergeants, because you would appoint them over men who are constantly out doing beat duty, and give them a rank senior to the men doing beat duty all the time.

8. But you advocate giving them a rank for the purpose of increasing their pay, and then you say you would not make them do work inconsistent with their rank?—I refer to the present condition of the service. I am only saying that it ought to be altered so as to give these men adequate pay in another way.

9. You would not be in favour of compelling them to go out and do police duty?—I do not think it would be right. These men have special qualifications, and as long as they give satisfaction in the office they should be left there.

10. Then the logical result of what you now say is that once a man is appointed district clerk on promotion he should always remain a district clerk, and be nothing else?—I think so, in the present state of the service.

11. But the present state has existed for a considerable time past, and many men would never have been Inspectors if it had not been for the experience they gained as district clerks?—There is only one man in the service who is an Inspector who was a district clerk.

12. You are quite wrong?—There is only one that I know of.

13. If I have been told otherwise, then I have been told what is wrong, and you are right?—I do not say I am right, but he is the only one I know of.

14. You are speaking on incorrect premises. However, you would not be in favour of sending them out, but of simply keeping them as district clerks?—That is so.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think it would be better if we could arrange for those employed as assistant clerks to remain a certain number of years in the office, and then go out and qualify for sergeants?—Yes.

16. Supposing they had three or four years in the office, and then went out and took their chance of promotion with the others?—They would get their promotion in turn then.

17. And as regards the assistant clerk, you would have to give him a little extra pay?—Certainly, he should be paid according to his work.

18. And not be promoted until he is entitled to it?—There should be a means of paying him without promoting him to the rank of sergeant.

19. Of course, you know that it is not each Chief Detective who may be offered promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector?—That is so; but within the last five years a Chief Detective has got commissioned rank in about fifteen years' service.

20. But there has only been one Chief Detective appointed a Sub-Inspector for many years past?—That is so.

21. Then, they have not interfered with the promotion of the uniform branch?—But they are likely to in the future.

22. If we were to appoint more senior sergeants to out-districts—and that is the idea—that would give the uniform branch a similar chance of coming into competition with the detective branch?—It would put them on the same footing.

23. I suppose you have never had occasion to use that patent baton of yours?—I have used it.

24. With effect?—It had the desired effect. I did not injure anybody with it, but still it did the trick.

25. What was the cost?—I think, about 5s. I got it through Duthie and Co., Wellington.

26. It is not in use generally anywhere?—I have not seen another of them.

27. Have you ever made inquiries with respect to candidates for the service?—I have.

28. Are they stricter now than they used to be?—I cannot say that they are, but I have been always very careful when I have had inquiries to make.

29. Can you suggest a stricter inquiry?—I cannot.

30. You know the old system that was in force: the inquiries were made for about five years back?—Yes.

31. Now we go back to the time when the candidate left school?—That is so. I made some inquiries not very long ago, and we could not account for about four months of a man's time, as to where he had been, and I had that correspondence back twice.

32. It shows that the inquiries are strictly conducted?—Yes.

33. What about the efficiency of the Force at the present time?—I think it is good.

34. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service?—I do not know of any dissatisfaction in the service.

35. I suppose you know that as regards promotions there has always been dissatisfaction?—Of course, it naturally follows that when one man is promoted another man feels he has been slighted. The promotions are generally made on the recommendation of an Inspector who is qualified to pronounce an opinion on the men before him, and to say who is the better of the two.

36. You think that is a satisfactory system?—It cannot be done in any other way if the service is to be properly kept up.

37. *The Commissioner.*] What do you think should be the maximum age at which a man should be promoted?—Forty-five.

38. You would not promote any man over forty-five?—No.

39. And on the understanding that he should have to do two or three years' sectional duty?—It is generally the rule that the man who is promoted does three years' sectional duty.

40. Say, twelve months?—Yes; if you take a man away from a country station and put him on to street duty, he will soon go to pieces.

41. How many men are there at Waihi?—Six men is the strength of my station. One man has gone to take charge of a station, and he has not yet been replaced.

42. What is the total population?—Over seven thousand. It is a borough, but I have a big country outside.

43. Are the men there of a rough class?—A very rough class of men.

44. You have “no-license” there now?—I have licenses in part of my district still.

NICHOLAS KIELY, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 246.)

Witness: I am an Inspector of Police, in charge of Thames District. I have sixteen stations and thirty-four constables under me, three sergeants, and one detective. There are also four district constable stations. I joined the Force in September, 1875, was promoted to be sergeant in 1879, Sub-Inspector in 1899, and to my present rank in July, 1902. I had charge of Wanganui District up to about two years ago, and was transferred here on the creation of this separate district. This is the only retrograde step, as regards the importance of the station, I have taken since I joined the Force.

1. *The Commissioner.*] A “retrograde” step?—Every step I took prior to this was an advancement.

2. In what respect is not this an advancement?—It is an unimportant district.

3. Then, you think you did not receive your due?—For some reason or another the Minister thought fit to transfer me here. I do not know what his reasons were; I was told it was for the benefit of the service.

4. Would you rather have remained in Wanganui?—I had boys apprenticed there at the time, and they could not support themselves.

5. How long have you been here?—About two years. The matter was rectified afterwards. I was told I might be sent to Napier, and I was recommended for Napier.

6. Who recommended you?—I understood from the Minister at the time that he recommended me; at least, that he was favourable to it, and that the Commissioner had recommended me.

7. Why did you not get Napier?—The Minister is always able to do everything he wants. There was a change at that time.

8. Then the appointment to Napier was not made until the present Minister took charge?—Not until the present Minister took office was the appointment made, and then Inspector Dwyer was appointed.

9. Inspector Dwyer was sent there?—He was Sub-Inspector then.

10. You would have preferred that district?—Certainly; it is a more important district than this.

11. Do you think there is any necessity for the existence of this district?—I suppose there is.

12. I am asking you for an opinion, as the result of your practical experience?—There certainly is a necessity for it. There is a population in this district of about thirty-seven thousand people.

13. Do you think the district is properly constituted?—I do not.

14. Tell me in what respect you think it is not?—It is too small. When this district was first made I understood that Hamilton was chosen to be the police headquarters. All the Waikato stations were going to be put into this district, and the Bay of Plenty; but through some political cause or another, Thames was chosen for the headquarters.

15. The Hon. Mr. McGowan dealt with the cause of the change the other day—it was on account of the railway service, and so on; it was better worked from here than from Hamilton?—I do not think that is correct.

16. Of course, he was the member for the district, and is supposed to know all about it. Where do you think the centre of this district ought to be?—The centre of this district is Rotorua. At Rotorua I am within a day of any point of the district, and here I am two days away from any part.

17. If the district were reconstituted, what would you add to it, making Rotorua the headquarters?—I would be trespassing on the preserves of another Inspector.

18. Inspector Cullen said in Auckland that the constitution of this district, and the removal of these stations from his control, has not made a difference of a quarter of an hour a day to him in his work?—The majority of these stations had only recently been put into Mr. Cullen’s district when the change was made.

19. Where were they transferred from?—From Rotorua and Taupo to the Bay of Plenty. They were formerly in the Napier District, and had been only recently added to Mr. Cullen’s district.

20. He has an enormous district?—I suppose he would like a little more added to it.

21. I do not know so much about that, but he thinks the creation of this district did not make any difference to him?—It must have made some difference to him.

22. A quarter of an hour a day. Would it assist the efficiency of the Force if your district were enlarged at the expense of taking a piece off Mr. Cullen’s?—I think so. I think the original intention should have been carried out.

23. You might at your leisure prepare a statement showing how, in your opinion, as the result of your experience, the district could be altered with advantage?—I will do so.

24. Attach to it a plan showing how this centre stands in relation to the district as you would propose it should be constituted?—Yes. The headquarters are here, and the station is a new building.

25. I was not speaking about the headquarters, as the facilities for travelling about the country are very much better than they used to be. What, in your opinion, is the cause of the lack of suitable young men offering for enrolment in the Police Force?—I have no doubt that active and intelligent young men are much better off outside the service than in it at the present time.

26. Do you think that is due to the improvement in the industrial condition?—I suppose it is. Two years ago it was possible for any young and vigorous man to earn 10s. a day, whereas if he joined the police he would have to work for 7s. 6d. a day.

27. You think there would be an improvement in the recruiting if the pay were increased?—Yes; 1s. a day increase at least would be a great incentive to young men to join, and I think also that a better class would come forward.

28. What would you make the increments?—Sixpence every three years, until the pay reached 10s. a day. I would make the minimum pay of a constable 8s. a day.

29. Do you wish to refer to any other matter?—As regards promotions, I firmly believe that no man should be promoted later than forty.

30. Forty?—Yes; I do not think a man is capable of going on the streets and doing effective work as a sergeant if he is promoted after that age.

31. Take the case of your own sergeant: he was fifty when he was promoted?—He is very good stuff.

32. There might be just as good men in the Force?—I doubt if there are.

33. You are giving Sergeant Morgan the benefit of ten years—from forty to fifty—it seems a big jump?—Sergeant Morgan was not long on the streets.

34. Yes; he was three years doing sectional duty in Christchurch?—Things are different there now from what they were. I had to do twelve years.

35. I dare say; still, you are limiting the prospects of promotion to an almost unreasonable extent when you would make the maximum forty years, because there would be numbers of men who would never get beyond the rank of constable?—Quite right, and there will always be numbers under the present system left behind, because you cannot promote them all.

36. I know that is your opinion?—I am giving it for what it is worth.

37. What length of service would you require in respect to promotion before promoting a man at forty years of age?—A man who showed sufficient qualifications as to warrant his being promoted I would advance on his completing ten years' service.

38. Then, you would leave it open, and promote a man on ten years' service?—Yes.

39. But not exceeding forty years of age?—No.

40. At what age would you admit a man into the service?—Twenty-two.

41. Would you give him a period of probation?—Yes. I would recommend his being instructed in the laws for about three months, and during that time I would send him round for four hours at night with night-duty constables who know their work and can be relied on—on Saturday nights particularly.

42. What period of probation would you give recruits?—Six months—that is, three months at the depot in Wellington, and three months' probation after appointment to some station. By that time it would be well known if they were fit candidates for the Police Force.

43. What is your district clerk?—A local constable.

44. What service has he?—A little over eight years.

45. Have you any opinions as to the promotion of district clerks to be sergeants?—The district clerk holds a very important position; he has the records and accounts to keep, and also to keep a check on everybody.

46. What has that to do with his rank?—I think his rank should be something in advance of the local constable.

47. But you must apply a principle in dealing with such a matter?—The principle has been applied already by the Commissioner. For a long time past he has promoted each district clerk on his attaining ten years' service, and it would be rather hard on the remaining district clerks if that rule were altered, because they are looking forward to it.

48. Would you approve of promoting a district clerk after ten years' service, and leaving him in the office?—I know a district clerk who would not think of going out on the streets.

49. That is hardly an answer to my question. Would you, as a matter of practice, and having regard to the efficiency of the Force, once having promoted a district clerk, leave him in the office, or send him out to street duty?—Send him out on street duty. His training as a district clerk would certainly be a qualification.

50. What clerks have you in your office?—Only one.

51. Is he kept fully employed?—Yes.

52. In inquiries in regard to discipline and so on, do you think it would be any advantage for the Inspector to have power to administer an oath to the witnesses?—I do not think so.

53. Do you not think that some men may tell a lie if they are not sworn?—In my experience, if a man will tell a lie when not on oath he will tell a lie when on oath.

54. I do not agree with you, but it may be so in a great many instances. You do not attach any importance to it?—No.

55. Do you consider the standard of education satisfactory?—I would not lower it. In the present day, when so much is spent on education, I think it might be a slur on the whole system if the standard of education was lowered.

56. And the physical standard?—You will find, as a rule, good men between 5 ft. 8 in. and 5 ft. 9 in., perhaps better than the man at 6 ft.

57. Would you give a discretion?—I think it should be left discretionary.

58. Have you any views as to the promotion of superior officers from the plain-clothes branch?—At present if the station sergeant and the Chief Detective are promoted equally—

59. Presuming that we do away with the station sergeant, and have senior sergeants?—That puts it on a different footing: they could take their place then equally.

60. You would be in favour of having senior sergeants at certain stations?—Yes.

61. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you consider that the inquiries into the previous history of applicants for the Force are sufficient at the present time?—Yes; I think they are a bit overdone at times. I might mention the case of one applicant whose character was found to be unblemished, but he happened to be away from his place visiting friends for some three months, and, notwithstanding his unblemished character, his life during those three months had to be traced out.

62. There is nothing missed in these inquiries?—No.

63. You suggest six months' probation—three months in the depot and three months in the street?—Yes; but during his period in the depot I think he ought to be trained in police duty as well as in theory.

64. I suppose you believe in sending men to a city first to learn their duty?—I think it is only fair to have to commence their duties in one of the cities before they are drafted to out-stations.

65. I suppose you have known men join the service with a very good character, and then get into trouble afterwards?—Very true; there is no accounting for it.

66. You know that we have to be very careful in dealing with men misconducting themselves?—Men misconducting themselves are generally dealt with.

67. You know of men who have been dealt with for having been under the influence of liquor, and who have subsequently retrieved themselves and turned out very good officers?—Yes.

68. So that it is not right to dismiss a man right off for being under the influence of liquor?—I do not think so.

69. You approve of seniority and merit being equally considered in promotions?—I think they should be equally considered.

70. Constable Crosier has complained of not getting a certain lodging-allowance during the time he had lodgings at Palmerston. This is your report on the matter: do you recollect the reason for it not being allowed [file handed to witness]?—Yes, I remember the case very well. When I took charge of the Wanganui District Crosier was stationed at Ohingaiti. On my first visit to that station I found him living as a bachelor, cooking his own food, and none of his family living with him. I made inquiry, and found that the family was living at Marton. I could not understand the reason for this arrangement. I did not inquire very closely. In the course of six or eight months that station was closed, and Crosier was transferred to Palmerston North to take up the duties of mounted constable there. I think it was about the end of December when he went there. He may have been there a month before I visited Palmerston. When he was transferred both the district clerk and myself thought he would have to set up housekeeping like any other married man. He was put on the list of married constables, where they get ordinary house-allowance. On my first visit to Palmerston I found that Crosier was not only living at the station but was cooking his own meals there. The single men who were sleeping at the station were boarding at a boardinghouse.

71. *The Commissioner.*] You knew he was a married man. Why did you not speak to him? You led the Commissioner to believe that there was no ground for any other consideration in the matter. It seems to me that you did give Crosier a chance?—I think I asked Sergeant Stagpoole about him.

The Commissioner: Let me read the correspondence, because if an injustice has been done we want to put it right [reports and memo. on the subject read]. The Inspector led Mr. Dinnie to believe that everything was satisfactorily settled, and, as a matter of fact, it was not.

72. *Mr. Dinnie.*] At the time you found him living at the station, did you mention anything about his allowance?—No; because he was living at Palmerston under the very same conditions as at Ohingaiti.

73. And when he stopped he did not say anything about it?—No.

74. He accepted it as being the result of your visit, I suppose?—Yes. A similar thing occurred at New Plymouth when Detective Benjamin was there.

75. He got it?—Yes; but he had to apply for it.

76. *The Commissioner.*] Would it not have been better to have cleared up the matter then?—He was just as much entitled to apply for lodging-allowance at Ohingaiti as he was at Palmerston North. It is our mistake. I tried to revive it when I found I had made a mistake.

77. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you recently had any letters from the ex-Inspector at Napier?—What do you mean by letters?

78. Any communication from him of recent date—since he left the police, or since this Commission was set up?—Yes, I think I have.

79. I do not want you to give me the details of the contents. Where they seeking information?—They were private letters. I do not think the contents of the letters should be divulged.

80. Did they refer to me in any way?—Your name was mentioned.

81. *The Commissioner.*] This unfortunate personal question of Constable Beddek has been brought up: what is your opinion of him?—He is a very intelligent man, but I do not think he would be active enough for a sergeant. There is a lack of activity certainly. Some little time ago I was sending him up to Te Aroha in charge of the out-station while the constable was away, and he begged of me not to send him there as he could not ride, and did not feel capable of going any journey.

82. You know the Commissioner must depend to a very large extent on the recommendations of the Inspectors?—I try to pick the best men.

83. You did not recommend him?—No.

84. Presumably you did not think him qualified?—I did not think there was sufficient to recommend him.

85. *Constable Beddek.*] Do you remember me once asking you why I did not get promotion long ago, and you recommended some one else?—He was a far more active and intelligent man than you are.

86. When you say he was an intelligent man, do you mean he was better educated?—He was more active and intelligent.

The Commissioner. A man may be very intelligent without being very well educated.

87. *Constable Beddek.*] I think when you recommended my going to Hikurangi I drew attention to the fact that I was not fit to ride?—Yes; you are too heavy to ride.

88. Since you have been here, have you ever seen me rolling about the street under the influence of drink?—No.

89. It has been said that I drink beer.

The Commissioner. You are not charged with drunkenness at all.

90. *Constable Beddek* (to witness).] You have nothing to say against my character at all?—No, nothing at all.

The Commissioner. It is only a question of what can be done to improve your position, having regard to the efficiency of the Force—that must be the first consideration of the Commissioner and the Inspectors.

Mr. Dinnie. I shall be very pleased to do what I can do.

Constable Beddek. Thank you, sir.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 13TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

Mr. A. Gray, Barrister and Solicitor: I am instructed to appear on behalf of the Lambton Quay police—that is, the non-commissioned officers and constables; and before your Worship takes evidence I desire to refer to a matter that has already been brought under your notice—namely, the fact that the Wellington police held a meeting while the Commission was sitting in Dunedin, and passed certain resolutions. I do not intend for one moment to defend the propriety of the men meeting and passing resolutions of the nature your Worship is aware of; and I desire, on behalf of the men, to say that in meeting as they did, and in discussing the matters they did, and in passing the resolutions they came to, they were not actuated by any feeling of hostility to the Commission, nor any desire other than that of seeing that the inquiry was thorough. As far, therefore, as any of their resolutions may be considered to have been in the nature of criticism of the Commission, or to have amounted to an expression of want of confidence, I desire particularly to express the regret of the men for having arrived at those resolutions, and to withdraw any appearance whatever of want of confidence in the Commission, or of anything which may savour of a want of proper duty on their part. It is only fair that I should take the earliest opportunity of saying that the men, upon reflection, consider their action was unwise. In excuse, if excuse can be offered, I may say they were actuated to a certain extent by more or less short reports which were telegraphed from Dunedin, and they were under the mistaken impression that some individuals who had appeared before you were using the opportunity afforded by the Commission of ventilating personal grievances, and not tendering evidence with a view of facilitating you in deciding upon matters which really affect the discipline or organization of the Police Force.

The Commissioner: What on earth had that to do with the Wellington police?

Mr. Gray: I do not excuse their action; I only say this was one of the matters which affected their minds when they met and discussed these matters. But I desire again to say they entirely withdraw every appearance of disloyalty or want of confidence in the Commission.

The Commissioner: I am glad to have your assurance, Mr. Gray, that the Wellington police now see what I may term the error of their ways, and also to receive from you what is practically a withdrawal, in effect, of the whole proceedings. But reading the resolutions, there could be no misconception in any mind as to what apparently actuated the persons who were responsible for the resolutions. So absolutely improper were they to my mind that I was very loth indeed—and I have said so publicly on several occasions—to hold the Wellington police as a body responsible for what was done. I should be sorry to think a body of forty men—I think that was the number described as being present—belonging to the Police Force of the Dominion would meet together in solemn conclave and speak about matters, and deal with them, that they know nothing whatever about, and that, as a result of this meeting, they should carry resolutions which were tantamount to expressions of want of confidence in the person appointed to hold the Commission, and expressing the fullest confidence in their own head, the Commissioner of Police, and reflecting generally on the conduct of the Commission by myself. Fortunately, I was able to treat this with absolute contempt. I was impressed with the fact that it seemed to me that this meeting was not the outcome of a spontaneous expression of opinion on the part of the Wellington police as a body, but was engineered by one or two people—I have not the slightest idea whom; but I have made certain inquiries as to the manner in which it was conducted, and it seems to me that those who were responsible for the resolutions had simply been made use of, if the information supplied to me is correct. At no time did I wish to hold the Wellington police responsible; it is the persons behind on whom the blame should fall. I am exceedingly glad, even at this late hour, to receive your explanation of the matter. It did a great deal of harm at the time, and afforded material to some people who were ready to scoff at the organization of the Force and its discipline to emphasize their unsatisfactory opinion of the condition of the Force. The men have only them-

selves to blame for a position caused by their own conduct. So far as this Commission is concerned, it is needless for me to say that, so far from there being any encouragement afforded by myself or any person in connection with the Commission to air personal grievances or dissatisfaction, it has been studiously discouraged throughout. It is impossible on an open Commission to shut the door to a great deal of irrelevant and perhaps from some standpoints improper evidence. The unfortunate effect of an open Commission is to open the door to a great deal of matter which would be much better left alone, but which the person intrusted with the Commission has to hear before he can ascertain whether it is relevant, proper, or could be considered to come within the order of reference. In this respect it is open to criticism not only by bodies of police, but other persons. At the same time, one can scarcely take exception to it, because those who criticize do not realise that it is impossible to shut the door on a great deal of what the public who read the papers consider a lot of nonsense, which is not relevant and is not in the best interests of the service. It has been described by some of the papers as "preposterously irrelevant." I may agree with them, but certainly take exception to being held responsible for the admission of a great deal of the evidence which can be so described. The sole endeavour of the Commission has been to obtain information throughout the Dominion to enable the Police Force to be placed on the highest footing as regards efficiency, organization, and discipline. I have addressed the men in the various centres, and have impressed on them that I do not desire the men to grasp the opportunity to air grievances. I do not want them to air grievances. I want material to enable me to furnish a report to the Government which will enable the Government to place the Force on a footing that will enable it to be spoken of far and wide as a credit to the Dominion. So far as I am personally concerned—and there are few men in New Zealand who have had closer connection with the Police Force—I have always held them in the highest esteem, and I should be sorry to find any material that would justify me in reporting very adversely. There will always be, in connection with administration, points on which persons may differ, and I may differ from those who are responsible on small points; but so far as the general conduct of the police is concerned, I have never heard any one speak of them in terms other than of admiration, and recognition of the fact that the Force is generally regarded as a credit to the Dominion. It is a most unfortunate thing that when one is out on a work of inquiry, to ascertain matter to enable one to improve the condition of the men, that the men one is trying to benefit should try not only to belittle the work of the Commission, but place serious obstacles in the way. Beyond this I have nothing to say, and, as you appear now on behalf of the Lambton Quay police, I shall afford you every opportunity of cross-examining witnesses who may proffer themselves, within certain limits; and also give you an opportunity of calling any evidence you may think proper, also within certain limits. I have stated elsewhere, and I may as well do so here, that so far as the evidence is concerned no person is responsible for leading evidence before the Commission—the onus falls on me. It is a big labour, the immensity of which is not fully appreciated perhaps by those who are prepared to criticize one's work. I have intimated my intention to call all the commissioned officers, the station sergeants, the Chief Detectives, and sergeants. I call these, I may say, *ex officio*. I do not peremptorily call any constable to give evidence; I leave it entirely a matter of his own motion as to whether he shall come forward or not. All I require him to do is to send his name to the Secretary, expressing a desire to give evidence, and the Secretary will communicate his intention to his superior officer, so that facilities may be given for him to come and give evidence. This will prevent the men from being in any way responsible except to me during the sitting of the Commission so far as giving evidence is concerned. As a matter of courtesy and discipline the Inspector is notified of the desire of the man, and gives facilities for him to appear. There is an assurance that has been referred to that any man may come before the Commission and state, without fear of ulterior consequences to himself, the faith that is in him, if he does so honestly, although his evidence might be considered inimical or prejudicial to officers of the Force. In several places the men at meetings that have been held have elected delegates to appear on behalf of the Force, and to lay before me any matters the police as a body think proper to bring before me. I encourage them to say anything they wish. It is for me to deal with the evidence, and to winnow out the corn from what may be called the chaff. To enable me to do that, I place no difficulties in the way of any man saying what he chooses, if he does so in a proper manner.

Mr. Gray: I am obliged to your Worship. The principal reason the men desire to be represented is that certain reflections have been made upon them as a body. In regard to certain specific statements made in Parliament and before you in Dunedin affecting the Wellington centre, those matters will probably be dealt with by Mr. Dinnie.

The Commissioner: I am glad you reminded me. Recognising that the Commissioner of Police, as regards the administration of the Force, is the person most nearly affected, I have undertaken and given him to understand that at the close of the evidence I shall give him full and ample opportunity of justifying his own administration, and making a statement to me on any lines he may think proper. He understands that, and he will cover the whole work, not only of his own administration, but matters that more nearly affect him arising out of the evidence given before the Commission that may relate to his own administration. He will be the last witness.

Mr. Gray: With such matters I have no intention of dealing; but certain statements have been made, you will recollect, which reflect on the Wellington police as a body, and they desire, therefore, to be represented.

Mr. Dinnie: I should like to say, as regards the meetings held in Wellington, I had no knowledge that they were being held, and as soon as I knew I wired my disapproval, and ordered their discontinuance.

The Commissioner: I am glad to turn down the page dealing with a matter I strongly disapprove of.

Mr. John James Meikle: I wish to be heard on a very important point in connection with my conviction for an offence twenty-two years ago. It turns out that the constable who made a tool of Lambert is still in the Force.

The Commissioner: How do you propose to bring that within the order of reference?

Mr. Meikle: I propose to inquire into his conduct.

The Commissioner: I am not here to inquire into the conduct of any individual member of the Police Force. Is your statement tantamount to saying this constable committed perjury?

Mr. Meikle: Yes.

The Commissioner: Then, he should be prosecuted and dealt with according to his deserts if the charge is proved. I cannot deal with any charge of perjury against him.

Mr. Meikle: He was before the Police Commission in 1898, and said he knew nothing about Lambert, and was not in league with him.

The Commissioner: That is a statement on oath, and might afford grounds for a prosecution for perjury; but this Commission is not in a position to try a man for perjury.

Mr. Meikle: I simply ask you to hear evidence to show whether he should be in the service or not. Dr. Findlay wired to me telling me to apply to the Secretary to the Commission, and I had a letter from Mr. Dinnie, and I replied to him, and said he ought to have the constable here. They promised the matter would receive attention. What remedy have I?

The Commissioner: I am not responsible for any statement made to you by Dr. Findlay or Mr. Dinnie, and I know nothing of it, except that the Secretary drew my attention, at one period of the sittings, to a letter addressed by a member of the committee in connection with your matters, and I told him to reply that I could not see or imagine for a moment that the particular matter I was addressed on came within the order of reference. It would be unreasonable on your part to hold me responsible in any way, because from the very first, immediately I became aware of the desire of certain persons interested in your grievance, rightly or wrongly, to bring up the matter, I instructed the Secretary to inform them that I could not hold that it came within the order of reference. I absolutely repudiate all responsibility for what may have been said by Dr. Findlay or Mr. Dinnie. During the currency of a Commission of this sort I am responsible to no one, and no one can dictate to me the lines on which I should conduct the inquiry. I am certain Dr. Findlay is the last person to attempt to influence me as to any lines on which I should take evidence. I have considered the question thoroughly, and have quite decided that it is outside the order of reference to go into an allegation of perjury.

Mr. Meikle: I do not ask that; I merely say this man is not fit to be in the service.

The Commissioner: I do not dispute that for a moment. I may say this to you: Any allegation of perjury against a constable is, in my opinion, a very serious matter; but it must be dealt with in a proper way and proper place, and I say this is neither the time nor place nor the opportunity to inquire into it.

Mr. Meikle: What can I do? I have approached the higher authorities.

The Commissioner: You are asking me to express an opinion on matters I know nothing of.

Mr. Meikle: I am prepared to prove all the allegations I have made.

The Commissioner: I do not doubt it. I am not going to doubt your capacity to prove what you say. I only say I cannot give you the opportunity to prove it before me.

JOHN ROBERT THOMPSON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 247.)

Witness: I am an assistant clerk, in the Commissioner's office. I was enrolled in 1906, and first entered the office in March, 1907, in Christchurch. I was transferred to Wellington. I was told there was no vacancy in the office, and elected to go on street duty for three months. I was appointed to the store and *Gazette* office. I was helping Detective Quartermain while Mr. Dinnie, jun., was away. I am still employed between the store and the *Gazette*. I get 1s. a day in addition to my pay as plain-clothes allowance. I appear as delegate on behalf of the Lambton Quay police. I was instructed by them to give evidence on the same lines practically as that brought forward in other centres by the men. In regard to pay, the men ask for another shilling, rising by instalments of 6d. every three years to a maximum of 10s., and they ask for 1s. 6d. house-allowance instead of 1s. In regard to leave, they ask for eighteen days in place of twelve, to be allowed to accumulate for three years. Another matter is that of late leave. At present the sergeant comes round at 11, or a little past, and the men who have to be on duty at 5 in the morning are often woke up in consequence; they ask if some other system could not be adopted.

1. *The Commissioner:* Can you suggest any other system?—I understand in some Forces in the Old Country the men simply report themselves when they come in to the watch-house keeper, and are checked off in a book. The men also ask that night leave should be extended to 12 o'clock in the cases of men over twelve months in the service and with a clean record.

2. You would differentiate between the men?—Yes, to that extent.

3. Is there any reason for that extension of time?—Under the present system, if a man wants to go to the theatre, he can get late leave; but he might forget, and if he comes in late he would be reported. The men also ask for free uniforms and two pairs of trousers, instead of one as at present. They also wish me to point out that the accommodation at Lambton Quay is very limited; there are seven or eight sleeping in a small room about 16 ft. by 16 ft. and three in another. Then, we wish to refute the statements made by Mr. Arnold in Parliament in regard to the conduct of the men in the station.

4. What is the general conduct of the men?—I have been in the station for over fourteen months, and during that time I can honestly say I have never lived amongst a better class of young men, as far as their behaviour goes.

5. You would recognise the fact that Mr. Arnold would have no personal knowledge?—Yes.

6. He was presumably speaking from information supplied to him?—That is the only way it could be accounted for.

7. Can you offer any suggestion as to the source of the information?—No.

8. Have you ever been spoken to outside the Force in regard to this matter?—No; the first time I ever heard of it was when it was brought up by Mr. Arnold. I cannot account for such statements being made.

9. Is liquor ever taken into the barracks?—I have never seen it.

10. Did you read the statements that were made in Auckland?—Yes.

11. Have you ever seen anything of that sort here?—No.

12. Speaking generally, are the men respectable, sober, and well behaved?—Yes; they are as well behaved a lot of men as I have ever lived amongst.

13. *Mr. Gray.*] Mr. Arnold, in Dunedin, said that on one occasion two sergeants had to go to the barracks to make peace: did you ever hear of such an occurrence?—I do not know anything about it.

14. Is it likely to have occurred without your hearing of it?—It is not likely. The upstairs room is one large room, boarded off with partitions only 8 ft. high into cubicles; you could hear anything from one end of the room to the other.

15. If such an occurrence took place you would have heard it?—I think so.

16. Do you know of any feeling of unrest in the Force in Wellington?—I never heard of it.

17. Or any general dissatisfaction except in regard to the matters you have brought before the Commission?—No, I know of no cause for dissatisfaction.

18. Apart from the instances that have been spoken of before the Commission in regard to the conduct of one or two men who are not now in the Force, do you know of any larrikin element in the Wellington police?—Not in the slightest.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think the hour for being in barracks should be extended to 12 o'clock?—Yes, for men over twelve months' service.

20. In what part of the Old Country is there such an arrangement as you spoke of in regard to reporting to the watch-house keeper?—In Newcastle, I understand, where all the watch-house keepers are sergeants.

21. Do you not think it necessary to call the roll, and see that the men do not go out at the back door?—But in nine cases out of ten it wakes the men who have to go early on duty out of their sleep. It is not as if each man had a room of his own.

22. Have you made any representations in regard to additional uniform?—No.

23. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service as regards the control?—I never heard of any.

24. The men seem perfectly satisfied?—Yes, except on the matters I have referred to.

25. If these requests were granted, there would be general satisfaction then?—I think so.

26. Have you heard anything of the "special" man referred to in Dunedin?—No.

27. You have heard no rumour of his existence?—Nothing of the sort.

28. Do you believe in his existence?—No; it is regarded as a joke in the station.

29. So far as you are concerned you have been treated fairly?—I have no reason to complain at all.

30. *Inspector Ellison.*] How many are there in one dormitory?—Seven or eight.

The Commissioner. It is absolutely indecent.

31. *Inspector Ellison.*] It is on account of want of accommodation?—Yes.

32. If every man had a room there could be no objection to the roll-call at all?—No.

33. The present objection is simply because opening the cubicle doors makes a noise?—Yes, and it shakes the whole dormitory.

34. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long have there been seven sleeping in a room?—Ever since I have been there.

Mr. Dinnie. It is the first I have heard of it.

35. *The Commissioner.*] These men get no privacy at all?—No.

36. Is it generally complained about?—Yes, it is the main complaint.

JOHN JOSEPH GALLAGHER, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 248.)

Witness: I am stationed at Lambton Quay. I was enrolled in 1907. I have been watch-house keeper for about eighteen months. I appear as a delegate for the Lambton Quay police. My evidence will be almost a repetition of what the last witness said. We consider the pay is insufficient, owing to the cost of living; and we ask for an increase of 1s., by increments of 6d. every three years. We consider 1s. house-allowance is not sufficient.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you ascertained what is the average house-rent paid by the married men?—I should say, 15s. or 16s.

2. What is the maximum you have heard of being paid?—£1 2s. 6d. The house-allowance at present is 7s. Then, in regard to leave: at present it is twelve days a year, and if a man is stationed at Auckland, and wishes to visit his home in the south, all his time is taken up in travelling. We think eighteen days a year should be allowed. And we ask for one Sunday off in the month.

3. Do you know what holidays are given to other bodies of men somewhat similarly situated to you—such as prison warders or mental hospital attendants?—I believe the mental hospital attendants get one month a year, besides one Sunday a month. I do not know what prison warders get, but it is considerably more than we get. Then, other Departments get public holidays, which are a policeman's busiest days. In regard to late leave, we think, in the case of men of good conduct, it should be extended to 12 o'clock.

4. Do you mean on application or as a general rule?—The men can get it now by applying for it; we want it as a rule.

5. Is there any difficulty in getting leave?—None whatever.

6. As a matter of discipline, it is necessary that the men should be in at a certain hour?—Yes. Then, we think there should be some other system in regard to seeing that the men are in barracks at night; at present the sergeant goes round at 11, which wakes the men up who are on duty at 5.

7. Is that not due to the structural defects of the place?—Yes.

8. I should regard it as a legitimate grievance if the men are disturbed in their sleep. Do I understand it is the result of carelessness?—I do not say that.

9. To what is it due?—The sergeant going round and opening the different doors, which it is impossible to do without the noise being heard all over the barracks.

10. Then, it is the opening of the doors that is the objectionable feature?—Yes, and walking along the passage. Then, we think the men should be allowed two pairs of trousers and a tunic free. At present it costs us about £2 5s. every year, or perhaps a little more. Then, as regards accommodation, there is nowhere for the men to hang up their wet clothes except in their bedrooms; there should be a drying-room. We have a grievance in regard to the statements made about the conduct of the men in the barracks—not only in Parliament, but it is thrown up at us by prisoners who come in, and we hear it on the street—remarks about participating in nightly drunken orgies.

11. What is your experience of the behaviour of the men?—They are well conducted, and I have never seen anything that could be found fault with.

Mr. Gray: I am instructed that every constable and non-commissioned officer in Wellington is prepared to give the same evidence in respect to the behaviour of the men as the last two witnesses; all are prepared to deny the truth of the statement that disgraceful scenes occur almost every night.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What has been said in regard to the conduct of the men in the station has caused dissatisfaction and unrest?—Yes, more than anything else; they feel very keenly about it.

13. Prior to what was said there was no dissatisfaction?—Not during the time I was in the barracks. Now it is the first thing that is thrown up to us; it has died down a bit, but you hear all sorts of remarks as you go about the streets.

14. Do you not think that men who have to get up at half past 4 in the morning should be in bed at 11?—Yes.

15. Then, is it not better to have a strict rule in regard to 11 o'clock, and apply for an extension on any occasion you want it?—If the men had a free hand there would be very few cases of being out after 11.

16. But the roll must be called at some time?—That is so.

17. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in regard to the control of the Force?—No.

18. Have you ever heard anything about a "special" man?—Never till I read the account of the evidence in Dunedin.

19. Do you believe there is such a man in existence?—No.

20. *Inspector Ellison.*] Are you aware there is a sergeant sleeping on each of the floors?—Yes.

21. And if there were any disorderly conduct he would have an opportunity of knowing it?—Nothing could happen without him doing so.

22. Do you know that men who come off duty at 9, and have to go out again at 4.45 in the morning, do not get leave unless under urgent or special circumstances?—That is so.

PATRICK DOYLE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 249.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1907, having previously served in the Birmingham City Police. I appear as a delegate on behalf of the constables at Mount Cook. There are nineteen constables on that station. They ask that the wages should commence at 8s., rising by increments of 6d. every two years to a maximum after eight years' service. At present the pay is 7s. 6d. to commence with, which we maintain does not compare favourably with the pay in other occupations. A labourer receives on an average 9s. for six days, which makes £2 14s. a week; while a constable, working seven days, only gets £2 12s. 6d. If a labourer were to work on Sunday he would have to be paid time and a half, and would get £3 7s. 6d. A constable gets twelve days' annual leave, and an average of about ten Sundays a year. This would bring his pay up to £2 15s. 9d. a week. The quarters are no concession so far as Mount Cook is concerned. I have been there for six months. The food costs a man 16s. 1d., and washing 3s., which makes 19s. 1d. per week; while you can get board and lodging in any respectable part of the city for £1, including washing.

1. *The Commissioner.*] That seems pretty high. Do you live very well?—Nothing exceptional; just as one would in a boardinghouse; we have to pay a cook and a waiter. It is more expensive than Lambton Quay, where there are fifty men.

2. The cost is reduced according to the number of men?—Yes.

3. What is the average at Lambton Quay?—About £2 6s. or £2 5s. a month. In an ordinary trade, an apprentice starting at fifteen years old will receive full wages at twenty, while under the present system a constable does not reach his maximum till he is forty—after sixteen years' service. We think a man with sufficient intelligence to be a constable can learn to do his duty thoroughly within eight years, and if he does not, he never would be competent. After eight years he should be considered fit for promotion to sergeant.

4. What is the average time a man acts as constable before being put in charge of a station?—From five years.

5. That would give him three years in charge of a station before being eligible for promotion?—Yes, if competent. The men think they should get one tunic and two pairs of trousers on joining, the Department to pay for making up, and the same should be supplied annually.

6. That would mean a saving of £2 5s. to a constable?—Yes, and more. At present we only get one pair of trousers, which is not sufficient for nine months; if they get damaged or dirty we have not a decent pair to put on unless we get a pair made up ourselves. The majority of men have to pay for an extra pair. We suggest that the annual leave should be increased to sixteen days, and be allowed to accumulate for three years. If a constable is stationed in Auckland, and his home is in Invercargill, he would be travelling practically all the time of his leave if he wished to go home; and in regard to accumulated leave, there are a good many Australians in the Force who, if the accumulation were allowed, could visit their people occasionally. In regard to attendance at Court when on night duty when a constable has a case, the present system causes a great deal of dissatisfaction and neglect of duty. We suggest that two hours should be allowed off for men on night duty attending Court.

7. What is the exact position?—A constable comes off duty at 5. He has to attend Court that morning, and, having to be at Court not later than a quarter to 10, he is called at 9. He never gets to sleep before half past 5, so that gives him three hours and a half only. Very few men get any sleep again after attending Court; I never can.

8. When does he get away from Court, as a rule?—Well, that depends; but as a rule we get back to Mount Cook at 11, or a quarter to 11. Of course, one is at liberty to go to bed, but it is entirely impossible to get any sleep, because every one is up and about, and one has to get one's meals. On the following night he may be all right on duty for the first two or three hours, but by 12 he is very tired and sleepy.

9. On an average, how often does this occur?—I should say twice a week is a fair average.

10. You wish me to understand that this has a serious effect on the morale of the men—that it causes them to shut their eyes to things?—Yes; irregularities escape their notice.

11. They prefer their sleep to their duty?—Some will. The men also suggest that they should have a free pass on the railway when on annual leave. A policeman is liable to be called on at any time to assist the guard or passengers, and we think the same concession should be allowed us when on leave as when on duty.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long have you been at Mount Cook?—Seven months.

13. Are you a single man?—Yes, sir.

14. You say that it takes a long time to reach extra pay, but the average man gets charge of a station after from four to five years' service?—Yes, if a married man.

15. And that makes a great difference to his pay?—I believe it does.

16. He gets a house rent-free, and sometimes other emoluments?—Yes.

17. That makes his pay better than that of a labourer?—A man in charge of a station would be better off than a labourer. I am not comparing them.

18. You simply refer to those who have not charge?—Yes.

19. And the time when a man is most tried for want of money is between his joining and getting charge of a station?—At the rate of living in Mount Cook, he is pretty hard up.

20. You speak about time off after attending Court?—Yes.

21. You have got all the afternoons off after lunch or dinner, up to 8 o'clock if you like?—Yes.

22. And you say that you get from 5 o'clock up to 8.30?—I contend that when a man's rest is broken on night duty by being called to attend the Court he cannot get proper rest afterwards, and, if I might be allowed to make a comparison with the time allowed in other Forces, I would point out that I served for seven years in the Birmingham Police before joining the New Zealand Force. There you were allowed two hours off, and if you had been detained longer in Court, you made application, and were allowed the extra time; but you were always allowed two hours, and if compelled to attend Court in your own time when on day duty, the same.

23. Of course, the difference is that you have got a large body there and only a small body here, and they are not to be compared?—No, sir; but if the time is not allowed on the morning of attending the Court it is allowed on the following one.

24. Can you get time off here?—By application—an hour and a half, when at the Court two mornings in succession.

25. You think that you should not have to apply for time off?—Yes.

26. You think that a tunic and two pairs of trousers should be allowed each year?—Yes.

27. You get a pair of trousers every nine months now?—Yes.

28. You have not represented that you had not a sufficient clothing-supply?—I am speaking on behalf of all the men when I say that.

29. Is there any general dissatisfaction?—No; I think they are perfectly satisfied.

30. Are they an orderly, well-conducted body of men in Mount Cook?—The finest lot I have met with in all my experience—a sober, steady lot of men.

31. Have you heard anything of that "special" man who has been mentioned?—Only since the Commission.

32. Then, it is not true that it is rumoured from north to south?—No.

33. The same as this disturbance in Lambton Quay?—I was stationed there, and I think the discipline there would compare with that of the strictest Force in England.

34. *Inspector Ellison.*] The application for leave off simply consists in telling the sergeant—a report to him?—Yes, sir.

35. And you would not have to turn out in Mount Cook if it was only a case of a drunk who pleaded guilty?—No.

36. It is only in coming down to Lambton Quay that that arises?—Yes.

WILLIAM ARTHUR CALWELL, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 250.)

Witness: I was sworn in as a constable on the 1st July, 1908, and have now just over fourteen months' service. The first two months I was on special duty in the King-country. I was then stationed at Lambton Quay for a few weeks. I was transferred to Mount Cook in October, 1908. I have been there since. I am one of two delegates appointed by the nineteen constables stationed at Mount Cook to give evidence on their behalf. I am instructed to bring before your Worship the following matters, which were agreed to by resolution at a meeting held for that purpose, and which, if given effect to, would, we believe, help to remove any discontent which now exists and to promote the general efficiency of the Force. The first suggestion relates to wages. We think that on appointment we should receive 8s. per day, to rise by increment of 6d. per day every two years to a maximum of 10s. The wage on joining is at present 7s. 6d. per day, which we contend does not compare favourably with the wages received by an ordinary labourer. A labourer in Wellington receives 9s. per day, and by working six days per week earns £2 14s. A constable, who is paid at the rate of 7s. 6d. per day, earns only £2 12s. 6d. for working seven days per week. A constable, of course, receives on full pay twelve days' annual leave and about ten Sundays per year. This amounts to 3s. 3d. per week, bringing his wages up to £2 15s. 9d. The constable also receives quarters, but in the case of men stationed at Mount Cook this is no concession. For the six months ending on the 30th June last food and washing cost us 19s. 1d. per week. Good board and lodging can be had in a respectable part of the city for £1 per week, and this includes washing. You will see that this leaves only 11d. with which to supply ourselves with bed, bedding, and towels; so we are not gaining anything by being allowed quarters. If a labourer works overtime he is paid for it, but we get nothing. We contend that this is a grievance, and a reason why we should get more pay. We contend that our wages should be the maximum at eight years' service, and for these reasons: In ordinary trades an apprentice, starting at fifteen, is a journeyman and entitled to receive his full wage in five years—that is, when he is twenty years of age. Under the present system a constable joining at twenty-four does not reach his full wage until he has served sixteen years, or when he is forty years of age. We are of opinion that any man who has enough intelligence to be a policeman can learn his duty thoroughly in eight years, and that if he has not learned it then he never will learn it. Although we believe that increments should be the reward of service alone, and the only reward of service, we hold that it is not to the interest of the Department to study the man who cannot rise in the service by ability after having served eight years. In regard to annual leave, we suggest that it should be increased to sixteen days, and allowed to accumulate for three years, as at present. In support of this, I am instructed to point out that if a man's home is in Southland he will probably have to do duty in Auckland. If he wishes to visit his home, and has only got twelve days to do it in, he is practically travelling all the time. In regard to the accumulation for three years, many would like a trip to Australia, and there are a good many Australians in the Force who would take advantage of this privilege in order to visit their homes. This could be done comfortably in forty-eight days. We consider the present system of Sunday leave unsatisfactory, and make this suggestion: Sunday leave to be granted at the rate of one Sunday every four weeks, to be definitely laid down, and in the event of a man having to work on a Sunday on which he is entitled to be off, and not receiving a day off in lieu thereof, the day to be added to his annual leave. It has been said by those competent to express an opinion that a man or a horse will do more work in his lifetime by working six days a week than by working seven days; and it seems to be a law of Nature to such an extent that even inanimate things—such as telegraph and telephone wires and instruments—will give better results when working six days a week than when working seven days. Surely, then, even a policeman would be able to do more work and do better work if he had one day's rest in seven. We realise, however, that to grant this concession would put the country to more expense than the present economic conditions warrant, and that is more than we expect; but in asking for one day's rest in four weeks we think that we are asking a reasonable concession—one that would put the country to very little or no expense, and the Department to no inconvenience. We ask that it should be definitely fixed for two reasons—first, we would know that we were entitled to get thirteen Sundays off in twelve months; and if we had only received, say, ten Sundays off, we would know that there were three days to add to our annual leave. Secondly, we would know when our Sunday off was due, and could make social arrangements for that day, knowing that except in case of emergency they would not be upset. At present we can make no social arrangements. We recognise, of course, that it is not desirable for a policeman to seek popularity, or make too many friends, but we see no reason why we should be social outcasts. We think that there should be a properly equipped gymnasium in the central station, and a room set apart for exercise in all stations where there are six or more men stationed. We believe that gymnasiums would provide means of exercise, and so keep the men healthy and fit, and be an asset to the Department. The majority of men who join the police have been used to hard, muscular work, and although they find police duty very tiring, and that the work is hard, it does not provide the active, muscular exercise to which they have been accustomed, consequently they either fall sick, or become very soft and out of condition. At present there is no provision made for physical exercise or training of any kind, and if the average constable has to arrest a strong labouring man who resists, and does not overcome him almost at once, his lack of skill and condition is such that he either has to knock the prisoner about unduly or let him go. If we were all instructed in the art of wrestling, and were kept in good condition by exercise, we would be able to arrest resisters smartly, without injury to the prisoner or ourselves. This would give those witnessing the arrest a wholesome respect for the constable and a good impression of the police generally, and save the prisoner a good deal of suffering. We have in the New Zealand police a constable said by those who know him to be one of the finest physical instructors in Australasia. This man's services are simply wasted as an ordinary constable when he could be so well employed as physical instructor to the police.

I refer to Constable Skinner, who gave evidence before your Worship at Rotorua. As to attendance at Court when on night duty, we have in this a genuine grievance, and one which causes a good deal of discontent and neglect of duty; and I am instructed to suggest that a constable on night duty who has to attend Court should be allowed two hours off, irrespective of the time taken to write his report, if practicable, on the morning his case is to be heard. In the event of this being impracticable, two hours to be allowed off the following morning. At present a constable on night duty goes off at 5 a.m., and gets to sleep at about 5.30. In order to attend Court he must be called at 9 a.m., and this allows him only three and a half hours' sleep. There are very few men who can sleep again that day, partly from noise in the barracks and being wakened. It stands to reason that at about midnight a man who has had only three and a half hours' sleep becomes very sleepy, and cannot attend to his duty properly; he cannot take any interest in his work, and irregularities must escape his notice. The fact of a man having to attend Court in his own time, and to lose his sleep, is a direct inducement to him to shirk his duty; and there can be no doubt that there is a good deal of neglect of duty from this cause alone. It would not be practicable to allow every constable having a case of drunkenness two hours off; and I am instructed to bring the following suggestion under your notice: that a constable on night duty who has a case of drunkenness should not be compelled to attend Court in the first instance. If his prisoner pleads "Not guilty," and is prepared to go on, the constable to be called at once, and the case allowed to stand down to the end of the list. If the person charged is on bail, and does not appear, the case to be set down for the afternoon. Of course, at Mount Cook I do not believe it would be practicable to allow every man two hours off in cases of drunkenness, but it is different at Lambton Quay, or nearly any other station in New Zealand. If this were given effect to, the constable would not have to be called very often.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How about the Magistrate?—I do not want to say anything about that, your Worship.

2. You think your suggestion could be given effect to to a certain extent?—I think it could, your Worship, inasmuch as about 99 per cent. of those arrested for drunkenness plead guilty. In regard to the free issue of uniforms, we suggest that one tunic and two pairs of trousers should be issued on joining, and the same every twelve months afterwards, to be made up free. Trousers are apt to be torn or wet, and we have no premises for drying our clothes if they get wet. At present we get only one full uniform on joining. Even without accidents one pair of trousers will not last nine months, and every man I have spoken to on the subject has had to buy an extra pair during the first six months of service. We often have to handle persons in a dirty state, and our clothes get soiled and dirty. We think that, as a man is expected to be thoroughly tidy, two pairs of trousers and one tunic per year are a necessity. The making-up of the uniform is an expense which we think we should not be called upon to bear, and I would point out that whereas it costs the men in most parts of the Dominion £2 10s., the Department could get it done by contract for about £1 13s. We think that we should get a free pass on the railways when on annual leave, for these reasons: A constable gets his holidays in the slack time of the year, and so cannot take advantage of excursion fares. A policeman is always on duty, and is liable to be called upon to act whether on leave or not. He can be, and is, of use to the Railway Department and the general public when travelling; and we therefore contend he ought to have the privileges he would have if he were in uniform. There is one other matter I wish to deal with, and it is to disagree with the evidence of those witnesses who in other parts of the Dominion have stated that the men in the Police Force to-day were inferior—mentally, morally, and physically—to those who joined fifteen or twenty years ago.

The Commissioner: That was not generally stated.

Witness: But it was stated by one or two. With your permission, we resent this, and honestly do not believe it to be true. As you know, there are a great many men no longer young who have a very exalted opinion of what they were and what they could do in their youth. In criticizing us these men make the mistake of comparing themselves as they are now with us as we are now. They have steadied down; Nature has compelled them to do so; but if they compare themselves as they were with us as we are now, and do it fairly, we are confident that we will not suffer by the comparison. Of course, I cannot prove this; but if the tales told by these old men themselves of the way police duty was done in their young days be true, then we certainly are not inferior to what they were.

3. *Mr. Gray.*] Do you know of any larrikin element in the Force you are connected with?—I have known one or two men inclined that way, but very seldom.

4. You have not had experience in other parts of the world?—No.

5. But what is the general behaviour?—Splendid. Of course, most of my service has been at Mount Cook; but there I have never seen one constable under the influence of liquor. There is certainly a little wrestling in the rooms occasionally, but men will be men.

6. Friendly play?—Yes. We get growled at for breaking the gas-fittings occasionally.

7. But you have never seen anything that could be classed as disgraceful conduct on the part of the men?—No, sir.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You suggest some definite arrangement about time off in lieu of that spent in attending Court?—Yes.

9. Do you not know that it is difficult, considering the number of men that we have?—I believe it is.

10. And the number away on leave sometimes?—Of course, as I say, "if practicable." On the whole, if it is not practicable one morning, it is the next. Take those on night duty in Mount Cook, very seldom more than two have to attend Court.

11. *The Commissioner.*] There is no doubt there is something in what he says—that 99 per cent. of the drunks plead guilty.

Witness: At Mount Cook, if they plead guilty before the Justices, the constable is not called.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If it be possible to make some arrangement, there should be no difficulty in doing it?—We think we should be entitled to it.

13. You suggest that irregularities occur owing to not having time off for attending Court. You do not say that if you saw a drunken man in the morning you would not arrest him?—Drunks in Mount Cook do not affect us; but I believe I would let a man go in a case of that kind.

14. You have not done so?—No.

15. If you saw a theft, would you arrest the guilty party?—Yes; but I have put men in for drunkenness who should have been charged with a breach of the peace, because I would know that I would have them dealt with in Mount Cook for ordinary drunkenness.

16. You think that a gymnasium is very desirable?—I think so.

17. You know that it is only recently we have started gymnasiums? We started one in Auckland?—Of course, I heard that.

18. And that it is intended to have more?—I did not know that. Of course, if it had been provided in the first instance, it would not have meant the large expense that would be involved now in a place like Lambton Quay.

19. We have a drill ground not far from there?—There is enough ground at Lambton Quay at present.

The Commissioner: You cannot provide ground for a gymnasium when you have seven or eight men occupying the one room. I quite agree as to the necessity for it.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] We are providing extra rooms at Lambton Quay at the present time. (To witness): Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the Police Force?—No.

21. If a rise in pay and a lodging-allowance were given, do you think it would satisfy the demands of the men to a considerable extent?—I believe so; but I believe there are other things.

22. What are the other things?—There should be a systematic style of examinations, or some way of finding out the capacity of the men—some standards of knowledge to find out the good men and those who ought to be promoted in their proper turn.

23. *The Commissioner.*] The whole thing must turn to a large extent on the Inspectors recommending the men who ought to be promoted?—I hold that wiser heads than mine could devise a proper scheme.

24. But they are carried out on the recommendation of the Inspectors, and who is in a better position to judge?—Quite so, but I hold that he has not a proper opportunity of finding out where his best men are.

25. Presumably, he takes the advice of his senior sergeants?—I am not sure.

26. Inspectors have told me so. You would not go so far as to make promotion contingent on a competitive examination, because that would be a most mischievous thing?—No; but I do hold that he could have a better standard, because at present there is no encouragement—our rewards are indefinite and unsatisfactory. I believe some system could be devised to make them more satisfactory and definite. I do not suggest what it should be.

27. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think that the Inspector is in a proper position to recommend his men?—He is.

28. Then, how is he to overlook his men?—I believe it is so.

29. In what way?—Men of quiet, retiring dispositions may be overlooked who would be suitable for country stations. Another man might be a brilliant constable for town work. I hold that the Inspector should have better opportunities of knowing their different qualifications. The examination you instituted should, I think, be taken more notice of.

30. It will be compulsory in time. Do you think it would raise the standard?—Certainly.

31. That a man to be promoted should pass a good stiff examination?—Yes.

32. *The Commissioner.*] What kind of examination?—Practical and in law. I hold that a man cannot be a good sergeant without a good knowledge of the criminal law.

33. Not a general knowledge of the criminal law?—I know of one sergeant who told me he did things I knew to be unlawful.

34. *Inspector Ellison.*] In regard to Sunday leave, you admit that you get it in turn when on day duty?—Yes.

35. And you admit that it would be difficult for men on night duty to get it?—They could.

36. Where would you get the men from? Would you not have to leave the night duty neglected?—We hold that a man should get one Sunday in every four weeks.

37. But during the fortnight a man is on night duty, how do you propose to give him Sunday leave?—We do not propose that.

38. And you get it in turns while on day duty?—We do. I believe it is pretty fair in Mount Cook.

39. Supposing you are at Mount Cook, and you have to come to the Court at Lambton Quay, do you not get time off?—One hour and a half if we have to come two mornings in succession.

40. *The Commissioner.*] How long were you in the depot?—Only about six weeks.

41. Why?—I believe we have to get out by the end of the month; the usual time is two months.

42. Why?—We had to get out in that time. I remember the sergeant saying, "I will have to cut you short at the end of the month."

43. What did he mean by that?—You have to pass a certain examination.

44. You think, then, that the extra time is not of any value, because I am inclined to think that the time is too short for the average man?—I think so.

45. I want to get your experience, because you seem to have a very intelligent appreciation. You think that the service in the depot ought to be longer?—I believe it ought to be, certainly.

46. It is not long enough for the average man?—No.

47. Would three months be long enough?—I think it would.

48. You think a constable ought to have a good physical training? Assuming that we had a man attached to the Force who occupied the position of physical instructor, would periodical visits from him during the three months be of value?—Certainly. The fact of them being provided would enable the men after a few lessons to provide for themselves. Sergeant Dart is very good.

49. But you think that Constable Skinner is exceptional?—Yes.

50. And that his services, if secured as physical instructor, would be of very great value?—Of very great value.

51. And there would be no difficulty at the depot?—None whatever.

52. In regard to the quality of the men passing through there, is there much trouble in the matter of conduct, and so forth?—We used to have a pillow-fight occasionally, and have some tossing of our beds.

53. What was your occupation before you joined?—Bushman.

54. Always in the country?—Always.

55. Did you find any inclination for the Police Force on the part of men such as yourself, or disinclination?—I found that a lot of men had an idea that it was very hard to get into the Force—thought they could not pass.

56. You know that men are not coming forward now?—I have heard that.

57. It is a fact, and the position will have to be improved in some way or other. Do you think it is lack of knowledge, or do you think that the requirement of the Fifth Standard is any bar?—I do not think it is.

58. What part do you come from?—Australia. I have been here about six years.

59. Were you doing bushwork all the time?—No; immediately before I joined the police I was driving a delivery-van for Sharpe Bros., of Christchurch. The difficulty is that many men who passed the Fifth Standard at school could not pass it at the depot.

60. And you have to produce evidence of having passed it, or pass the equivalent of it?—I believe that the equivalent is to go to a local schoolmaster, and be examined. I know of one man who had never been beyond the Second Standard, and had been in the one place all his life, who got a certificate.

The Commissioner: That seems a very extravagant statement.

Mr. Dinnie: The man may have improved himself after leaving school.

61. *The Commissioner:* You are saying, of your own knowledge, that at the time he was unable to pass the Second Standard?—At school he had passed the Second Standard, and he told me that he had not studied since he had been at school; but he went to the schoolmaster and got a certificate. I know that he could not pass the Fifth Standard.

62. *Mr. Dinnie:* I would be glad to know his name?—He is not in the Force at present, but he was a very good man.

The Commissioner: Unfortunately, this is not the first time the statement has been made—it has been mentioned before—the facility with which men can get a certificate.

Mr. Dinnie: It was mentioned once before, but they undergo another examination when they go to the drill ground.

The Commissioner: I am in favour of more elasticity being used—that a man should not be required to pass a stereotyped examination.

At Mr. Dinnie's request the witness wrote on a slip of paper the name of the constable in question.

63. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Then, you think that the standard of education is not of absolute importance?—No.

64. At any rate, it does not convey that value it is supposed to convey, which is the main thing?—No.

JOHN WILLETTS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 251.)

1. *The Commissioner:*] When were you enrolled?—In April, 1908. I am now stationed at Wellington South. I came here in reference to an allegation made against me by Mr. Arnold, which I say is unfounded.

1A. In evidence given in Dunedin?—Yes, sir.

1B. That was in reference to a man working on the tramways in one of our New Zealand cities who was dismissed for making immoral suggestions to lady passengers and joined the Force. You consider that you are the man referred to there?—There is my complete answer [handing in a file of papers].

2. Take the first—that of the 5th December: "Wellington Corporation Tramways.—Memorandum for Conductor J. Willetts.—*Re* Resignation: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of even date, resigning your position as conductor, and to inform you that the same has been accepted.—STUART RICHARDSON, Tramways and Electrical Engineer." That disposes of the allegation that you were dismissed?—Yes, sir.

3. Then there is this letter of the 29th July, 1909: "In reply to your request of the 27th instant, I enclose herewith copy of your resignation from this service. Regarding your inquiry, 'Whether at any time you were guilty of making immoral or indecent suggestions to lady passengers,' I beg to inform you that I have no knowledge or record of any report to this effect. If necessary, I shall be pleased to answer any inquiries or produce your record of service should the Commissioner desire it.—STUART RICHARDSON." You wrote tendering your resignation, and that was accepted?—Yes, sir.

4. That disposes of that allegation, with regard to your dismissal, and the reason for it?—Yes.

5. Is there anything else you wish to say?—That is a serious charge to make against me, because, practically, all I have got is my character, and Mr. Arnold is trying to ruin that. Would I not have any redress in the matter?

6. How could I answer that? The proper person to answer that is Mr. Gray, at the table there. I have no doubt, if you consult him, he will advise you?—Very well, sir.

7. What led up to this matter? Was there anything at all between you and any woman on the tram?—Absolutely nothing of the sort, and I would like to get at the bottom of it.

8. Was there not something about a practical joke played by you?—There may have been a practical joke.

9. Was there not some trouble between you and the husband of some woman?—I was conducting on the cars, and I had a little bit of time to spare one day around Oriental Bay, while waiting for another car to pass. A boy brought in a tinful of crabs, and I dropped one of them into a lady's purse as I was passing.

10. Was this lady a stranger to you?—Not altogether a stranger.

11. In what way?—She was a lady about sixty years of age, and had a daughter with her. There could be no possibility of any immoral suggestion in the affair.

12. Did you know her well enough to take such a liberty? You must remember that you were in a position of trust?—I could not answer that. Every man does things at some time or other that he would wish afterwards he had not done.

13. Was there anything said about the crab?—Not a word passed.

14. When you dropped the crab into the lady's bag, what did she say?—Nothing.

15. Was there any complaint made to the authorities?—I do not know; I do not think there was any complaint.

16. Did you have any correspondence with the husband?—Absolutely none. I will give you the name of the man.

17. Are you absolutely certain? I know the name of the man; the Commissioner showed me some correspondence?—That was since then—recently.

18. I ask, did you have any correspondence with the husband?—Yes, sir.

19. What was the nature of your letter to him?—I saw him personally, and put the facts before him, and he agreed that there was no ground whatever.

20. No ground whatever?—That was the letter I got from him.

20A. This letter is dated the 28th July, 1909: "In reply to your request for a statement of the circumstances in connection with a practical joke which you played on Mrs. —, while a passenger on a city tramcar on the Oriental Bay route, and on which you acted as conductor, I have to state that the whole affair was a practical joke. The idea that immoral conduct was displayed, or immoral suggestion made, is simply preposterous." Then, there must have been some complaint made?—I do not know what answer they would give to them.

21. You must be perfectly plain and straightforward. You led me to understand that there was nothing, and there must have been something?—As regards the immoral suggestion.

22. Never mind about the immoral suggestion. I want the true history of the matter. This letter of the 28th July states: "In consequence of the incident, you were removed from the position of guard, and placed on other work, as the offence was not sufficient to warrant your dismissal from the service." Who complained?—The lady herself, I believe.

23. Why did you not say so at first? To whom did she complain?—The Electrical Engineer.

24. And what was done? Were you called upon for an explanation?—I was called upon, but I had been contemplating leaving. When the matter was mentioned to me, rather than be subject to petty persecution I decided that I would resign.

25. What petty persecution was there?—I do not mean about that particular thing.

26. Then, you admit that you were quite wrong in playing this practical joke upon a lady who was evidently a stranger to you?—There is no doubt about that.

27. She evidently considered it unbecoming, and made a complaint?—Yes.

28. The allegation was not so much immoral conduct on your part as a suggestion that there was a connection between the thing you put into this lady's bag and dirty habits. Did you refer to anything of that sort?—It is ridiculous to suggest anything of the sort.

29. You say it was simply a practical joke?—Until I heard the talk, I never knew there was such a thing as any suggestion of the kind you mention.

30. The official of the Tramway Department will be subpoenaed to produce all documents connected with the matter. We will get to the bottom of it. Is there anything else you wish to say?—During the evidence this morning I heard you express a wish to hear evidence about the working of some other Departments *re* holidays. Gaol warders get fifteen days' annual leave, and they also get every other Sunday off.

31. As of right?—As of right. The attendants in the mental hospitals get thirty days' annual leave, as well as three clear week days and one Sunday every month—a total of seventy-four days a year. The Artillery get twelve days a year, every holiday, such as saints' days and public holidays, three days at Christmas and New Year, and practically forty-five Sundays per year besides.

32. Do you know anything about the clothing?—They get a concession in regard to uniform, but I could not tell exactly what it is—a full dress and undress, I think, per year.

33. And the warders?—They get supplied with everything free, including boots.

34. Is there anything else you would wish to state?—Touching Sunday leave, I think that every man should get at least one Sunday a month off. In my own case, I have not had a Sunday for four or five months—since about the 18th March last, or it may have been the 18th April.

35. Have you applied for it, or represented the fact of not getting it as a hardship?—I have applied during that time on two occasions for leave, and for four hours one afternoon to do private duty, but through pressure of duty I was unable to take it. Last Saturday week I applied

for Sunday leave, but it was 2 o'clock when I put in my application, and it was too late and could not be granted.

36. I see you resigned from the tramway service on the 15th December: did you then contemplate applying for the police?—No, sir.

37. How long after did you decide to do so?—I did not do it on the spur of the moment. I came to Wellington nine years ago with the intention of joining the police. I got the papers several times, and filled them in, but did not go on with them.

38. Are you married or single?—Married.

39. What rent do you pay?—I have a place of my own.

40. What would be the letting-value?—Eighteen shillings per week. A married man in Wellington cannot possibly get a house at 15s. a week, as I heard it stated this morning, unless he goes to live in the slum part of the town.

41. What would be the average rental?—For a constable, at the very least, £1 per week, because he must be respectable, and live in a respectable locality.

42. What wages would you get as tram-conductor?—I averaged about £3 per week.

43. You get paid overtime?—Yes, sir.

44. How does your position in the police compare with that, taking everything into consideration?—I am a poorer man now than ever I have been in my life. I was in the Artillery for eight years, and during two years of that time I was a married man, getting £2 2s. per week and a house. During that two years I put away £1 per week, but during the last eighteen months that I have been in the police I have gone back, and all the little I had saved is gone. I owe £3 3s. for medical attendance for the last six months, and am unable to pay it. Of course, my family is growing; I have four now.

45. And you are better off in having your own house?—I am paying for a house to-day, and it does not cost me what the rent is.

46. Then, you think there is nothing to attract men to join the Force?—Absolutely nothing.

47. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In making application for employment, you submitted the usual application form?—Yes, sir.

48. In that is a statement of your previous employments since 1890?—Yes.

49. From 1890 to 1897 you were employed in gold-mining for yourself?—Yes.

50. You were known to the Hon. Mr. Holmes, M.L.C., and Mr. Michel, Mayor of Hokitika; and from 1897 to 1899 you were in the Public Works Department at Otira?—Yes.

51. From 1899 to 1907 you were in the Artillery?—Yes.

52. During 1907, from February to December, you were in the tramway service as a conductor?—Yes.

53. From December you were in the tramway service laying cables?—Yes.

54. They reduced the staff, and that is why you had to leave?—Yes.

55. From December, 1908, you were with Humphreys Bros., Wellington?—Yes.

56. So that accounts for all your time up to the time you joined the police?—Yes.

57. This is a certificate from Mr. Richardson, Tramways and Electrical Engineer, dated 1907: "To all whom it may concern: John Willetts was in the employ of this department as conductor from the 15th February, 1907, to the 5th December, 1907, and resigned from the position on the 5th December, 1907, as he found that the work was not congenial. Since then he has been employed on street-work for power-supply, and worked until the progress of the work necessitated reducing the staff.—STUART RICHARDSON, M.I.C.E., Tramways and Electrical Engineer."?—Yes.

Mr. Dinnie: I may say that the sergeant made inquiry into these matters.

The Commissioner: I only want to clear up the matter for his sake. We will have Mr. Richardson to-morrow.

58. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service?—None whatever.

59. You are not living in the barracks?—No, sir.

WILLIAM JAMES TAYLOR, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 252.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] When were you enrolled?—On the 14th March, 1907. I am now stationed at Wellington South.

2. What do you wish to say?—I wish to complain of unjust treatment at the hands of Inspector Ellison.

3. Give me the details?—I was sworn in in March, 1907, and was transferred to Auckland.

4. Forthwith?—Yes, sir. I was there a short time when I was transferred to Wellington.

5. Give the exact time?—I could not say that. Sergeant Hendrey read out an order that I had to report myself in Wellington as soon as possible. I went to Sub-Inspector Gordon, and asked if there were any complaints, and he said, "No; if you behave as well in Wellington, you will be all right." Sergeant Hendrey said, "I have no cause to complain." On coming to Wellington I went to Inspector Ellison's office. I knocked at the door, and he asked what I was there for. He said, "You are another waster; I have enough here without you; you will have to shake yourself up here." I then went to Sub-Inspector O'Donovan, who is a regular gentleman, and he told me I would have to put in an application for leave, to fix up my wife and children. I put in an application for twenty-four hours' leave, which Inspector Ellison would not allow, as he said I had not enough service to warrant getting the time. Sub-Inspector O'Donovan said there was a vacancy in Mount Cook or in Lambton Quay, but he said, "In the meantime, go to a boarding-house, and if you get a house, I will see that you get time off to fix it up." He allowed me eight hours off to do it. I was instructed by Sergeant Mathieson to take a witness to the district office to get his expenses. On doing so, Inspector Ellison said to me, in front of Mr. George

Morris, Willis Street, "Get out of this; it is time you knew your duties now." Later on I put in an application for plain-clothes duty, and received a reply that mine would be considered with others. Later on I put in an application for the position of mounted man, which Inspector Ellison forwarded to the Commissioner. Inspector Ellison stated that I could not be trusted for the position of mounted man, who would have to do duty in the suburbs; that I required a sergeant over me. I would like you to ask why I was left at Wellington South from July, 1907, to March, 1909, without seeing a sergeant. At the present time I am not under the eye of a sergeant from 8 o'clock at night till 4 in the morning. Some constables have said to me that it would be very unwise to give evidence for fear of the consequences; they are frightened.

6. Evidently you are not frightened?—I chanced the result. With regard to promotions, Constable Abbott applied for promotion, and was condemned by the Hon. Mr. McGowan on the floor of the House; but since Mr. McGowan left the House he has been appointed over the heads of myself and five others; and what notorious work has he done to warrant his promotion over our heads? When he came here first it was rumoured that he was told he would get to be acting-detective. I asked Sergeant Mathieson, who said he did not think so. They condemned me—I do not know why. I would ask you to peruse my record since I have been at Wellington South, and ask Mr. Dinnie whether it is that of a "waster" or not.

7. I see you have had "30 charges of theft, 11 of vagrancy, 7 of breaches of the Licensing Act, 21 charges (including assaults, obscene language, indecent language), 34 of breaches of the city by-laws, 78 charges of drunkenness." In all 181 charges, resulting in 178 convictions?—Since Sergeant Mathieson came, things have been made very unpleasant for us.

8. How many men are there?—Two, sir. The population is seventeen thousand, I believe, and there are two constables and a sergeant. The other constable stationed there—Constable Andrews—was transferred—as good a man as there was in the Dominion: he was transferred on his own application. With regard to election days, I think there should be provision made for constables looking after booths. At the last election I was on my legs from 9 o'clock one morning until 2 o'clock next morning, with half an hour for dinner and half an hour for tea. I want to know is that justice? What is more, since October, 1907, I have never had one Sunday off; and Inspector Ellison knows that. I notice that some of the witnesses have suggested that constables should be moved about. I would suggest that Inspectors, too, be shifted around for the same reason that constables are removed; it would be appreciated throughout the Dominion.

9. Is it on account of favouritism?—That is my opinion. They get in with cliques, and it is only natural. There is also a common rumour in our locality that Inspector Ellison does not carry out the Licensing Act. I would like that Sergeant Dale be questioned on that—his reports in regard to certain publichouses.

10. You say that no proceedings resulted from those reports?—Yes, so far as I am given to understand. When Inspector Ellison came here some years ago he recommended that certain hotels—the Foresters' Arms, Prince of Wales, Clyde Quay, Royal Tiger, Cambridge, and others—be condemned as "insanitary, dangerous, and out of date, and needed rebuilding." Why was not notice taken before Mr. Justice Cooper gave his decision in Blenheim some years ago? I would also ask that Sergeant Mathieson and Sergeant Dart be called and asked regarding my conduct and capabilities at Wellington South, and that Mr. Morris be subpoenaed as a witness. The reason I did not put in for leave was that I applied once, and was snubbed.

The Commissioner: Of course, Inspector Ellison, you are entitled to twenty-four hours' notice before having to answer these matters.

Inspector Ellison: I do not claim any notice, your Worship.

11. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Is there anything else you would wish to add?—I think that Inspectors ought to know how to treat good men when they get them. I have nothing to say against Mr. Dinnie's administration; I have never heard complaints about him.

12. Is Inspector Ellison the only Inspector you have served under?—I served under Inspector Cullen also.

13. How long were you under him?—Ten weeks, or three months. I have heard constables say that they got justice from him.

14. Have you anything else to say?—No; the other grievances have been referred to by other constables.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You did not know that you were being transferred from Auckland to Wellington?—No.

16. I think it was because your brother got into some trouble up there; and do you not think it was advisable that you should be transferred?—Yes.

17. *Inspector Ellison.*] In regard to your mention of Abbott, I suppose you reckon that you are far better qualified for the position of acting-detective?—I am as good, in my opinion, when Commissioner Tunbridge condemned him, according to Mr. McGowan. His word was good, I suppose.

18. You say he was promoted over your head?—I do.

19. He was a long time in the Force before you?—So far as I am aware, he was.

20. You think I should have recommended you for the position of detective?—No; I was advised it would be worse for me afterwards.

21. Do you now find fault because you were not recommended for the position of detective?—Certainly.

22. And likewise because you were not appointed a mounted man?—All I asked was that my application should be considered with the others.

23. You wanted to be appointed a mounted man: do you feel aggrieved because you were not mounted?—Not at all.

24. Why do you mention it, then?—Because you said I was not a man to be trusted.
25. Did I say it to you?—On paper, to the best of my belief. You said, “A mounted man’s duty takes him to the suburbs, and I cannot recommend Constable Taylor, as he wants to be under the eye of a strict sergeant.”
26. You asked why you were in Newtown so long without a sergeant: was there not a constable in charge there?—Yes.
27. Did Constable Kerr do his duties satisfactorily in charge of the station?—To the best of my belief.
28. And you think you were as well looked after as if a sergeant had been in charge?—I do not say so.
29. Did he advise you as well as a sergeant would?—I did not say that he could advise me as well.
30. Was he as careful and competent a man?—I am not a judge. I cannot judge between a constable and a sergeant.
31. You are a judge of Inspectors?—A bit of a judge.
32. But not of a sergeant?—I judge by the treatment he metes out to his subordinates.
33. When did I say you were a “waster”?—You said you had enough “wasters” without me, and that I would have to shake myself up.
34. Did you say what you were transferred for?—No.
35. Who was there at the time?—You were there by yourself.
36. A sergeant generally comes in with a constable on transfer. To whom did you report yourself?—To you, sir.
37. Did you not report yourself to the station sergeant and Sub-Inspector?—No; I was told to go to Sub-Inspector O’Donovan, who treats men as they ought to be treated, and is looked up to by everybody.
38. In this case you refer to the bringing in of a witness: was not the defendant ordered to pay a fine and costs?—Correct.
39. And you took the man in to be paid at the police office?—Quite right too.
40. Did I not tell you that you should not bring him there when the money was paid into Court?—You did afterwards.
41. You said you had a witness?—He is not here at present, but Mr. Morris could be called. Since Sergeant Mathieson came to the station I could do nothing right; everything has been unpleasant.
42. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know that Constable Abbott had considerable service before he resigned?—To the best of my belief he had.
43. Do you know that he was a sergeant before he resigned?—I do.

MICHAEL GREENE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 253.)

Witness: I was enrolled in the Force in 1875, in Otago. I remained there till 1898, when I was transferred to Wellington Central Station, where I have been till the present time. After arriving here I was doing sergeant’s duty for about two years. In 1900 I was appointed Inspector of Weights and Measures for Wellington and suburbs and the Hutt County. My predecessor was in office for about two years. He did no uniform duty during that time, and when I took over the duties I was given to understand my duties would be the same as those of my predecessor. However, I did sergeant’s work very seldom after being appointed Inspector of Weights and Measures—only when they were very short-handed. Later on I had to do a regular turn every second Saturday, relieving a sergeant and also on special occasions. About two years after being appointed Inspector of Weights and Measures I was appointed verifier-general of all Government weights in the Dominion. My predecessor was Sir James Hector, who handed me over the standard weights. I have continued in that position to the present time. I receive various communications from Inspectors of Weights and Measures throughout the Dominion, and reply giving instructions and information. There are two sergeants in the Commissioner’s office—one who attends to the *Police Gazette*, whose duty it is to hand in every fortnight the various sheets received from different parts of the Dominion to the printer for publication; he has an assistant. Another sergeant looks after the police stores—a man who does his work faithfully and well; he got promotion a year or two before it is generally given to a man, but it is due to him to say he is a thoroughly reliable man. These sergeants, in addition to getting sergeant’s pay, receive 1s. a day plain-clothes allowance, and there is reason to believe they also get 1s., or did some time ago, for being clerks. I am classed with them in Circular No. 6, *Gazette*, 1906, as clerks, and they are entitled to the same uniform-allowance that I am according to the circular, but it appears to me I am not entitled, nor do I believe, the plain-clothes allowance they do.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your remuneration?—Nine shillings and sixpence a day. I am a single man. I compare the very important duties I have to do in connection with all the weights and measures in the Dominion with these men I have referred to, and ask whether my duties are not more important than theirs.

2. Are you speaking to the matter of allowance, or what?—The pay and also the duties: they have got from 1 o’clock every Saturday till 9 the following Monday morning.

3. It is the absence of extra allowance you find fault with?—Yes; and having to do uniform duty as well. Regarding the pay, I think all constables should get 8s. as soon as they are appointed, which should be increased to 10s. in time. They should also get, if not once a week, at least once a fortnight, a day off. Every other person gets it, and I do not see why the police, who are hardworking men, should not. I think they should also get their uniforms free, as the officials in gaols, post-offices, and asylums do. I think an Appeal Board is very desirable; it is very much needed; it should consist of a Superintendent of Police—a man who would command the respect of

every policeman in the service; another member of the Board should be the Under-Secretary for Justice; and some other responsible man who would command respect—making three in all. Men are only human, and no doubt sometimes Inspectors may take a partial view of certain matters owing to certain circumstances, and may not do the right thing, and then there should be an appeal to the Board.

4. You would give every person with a grievance the right of appeal?—Yes.

5. If dealt with as a matter of discipline?—Yes; every man of any rank in the service should have the right of appeal. In regard to political influence, I do not find much of it here; but I say distinctly there is a worse sort of influence than political influence, and it is this: The Chief Clerk, who is a Sub-Inspector, and frequently Acting-Commissioner, is practically the Commissioner. The Commissioner is only so by name. With all respect to Mr. Dinnie, who is really an honest and conscientious officer, he has allowed his power to be usurped by his Chief Clerk; that is my honest opinion of the present state of the administration here.

6. Do you think that opinion is shared by others?—I do. This officer is frequently Acting-Commissioner, and in that capacity he can dictate to any Inspector throughout the Dominion, though he is only Chief Clerk and Sub-Inspector. There is also this serious defect: that he is closely associated with the uniform men daily—both constables and sergeants—frequently meeting and associating with them in the billiard-room, as the billiard-room cash-book will show.

7. Does he go into the billiard-room?—Yes; he associates with the men there. I look upon this as a dangerous thing, because if the men get closely associated with him day and night it will have an influence I say it should not have. Formerly—in Mr. Tunbridge's time, who was a very able man—there were Civil servants who were a credit to the Dominion in regard to anything confidential or of a private nature: there were the late Mr. Tasker and Mr. Evans, who is still alive. At that time there was no leakage of anything from the Commissioner's office. None of us knew those men, except the oldest hands. At the present time there is too close a corporation.

8. Are you in the habit of seeing Mr. Wright associating with the men?—Yes; I live in the barracks. The cash-book in the billiard-room shows every man who plays, and who he plays with.

9. Is a record kept of every game played?—Yes.

10. Are these matters you have brought forward the subject of comment by any others?—Frequently.

11. You have heard these matters discussed?—Yes; it is said, "A nice example for us to see a Sub-Inspector associating with the men: if there are promotions or transfers, his friends will no doubt get the benefit."

12. You think he has the ear of the Commissioner?—He is practically the Commissioner, and is looked upon as being so. I have known of numbers of men coming to Wellington from various parts of the Dominion to see the Sub-Inspector, whom they look upon as the Commissioner; they come to see him relative to promotion, &c.

13. Instead of the Commissioner?—Yes.

14. How long have you held these views?—Ever since Mr. Wright was appointed Sub-Inspector; that was the time he got so much power.

15. Had you been in contact with him prior to his promotion?—I have known him since I came to Wellington—about twelve years.

16. *Mr. Gray.*] How long have you been living in barracks?—Since I joined the police in Wellington, in 1898.

17. You would be able to speak to any disorderly condition of things if it existed? No doubt you are aware it has been said by Mr. Arnold, "I can assure the Minister that the worst of the scenes and the things I could speak of as occurring between pay-day on Saturday and the time for starting again on Monday morning were no worse than are to be found at the police barracks in Wellington almost every night in the week." Does this describe what goes on in the barracks?—I do not think so.

18. Is there any ground for saying there are disorderly scenes in the barracks at night?—There have been on one or two occasions.

19. How long since?—Perhaps three months, or thereabouts.

20. What were those incidents? Were you present at the occurrences?—I was not.

21. You heard what went on?—One occurred about 9 o'clock. I was in the billiard-room at the time, and I heard a sort of scuffle outside. I did not take much notice, and did not go out, but I heard there was an assault committed.

22. All you heard was a scuffle outside, and you did not think it of sufficient importance to go and see what it was?—No.

23. What is the other incident?—I was in bed reading, some time after 11 o'clock, and there were a number of young men playing apparently a bit roughly in the passage upstairs—you might call it horse-play. Sergeant Lyons came up and warned them to go into bed, and I think he went down again, and threatened to bring up the watch-house keeper. I did not take much notice of it; I thought it was only a bit of play among the young men—nothing serious.

24. You mean they were just skylarking?—Yes; and I would not give a button for a young man who has not a bit of fun about him, so long as he does nothing blackguardly.

25. These are the only instances of rowdiness that you know of having occurred?—Yes.

26. You have been in the barracks a number of years?—Yes.

27. Have you any idea how such a statement could be made?—Whoever made it was misinformed, and did not know the facts. No person could know better than I what has taken place there. I have not been out of the building one night for nearly twelve years.

28. If Mr. Arnold, who made that statement, received information that went to show that extreme rowdiness in the barracks was of frequent occurrence his informant told him what was untrue?—There is no doubt about that.

29. You are in a position to speak of the conduct of the men generally?—Their conduct is excellent.

30. Have you any idea how such statements could be accounted for?—Not the least.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you in the Force before you were promoted?—I was promoted in 1888 or 1889.

32. How long did you retain your rank?—About twelve months.

33. How did you come to be reduced to the rank of constable?—Through an Inspector, who was directly the cause of my reduction; he was himself reduced more than once, and retired from the service with reduced rank.

34. But what was the charge against you?—It was at the time of the Dunedin Exhibition. A sergeant said something to me, and I resented it, and he ordered me into the station.

35. How did you resent it? What were you reduced for?—He charged me with being out late at night, and I said there was no harm in it. He put his hand near my face, and I put it by; and all at once he got hold of me, and we went to the station, and he charged me with being under the influence of drink, and with assaulting him. Immediately afterwards I went to Dr. Brown, who gave me a certificate stating that he examined me, and I did not bear a trace of drink.

36. You were reduced on that charge?—Yes.

37. Your name came up at the Commission of 1898?—Yes.

38. What was that matter?—It was in connection with a publican who said I did not arrest a man at his publichouse.

39. But what was the complaint against you on that occasion?—I was reported by the sergeant for not reporting what took place, and the publican got annoyed because I did not take proceedings against the man he complained against.

40. Was it not alleged that you were found asleep when you should have been on duty?—That was so.

41. Was it true?—I was in my bedroom—not asleep.

42. You say men come from all districts to see the Chief Clerk: who are they?—I do not wish to mention their names particularly, but I can hand them to the Commissioner.

43. For what purpose did they come?—In reference to promotion and other advantages.

44. Now, I want you to be very careful in this matter: you know the late Inspector at Napier?—Yes.

45. You know he came to live at Petone: how often have you been out to see him?—About twice. I have known him since I joined the police—in Dunedin, Invercargill, and here.

46. Have you been in communication with him?—No.

47. You are quite sure?—Quite certain.

48. Do you know anything about letters appearing in the papers in respect to myself?—I have read them.

49. Have you any idea where they emanate from?—I have not.

50. Have you ever mentioned anything about the late Inspector to any one here, and about letters to the Press?—I am quite certain I have not.

51. If I bring some one to prove it, what will you say?—You cannot bring any one.

52. Have you communicated with Mr. Arnold in any way?—I have never spoken or, directly or indirectly, communicated with him.

53. Have you ever seen a telegram at the barracks in the hands of a detective to say I would have to go?—No.

54. You are quite sure about that?—Yes.

55. How often have you seen the late Inspector in town?—I saw him once after coming from Napier, when he came looking for a house.

56. Did you not take a letter out to him to be signed and sent to the Press?—Certainly not.

57. Are you quite sure?—Never in my life.

58. Have you any idea who used to write these letters to the Press?—I have not.

59. Are you quite sure?—Yes.

60. *Inspector Ellison.*] You complain about the hours of duty: how often do you do uniform duty?—Every second Sunday.

61. What time do you knock off on Saturday?—Last Saturday, at 5.

62. But what time generally?—Generally at 1. But then I make inquiries relative to complaints. Last Saturday I had to go out to Seatoun.

63. But, as a rule, you leave at 1 o'clock?—Yes.

64. On holidays, what time do you knock off?—The shops generally keep open, and I have to keep open.

65. On a general holiday you shut your office?—Yes; but I have to keep about, in case I am wanted.

66. What time do you go to your office in the morning?—Nine.

67. And you have nothing to do after 5?—No.

68. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards promotions, you say men come to the Chief Clerk: do you know how promotions are made?—I have a pretty good idea.

69. What is it?—Through a certain channel. If I happen to be well acquainted with your Chief Clerk I would go to him, and say, "Mr. Wright, we have been very good chums; don't forget me," and I am satisfied I would get what I wanted.

70. No question about that?—No question.

71. That is why so many come to see him?—Yes.

72. It is entirely through his recommendation they are promoted?—He has a lot to do with it.

73. The Inspectors have nothing to do with it?—Some of them may have, but he has a great deal to do with it.

74. Do you know that every man who gets promotion is recommended by his Inspector?—They should be; no doubt, they must have some recommendation.

75. Then, what has the other to do with it?—Their applications may be pigeon-holed unless they are favourably entertained by the Chief Clerk.

76. Do they not go to the Inspector at all?—They must make application to the Inspector.

77. Do you know that the Inspector makes recommendations whether they apply or not?—I know more than that. Frequently men who seek promotion would be checked and censured by the Commissioner, and told, "It is not for you, but for me. I am the man to know whether you are entitled to promotion, and if you were entitled you would get it without asking for it." The late Commissioner Tunbridge, who was a very able man, after I was laid up in the hospital with hernia, said, like a gentleman, he was sorry I had met with an accident, and had to undergo an operation, and I would be on full pay, and when I returned to my duty at that time I had only my own district to attend to. I met him on Lambton Quay, and he said, "Green, I am glad you have resumed duty, and that your operation has been successful." I thanked him and he said, "Would it not be to your advantage to revert to uniform, and I will see you get the first chance of promotion?" There was a gentleman. That was what he did without my asking or going to a member of Parliament.

78. But it is not members of Parliament who get men promoted: you have told us who it is?—There is not much done by members of Parliament here.

79. There would be no use in men going to members of Parliament: there is only one man to go to, you say?—If I wanted anything I would take care to be in close touch with the Chief Clerk. I would not bother about members of Parliament.

80. Well, could you not have gone to him?—I never troubled very much about him; twice I refused promotion.

81. It is a pity you did not take it?—I had a reason. I was suffering from hernia, and that is why I did not accept it. I am now doing responsible work, and am entitled to it more than many who have received it.

82. Well, you seem to know how to get it?—I would go a long time without it before I would go to Mr. Wright. I would put my claim before you if I were determined to get it. I never asked you for anything up to the present, nor any Inspector. But if I wanted I would apply to you.

83. Would you be satisfied with that?—I know it would be no use.

84. Then, why not apply to the other party?—I will let others do that.

85. *The Commissioner.*] How old are you?—Fifty-four.

86. Do you know whether the men holding the same position as you in the other centres do beat duty?—The man in Dunedin does not, although he is an able, powerful man; he has only his own district to look after; Christchurch the same way.

87. You are the only man occupying the position who does street duty?—Yes.

TUESDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

MICHAEL REDICAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 254.)

Witness: I am stationed and in charge at Island Bay. I was enrolled in the Armed Constabulary in 1881. About four years afterwards I was transferred to the Permanent Artillery, and in 1888 from there to the police.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Since then?—I have been in the police.

2. In charge of different stations?—Yes.

3. What stations?—I went from Normanby to Eltham, and twelve years ago I was temporarily, in the absence of a sergeant, in charge of Hawera.

4. How long have you been in your present location?—I was twelve months last March.

5. Were you sent there at your own request?—I had asked for a transfer.

6. What statement do you wish to make?—I made application for promotion about three years ago. It was returned by the Commissioner, with a memo. to the effect that it would be considered with others. Since then I have seen a number of junior men promoted. I made application recently as a reminder, but it was returned with a note to the effect that I was too old.

7. How old are you now?—About fifty-two.

8. And you were forty-nine when you applied?—I suppose I would be.

9. Was that the first application you had made for promotion?—Yes.

10. Are you aware whether you had been recommended by your Inspector?—I could not say. I was only a year or two in the Wanganui District under Inspector Kiely.

11. Have you got any papers in connection with it?—No.

12. Go on?—That is all I have to say, sir.

13. Nothing else transpired beyond your application and its return with the statement that you were too old?—That is all.

14. Do you consider that you ought to have been promoted?—I consider myself equally as good as, and have more experience than, a number I have seen promoted over me.

15. You would expect, of course, that promotions should be made on the recommendations of the Inspectors?—Well, yes; but I performed good work.

16. Under whom have you done duty?—Under Inspector Thompson (who is dead now), Inspector Pardy, Inspector Ellison, Inspector Pender, Inspector Kiely, and Inspector Wilson.

17. You say that the first occasion on which you applied for promotion was three years ago. Why did you apply then, and not previously?—I thought it was time that I did, when I saw a number of junior men promoted over me. When I was in Eltham I did the work of Clerk of the Court, Bailiff, and Factories Inspector. Now there is a Clerk of the Court appointed there at £150 a year, and Mr. Turnbull was satisfied with me.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You applied for promotion on the 6th October, 1906, as follows: "I respectfully make application to be promoted to the rank of sergeant. In support of the above, I wish to state that I have served continuously in the Police Force since the 26th May, 1888; previous to that in the Armed Constabulary and Artillery. I wish to state that I performed the duties of sergeant in Hawera from the 26th July, 1897, to January, 1898, and did the duties at the Normanby Station at the same time. As to my ability, I leave it to my present Inspector to recommend me for the above position." You were not recommended at that time. This is my remark on that: "This constable's claims have been considered with others as vacancies occurred, and will be in future." Again, on the 1st July, 1909, this is your application: "I respectfully make application for promotion to the rank of sergeant. I wish to state that over two years ago I made application, and received a reply that my application would be considered with others. Since then a number of junior constables have been promoted over me." This is minuted by Inspector Ellison as follows: "When Constable Redican was stationed at Thorndon some years ago he did his work very well, and was energetic. Since his return to this district he has not been nearly so attentive. I could not recommend him as a man well qualified and likely to make an efficient, smart sergeant." On this I put the following minute: "Constable Redican's application has been considered, but I regret I do not consider he is qualified to make an efficient sergeant, and his Inspectors appear to be of the same opinion. He is also too old for promotion." That is the file?—Yes.

19. *The Commissioner.*] You were not recommended by two Inspectors?—No; but I know constables who have been promoted, and I consider myself as good as they.

20. But it is not a matter of personal consideration. There is a general consensus of opinion that promotions must be made generally on the recommendation of Inspectors in the districts in which men have served?—If I had not been a good constable I could not have done two men's work. Since I left Thorndon two men have done the work.

21. You raise the question of fitness; the answer apparently is this: "Since his return to this district he has not been nearly so attentive. I could not recommend him as a man well qualified and likely to make an efficient, smart sergeant." Have you anything else you wish to add?—I should like to say I consider the leave is too short, and I think it should be increased to at least sixteen days a year, and be allowed to accumulate. In regard to the standard, I think no man should be accepted under 5 ft. 9 in., and made in proportion. Most of the trouble that occurs with constables is because men object to arrest by small men.

22. You think the bigger the man the more respect he commands?—Yes, that is my firm belief; that is the impression held by the public.

WILLIAM JAMES SIMPSON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 255.)

Witness: I am stationed at Day's Bay. I was enrolled on the 6th September, 1880. I had been previously in the Force, but was discharged on reduction at Timaru, in July of that year. I was in the Force in 1879, and returned. I was discharged with many others, and rejoined.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before me?—I think that Mr. Arnold's statement is a libel on the police in Wellington. I have been four years in Wellington, in the Thorndon Station, and I consider that the men here are as well behaved as you would expect a lot of young men to be. I never heard any beastly language or any disorder, and I am very often in the station. It is a reflection on the discipline of the station, from the Inspector downwards. Another matter I wish to mention is that I was recommended for promotion by ex-Inspector McGovern and Inspector Gillies. I signed my consent that I would be willing to go to any station in the colony, but that was all that was heard of it. Another matter I wish to mention is that I applied for a return, and it was not granted by the Commissioner's office in Wellington. This is the application I sent in: "Police-station, Day's Bay, 13th July, 1909.—Application of Constable W. J. Simpson (No. 347) for the following information:—I most respectfully apply for the following information, as I intend giving evidence before the Police Commission when here: (1.) The number of Roman Catholic Inspectors in the Force. (2.) The number of Protestant Inspectors in the Force, of all denominations, in every instance. (3.) The number of Roman Catholic Sub-Inspectors in the Force. (4.) The number of Protestant Sub-Inspectors in the Force. (5.) The number of Roman Catholic sergeants in the Force. (6.) The number of Protestant sergeants in the Force. (7.) The number of Roman Catholic constables in the Force. (8.) The number of Protestant constables in the Force. (9.) The number of Roman Catholics in the Force who have changed their religion to Protestant, the rank they held at the time of the change, and their present rank. (10.) The number of Protestants in the Force who have changed to Roman Catholic, the rank they held at the time of the change, and their present rank; this return is requested from the half-yearly distribution return, dated 30th June, 1909. (11.) A copy of the finding of the last Police Commission, held before Messrs. Bishop and Poynton, only as regards their findings in respect to Dunedin. (12.) The records of police duties done by Inspector Mitchell and Sub-Inspector Norwood previous to promotion from the rank of constables; these men are not the promotions of Commissioner Dinnie; they are by ex-Commissioners Hume and Tunbridge. (13.) The record of my own services, for comparison with the Inspector and Sub-Inspector named; I was senior to both in rank at the time of their promotions. (14.) Are the Protestants in the Force receiving their fair share of the best positions in the Force? I humbly request this information under the Police Regulations of 1887, No. 71, pages 13 and 14."

2. You sent this to the Commissioner?—Yes, sir.

3. What then?—I sent a further application, and the return has not come back to me. I got a reply that as I was a constable it could not be supplied to me.

4. What do you want it for?—I want to show by facts and figures that what I am asking is reasonable—that the Protestants will not get their fair share of the best positions in the service. During my time in the service there have been thirteen Inspectors appointed, and out of that number only four have been Protestants.

5. I may say that I have not the faintest idea of any of their religions. I know one or two, but I do not know the bulk?—At present there are only three out of nine, and I think that is not fair.

6. What are you?—A Presbyterian. I think we ought to get our share; we only want that, and do not get it.

7. Do you think religion is a factor in the making of promotions?—A man should get his fair share of the same class of the best positions.

8. You consider that a man's religion should be taken into consideration at the time of his appointment?—That we should get a fair share of the best positions. Why should one crowd get the whole lot?

9. Take two men, one of whom is a Roman Catholic: would you think that religion should be taken into account rather than relative merits?—All things being equal, the other men should get a fair show.

10. You are dealing with the Inspectors?—There are only three Protestants out of nine—Inspectors Ellison, Black, and Gillies.

11. What are the rest?—All Romans.

12. What about the Sub-Inspectors?—I asked for a return of them, and it has been denied to me.

13. I suppose you know?—Two, I suppose, have changed their religion and become Sub-Inspectors.

14. Who are they?—I do not know.

15. What is Green?—A Presbyterian.

16. O'Donovan?—A Roman Catholic.

17. Wright?—A Protestant.

18. Norwood?—I do not know.

19. Phair?—A Protestant.

20. McGrath?—A Roman Catholic.

21. Hendrey?—I do not know.

Mr. Dinnie: Sub-Inspector Hendrey is Church of England.

22. *The Commissioner.*] You say that Sub-Inspectors O'Donovan and McGrath are the only two you know as Roman Catholics?—I do not know, sir.

23. I may say at once, personally, that I deprecate altogether in the strongest possible way the introduction of this sectarian business into the question of the discussion of the merits of appointments, unless it has been a real potent factor in the question of promotions or otherwise?—I will give you the names and everything else. I think I have a reasonable ground for complaint.

24. I am not saying anything about the reasonableness of your ground, but I deprecate it personally, unless you are sure of your facts, because it is a very undesirable element to introduce?—I did not like to speak, but we are passed over.

25. Give me your material?—We have been passed over and others appointed.

26. On account of religion?—I do not know.

27. Then it boils down to the merits of the men?—It tells a very bad tale for the Protestants if we have to stand on one side and they get promoted.

28. What officers do you particularly object to?—I am senior to Sub-Inspectors McGrath, Norwood, and Hendrey.

29. In service?—Yes; and I am senior to all the Chief Detectives in the Force. I have been recommended for promotion by two Inspectors, but my name was simply put in the pigeon-holes, and there was no more about it.

30. Who recommended you?—Inspector McGovern and Inspector Gillies. I have a good record.

31. How long have you been under Inspector Ellison?—Five years in all.

32. Do you know if you have been recommended by him?—No, I was not; I am past the age, but when recommended I was reasonably within the age.

33. What is your present age?—Fifty-six. It is out of the question now. I have nothing to gain by giving my evidence.

34. You have a perfect right to give it. Do you consider you have been passed over for other men because they were Roman Catholics?—I do not want to infer that.

35. Why, then, introduce the religious element?—Because the returns show that we have been passed over.

36. But that may have been for other considerations?—I do not think we are more stupid than they are; I fancy we have as much brains. Further, it is a curious fact that any one who has spoken about the present administration is a Roman Catholic. Chief Detective Herbert, in Dunedin, began talking a lot of nonsense, and Fitzgerald, in Christchurch, began to talk about Freemason influence. I am an old Mason, and never got anything by it. I have never known Freemasonry to advance any man's position; it never advanced mine. Then, Green made a severe attack upon Sub-Inspector Wright, which I think was unwarranted. When I was in Christchurch Captain Lenors always mixed with the men,

37. There is no analogy between the officers. This is simply a question of discipline, and I cannot allow you to traverse the evidence of other witnesses. Give me facts. You are now reflecting upon the evidence given by other persons?—I do not think I have got any more to say.

38. Do you wish me to understand that the bulk of the witnesses who gave evidence reflecting upon the administration are Roman Catholics?—Herbert, Fitzgerald, and Greene are, and there were more than three amongst the others.

39. What do you deduce from that?—I leave you to deduce, sir.

40. Why should the Roman Catholic members of the Force give evidence reflecting upon the administration when they have been favoured?—The only one reason is that they wish to have Mr. Dinnie removed, and a Roman Catholic appointed in his stead. That is the only deduction I can draw from it.

41. Who do you think they have got in view as a Catholic to put in his place?—That would be very hard to say.

42. Of course, you know it was not a Roman Catholic who first voiced the complaints against the present condition of the Force. He is very far from being a Roman Catholic?—I know he is an Orangeman; but I think he was very badly informed—made a tool of. I believe he acted honestly, believing what he said was true, but which was very much untrue.

43. Have you anything else to say?—I think that is all I can say.

44. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I may say that there are two Roman Catholics Sub-Inspectors and five on the opposite side—two Church of England and three Protestants. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction because of the present control?—None whatever.

45. You know that there has always been dissatisfaction because of promotions?—I am dissatisfied because I was passed over when I should have been promoted.

46. But there has been dissatisfaction for many years past?—Since ever I have been in the Force.

47. Do you know anything about influence obtaining?—I only suspect, but I have nothing definite to go upon.

48. It is spoken of?—Very freely.

49. You know that men seek influence?—All they can.

50. You cannot quote a case?—I cannot for accuracy, and I do not like hearsay.

51. You have had inquiries to make regarding candidates for the service?—Very often.

52. Do you think they are carried out strictly?—As far as I am concerned they were, and I never gave one that I cannot go into the witness-box and prove.

53. You have heard remarks about the men in the barracks here?—They are emphatically untrue, and there has been a reflection cast upon the class of men joining the Force now. I am sure that the present class are quite as good as any I have seen in my thirty years' experience.

54. *The Commissioner.*] You mean physically and intellectually?—Yes. Those men who talk about them were not of much account when they joined themselves.

55. *Mr. Dinnie.*] And even if a man's character was of the best, he might misconduct himself afterwards?—It happens in every department.

57. You would suggest an increase of pay?—It should be increased—8s. per day should be the lowest pay.

58. You think that would secure a greater number of candidates?—I think if the standard were lowered another inch—to 5 ft. 8 in.—that a lot of good men would join.

59. But we accept as low as 5 ft. 8½ in. if they are good men?—I did not know that.

60. What have you got to say as regards efficiency?—I think the Force is in a very efficient state at the present time, as far as I know. Of course, there will be men who will creep into every service that you cannot get rid of.

61. Men get dismissed from all services?—In every service I know of.

62. And in many departments there are charges of larceny and other offences?—Look at the newspaper reports; we stand above the others.

63. You think our Force will compare favourably with any other?—I do, sir.

64. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] In regard to the religious question, you say there are cases on record, or insinuate there are, of men who were Protestants declaring themselves Roman Catholics for purposes of promotion: is that your meaning?—I know one who changed his religion, and who was run up in my own time.

65. *The Commissioner.*] Who is that?—Inspector Mitchell. In fact, I was entitled to the stripes he got at first.

66. *Mr. Wright.*] Then your contention is that if a man is a Roman Catholic in the service he has a better chance of getting promotion?—The amount of promotions to Roman Catholics suggests that.

67. Do many other members of the Force hold the same opinions as you?—A great many. We do not want their share, but we want our own share.

68. It is a question of bare justice: you will agree that a man's religion should not be considered one way or the other?—We should get our share of the best positions, all things being equal. It is a reflection on the Protestants that we should be pushed on one side.

69. Would the reason be that the Roman Catholics are better qualified?—I am sure, from mixing amongst them, that it has never been so.

70. You say that, all things being equal, they are unduly favoured?—I have no doubt about it.

71. *The Commissioner.*] In spite of the fact that a Roman Catholic is not at the head of the Department, how do you account for that?—There is the political influence made use of; that we cannot get rid of.

72. Do you think that the present Commissioner is influenced?—He is no exception.

73. You say that he is influenced by the Roman Catholics?—No; but when he is told by the head of the Department to do it he does not like to refuse.

74. *Mr. Dinnie*: All these Inspectors were promoted before I took office?—All except the last promotion.

EDWIN ARNOLD, Basketmaker, examined on oath. (No. 256.)

Witness: I am one of the Visiting Justices of the Wellington Prison, and for many years have taken a deep interest in the discharged prisoners. It has been stated since this Commission started that discharged prisoners, when they get work, are ousted by the police. For twelve years I have hunted this thing out in Wellington, and in not one instance have I found it to be true. There have been cases in which it has appeared as though some cruel hand, either in the police or outside, has ousted them from their positions. It was only the other day that a young man came out of our prison, and our Prisoners' Aid Society got him work. I may say that the Prisoners' Aid Society is composed of gentlemen such as the Chief Justice, Sir Robert Stout, and that all the Judges contribute. Sir Robert Stout is President, Dr. McArthur, S.M., is Chairman, I am treasurer, and the public of this city give money—not much, it is true—to lend a helping hand to men when they come out of prison. As I was going to say, a young man came out of prison the other day, and we got him work. He told me how pleased his employer was with him; but he was not there more than a week when he told me that he believed that the police had got him the sack. I asked him what reason he had for thinking so, and he replied that he had been praised by his employer only the day before, but that on the following day the tongue that had praised him had told him that he was not wanted. His employer said, "You suit me very well in the way you work, but I do not like your build." This man was most desirous to get on; it had been his only time in prison; he had made a mistake, and was very desirous to redeem himself. Coming back to the police of Wellington, I cannot think, in many years, of one policeman who ever did an unkind act to one of our men who came out of prison. I know many of them have put their hands in their pockets—more especially our detectives—to aid those out of work, and lend them a helping hand. Here is a case of a young man who asked me to take this note. Perhaps you will read it. [Letter handed to Commissioner.] This was a young man I sent away ten years ago to work up the country. He has been working there, but for some reason or other, which has never been made known, he states that he has been unduly treated by the police there; and therefore he is cast out into the world again, and has got to find work elsewhere.

The Commissioner: That is a matter that ought to be departmentally inquired into. If you hand me that letter as an exhibit, I will see that proper inquiry is made, because I will refer it to the police authorities to have the matter inquired into. The superior officers of the police are no more in sympathy with ex-prisoners being harassed than I am.

Witness: No one knows how hard it is for these men to get up, and every encouragement should be given to them, and nobody should try to get them out of their work.

1. *Mr. Dinnie*.] When you get a complaint from a discharged prisoner, what do you do with it?—I ask him the full particulars, and I generally go and search out for myself as to whether there is any truth in it.

2. You do not inform us?—No.

3. Why?—Because there may not be any truth in it.

4. Why do you not refer it to the police for inquiry?—I do not know that I should. I only got that last night.

5. Is that the only case?—The only case.

6. In all the other cases you found no interference?—No; if it is done, it is done in a very systematic way.

7. You have not found that it is general?—No.

8. *The Commissioner*.] And you have no reason to believe it is?—No. The young man is in the room if you wish to call him.

9. *Mr. Dinnie*.] Of course, you quite understand that I would like to know in cases where complaints are made?—I have never seen you before, and I do not know why I should run to you. I have to administer the affairs of the society.

10. The Inspector of Police would be glad to know?—Our Inspector of Police is a very worthy man, and we have always found him so. If he found anything wrong, he would put it right.

11. But if he did not know; how could he act?—If I found out that any policeman or detective belonging to the Force did so, I should do my very best to get him a fresh job.

12. What would you do? Would you complain to the officer in charge?—To the Minister of Justice, when I had particulars of it.

13. *The Commissioner*.] I do not think it is desirable to call this man to advertise the fact that this has occurred to him?—It needs inquiries to be made.

14. *Mr. Dinnie*.] I would suggest that if this witness has any further case of that sort, he should let the superior officer of the police know, as we would be glad to investigate these cases?—The next man who comes along I will send down to you.

15. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Have you come across any cases of a discharged prisoner being dismissed from employment without knowing the reason?—I have just mentioned one.

16. Have you come across a great number?—A few.

17. If the police gave information to an employer, how would you know of it?—I would not know. I have just stated here that I do not think it is usual. Some men, when they come out of prison, wish to lift themselves, and they go into a situation with an amount of timidity—there is a fear that some one will know that they have been in prison, and it ever haunts them. That is why I always say to them, "I will pay your fare, and make a fresh start somewhere else." When

that is done the man generally gets on better, although I am pleased to tell you that we have in Wellington men filling good positions to-day who have passed through our prison.

18. You must see the difficulty often from the standpoint of the police, and I want you to suggest to the Commissioner what you think should be done: supposing a man has been in gaol many times, and gets into the employment of some one who does not know, would there be any justification in informing the employer then?—I should say that if the man is doing good service he should not be interfered with.

The Commissioner: I have already expressed very strong opinions on this subject in other parts of the Dominion. In one instance that came before me there was *prima facie* evidence for believing that a certain detective had gone to a man in the presence of his employer and fellow-employees. I asked the Inspector of Police to make inquiries and deal with it on disciplinary grounds, because I considered it highly improper. At the same time, where a man is known as an ex-criminal, and something occurs which requires prompt action on the part of the detectives, they will consider neither time, person, or place, but make their inquiries very promptly in the detection of the crime. Personally, I think the greatest discretion should be shown in all those matters. Of course, you cannot put a sound head on every man—the personal quality must always count.

Mr. Wright: Probably, if the police got directions from Headquarters, it would have a good effect.

The Commissioner: I am certain that neither the Commissioner nor any Inspector would countenance the harassing of a man because he had a criminal record.

Mr. Wright: But in the case of new police?

The Commissioner: They do not come into this at all; it is the detectives. I think it is sufficient that I should express disapproval, and I think it is shared by the superior officers in the service.

19. *Inspector Ellison (to witness).]* Have you ever known of the police assisting to get employment for ex-prisoners?—I am very pleased to say that not only have the police done so, but also our worthy Magistrates.

20. And the police know of many earning honest livings now?—And they have sent clothes and suchlike to give them a start in life.

21. *Mr. Gray.]* You have been a Justice, and have taken an interest in the administration of justice, and your duties have brought you largely into contact with the police?—Yes.

22. What is your general opinion of the character of the police in Wellington?—As far as I know, they are upright, honest men.

23. You think that is their general character?—That is as far as I have proved them. I have had policemen come to me and say, “There is Jack So-and-so running about the town. You get on to him and speak to him.” I am very pleased to say that of the police of Wellington.

ALFRED HAMMOND, Acting-detective, examined on oath. (No. 257.)

1. *The Commissioner.]* When were you enrolled?—On the 1st May, 1895.

2. When did you commence to do plain-clothes duty?—In July of last year.

3. So that you were enrolled for about thirteen years before you commenced to do plain-clothes duty?—I joined in 1895, and in 1897 I was transferred to Mount Cook. My reason for coming before the Commission is owing to the prominence that has been given to the qualifications of several acting-detectives for future promotion. That is why I have come forward in support of my case. I would not have it thought that I am one of the discontents, and my discontent is more on account of the former than the present administration. I joined in 1895, spending two years at Lambton Quay. In 1900 I applied for a position in the detective office; that was strongly recommended by Inspector Pender. It can be produced, I dare say. At that time, unfortunately for me, there was a little disagreement between Inspector Pender and Commissioner Tunbridge, and I do not think my application received the consideration it deserved. I was continually called from Mount Cook to the Quay to assist in the detective office, and while at Mount Cook I also performed a considerable amount of plain-clothes duty. In 1902 I was acting in the detective office in Wellington when Inspector Pender retired and Inspector Ellison came. Immediately I was ordered back to my station to resume ordinary duties. In 1903 I accepted charge of a country station—Featherston. I accepted that because I thought I had no chance of getting into the detective office, because I considered Commissioner Tunbridge was adverse to my application. I was six years under Inspector Ellison when I was offered promotion to the rank of sergeant, with probably a transfer to Christchurch. For reasons of my own, I did not accept that. I was still anxious to join the detective branch. I was appointed to Christchurch, and then transferred to Lyttelton, Livingstone going to Christchurch. While at Lyttelton I applied for a transfer to Wellington, which I received. I also applied for promotion. That, I understand, was favourably recommended by the sergeant in charge at Lyttelton and by Inspector Gillies. I have now been fourteen months in the detective office. It has been said that a man should have eight years’ service before being appointed a detective. If my former plain-clothes duty was taken into consideration it would be seen that I have considerably over two years’ service as acting-detective. I have now been fourteen years in the Force. I was strongly recommended for promotion by Inspector Pender, and if it had not been for the slight disagreement between Commissioner Tunbridge and Inspector Pender, I think promotion must naturally have followed five years ago. There are twenty-one or twenty-two detectives who are junior to me; some were not in the Force in 1900, and only four or five were then acting in the detective office. The claims of some men for promotion in the detective branch have been made before this Commission, and that has been my reason for coming forward.

4. Why did you refuse promotion to the rank of sergeant?—Because I had a better liking for the other work, and I thought I would be more suited for it.

5. You had in view plain-clothes work?—I applied in 1900 for a position in the detective office, and was recommended as strongly as any application has been. I dare say it will be produced. I was five or six years under Inspector Ellison, who recommended me for the rank of sergeant. I was in charge of Featherston for five and a half years, and also acted as Clerk of the Court and Bailiff.

6. Why did you apply for a change from Lyttelton?—Because I thought my chances of promotion were obliterated in Lyttelton, and I could not afford to sit still.

7. How many are doing plain-clothes work in Wellington?—Four; three besides myself.

8. How many detectives are there here?—I think there are nine in the office altogether—four acting-detectives, four detectives, and the Chief—nine in all.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you are satisfied with your treatment as far as I am concerned?—Yes, sir; I have not a great deal of dissatisfaction as far as you are concerned. The only thing was going to Lyttelton.

10. That was to fill a vacancy?—Yes.

11. How long have you been up here?—Two months.

12. What do you say as regards the conduct of the men up here?—I think it is very good. There is one thing I would like to say as regards applications for the Force: the men applying to join it are asked purely on paper. If men when they sent in their application forms were told to call upon the nearest Inspector, and the Inspectors were to have a personal interview with them, they would be able to judge whether the applicants were suitable or not. There has been something said as regards the standard; one constable said he thought it should be lowered; I would say, certainly not. There is no doubt that the physique of the men is not what it was fifteen years ago.

13. *The Commissioner.*] Yet men come up here and say it is as good?—It has been said in Auckland that a little man is as good as a big man. Well, I have been on street duty in Wellington, and other men who have been smaller than me have received more knocks than I have. I am not the strongest man in the world, yet I have never experienced great difficulty in street duty.

14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What about the conduct of the men?—I consider it is very good.

15. As regards the efficiency of the Force?—I think it can compare very favourably with any other Department of the public service.

16. What do you say with regard to general dissatisfaction as to the control?—There are several discontented men who would be discontented with any control, and they are the cause of the present Commission.

17. That is a few discontented men?—Yes, a few duty men.

18. And it is not difficult to say who they are from the evidence given?—No.

19. Do you know anything of a "special" man being appointed at each centre?—I do not think there is anything in it.

20. What do you say as regards influence?—There has been a lot said, but it is not my experience. I was recommended by Inspector Ellison, and I am sure he was influenced only by my qualifications.

21. You believe in Inspectors recommending men for promotion?—Undoubtedly.

22. And it is on these recommendations that promotions and advancements are made?—I believe so.

23. And you think that is a proper system to work on?—The Inspector should be the judge of any man's qualifications. He is in touch with the men, and if he does not know, nobody should know.

24. And you believe that promotions should be made through merit and seniority combined?—I think seniority should receive the benefit, if things are equal in other respects.

25. You know there are a great many men not capable of being advanced to the rank of sergeant?—Undoubtedly.

26. And that is the reason why these men are not promoted?—One knows that if all the elder men were promoted you could not get the best results.

27. We would not have a very efficient Force?—No.

28. *The Commissioner.*] What are you receiving?—Detective's pay, with plain-clothes allowance, but until I receive the rank—

29. Can you give any reason why you have not received the rank?—Because I have not sufficient experience in the detective office.

30. Is there any rule?—No.

31. You cannot suggest any reason?—There is said to be a rule with Commissioner Dinnie not to promote any man without eight years' service, and at least two in the detective office. He has not taken into consideration my previous service in the detective office.

32. You know of no other reason?—Certainly not.

The Commissioner: Will you deal with that later on, Mr. Dinnie?

Mr. Dinnie: I will consider the case, but I am afraid it will cause great dissatisfaction to the senior men.

The Commissioner: In what respect?

Mr. Dinnie: In respect to service.

The Commissioner: I thought we were dealing with the Force as a whole? He has made out a *prima facie* case, and I shall ask you what is the bar to his promotion to the rank of detective.

Mr. Dinnie: Then I should have to show the merit of the other men.

The Commissioner: No. If you say his services and merit do not justify his promotion that will be sufficient; I have asked for no personal reason against the man. But I am bound to ask you, when a man makes a claim for promotion, why he has not received it. I shall be perfectly satisfied with your answer.

Mr. Dinnie: I will consider it.

The Commissioner: I will not press you for personal discrimination where a man presses his claim for promotion. (To witness): Supposing the Commissioner tells me he does not consider you worthy of it, I shall take that as his answer. I shall ask the Commissioner later on.

Witness: I have no doubt that by waiting another twelve months he will give it to me, but I was afraid that this Commission might make some recommendations and other men have come before me.

Mr. Dinnie: Of course, he has only been a short time a detective, and I have not seen sufficient of his work to know what he is capable of.

The Commissioner: When you have looked into it, if you think his is a case worthy of promotion, you can tell me so.

Witness: I would like to read what Sergeant Briggs, of Mount Cook, and Inspector Pender thought of my qualifications. Sergeant Briggs reported: "Hammond is a really good man, and has a good knowledge of the criminal class. I am certain he would make a good plain-clothes man, and, if the opportunity occurs, I sincerely hope my superiors will favourably consider his application. He has done good work at Mount Cook." Inspector Pender's minute, in forwarding the application, states: "I am afraid crime is on the increase in the city, and the services of a man like Hammond, who is full of energy, would be invaluable just now in plain clothes. The constable has proved himself a suitable man in every respect for plain-clothes duty. Please see report returned to your office on the 30th ultimo respecting the constable's conduct in a case in Christchurch." I happened to be connected with a case in Christchurch, and at the conclusion Inspector Ellison forwarded the papers to Inspector Pender, drawing attention to my praiseworthy conduct. That application was forwarded to the Commissioner with a note from Inspector Pender: "This man would make a good detective." Commissioner Tunbridge's reply was: "This application will be considered when future vacancies occur. From return attached of crime committed in the city during the months of August, September, and October, 1899, and the present year, there appears to be a decrease instead of an increase." That will go to show that Commissioner Tunbridge was not in accord with Inspector Pender's recommendation, because he took the trouble to have a return prepared to show that crime was on the decrease when Inspector Pender said it was on the increase. That reply of the Commissioner went back with another note from Inspector Pender: "I am in want of another man in the detective office, and, in my opinion, Constable Hammond is the most suitable man in the district for the position."

33. *Mr. Dinnie:* Well, the Commissioner was right as regards the crime?—He had three months for it.

JOHN FOSTER, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 258.)

Witness: I am stationed at Petone. I was enrolled in 1892 the last time. I was formerly enrolled in 1878, and resigned in 1887. I was promoted in 1906, at the age of forty-five. After promotion I did sectional duty in Dunedin for nearly three years. Petone is the first sub-district I have been in charge of as a sergeant.

1. *The Commissioner:* To what do you attribute the falling-off in the recruiting at the present day?—The lack of pay, and the Force being not sufficiently attractive.

2. What would make it more attractive?—I cannot offer any opinion except that the pay is the principal thing why young men do not come forward; and another thing is that they do not like the discipline.

3. After you were promoted, did you find any difficulty in doing sectional duty on physical grounds?—Not the least.

4. What would you fix as the maximum age for promotion to the rank of sergeant, keeping in view the fact that he is required to do sectional duty?—I would leave that to the Inspector whether he thinks a man fit to occupy the position, or to the Commissioner.

5. How would the Commissioner know about a man's physical capabilities?—He has the men's records, sick leave, &c. If a man is sick he gets a doctor's certificate.

6. Would it be advisable to require a man to be medically examined before promotion?—No, I would not be in favour of that. Dunedin is as hard as any city, and I did not find any difficulty there.

7. You must be better than some men, who say the duty is very trying?—A man on sectional duty in a city has easier work than one in charge of a country station. He has only eight hours' work, and is then done. A man in the country works from 9 in the morning till 12 or 1 at night.

8. You would not fix a maximum age?—No.

9. *Mr. Dinnie:* Have you had any inquiries to make in respect to applicants for enrolment?—A good many.

10. These inquiries are carried out very strictly, are they not?—Yes; they could not be more so.

11. What do you say as regards the conduct of the men generally?—It is very good; it is very much better than it was in 1878.

12. Is efficiency and discipline well maintained now?—Yes.

13. *The Commissioner:* Is the physique quite as good as it used to be?—Yes, I think so.

14. *Mr. Dinnie:* Do you know of any general dissatisfaction because of the present control?—No; the only dissatisfaction I know of is in regard to the amount of pay and the amount of leave.

15. What about influence?—I cannot give any instance where it has been used; there have been always rumours of it.

16. *The Commissioner:* I can give you hundreds of cases where it has been used, but the question is whether it has been effective?—I know of no case.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you heard anything about a "special" man being maintained by me?—I did hear of a "special" man in Dunedin for Mr. O'Brien's use.

18. Not for mine?—No.

19. *Inspector Ellison.*] Do you not think the discipline and restrictions a constable is under when he joins the Force have a greater tendency to prevent young men from joining?—Most decidedly.

20. That is one of the principal objections?—Yes.

NATHANIEL MILLER, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 259.)

Witness: I am in charge of the Masterton sub-district. I have been over three years there. I was enrolled in 1880, and promoted in 1902, at the age of forty-five. I did sectional duty for about two years in Wellington, and was sent to Gore, where I remained about two years. From there I was transferred to Masterton, where I have been ever since. I did not apply for a transfer from Gore, and did not want it.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Was any reason given you?—No.

2. You are in as good a district now?—I was as well off where I was.

3. How many men have you under you?—Four.

4. In regard to the difficulty in recruiting men, you know men are not coming forward as they might?—I have heard so.

5. It is a fact. To what do you attribute it mainly?—I suppose the men who otherwise would come forward think they can do better on account of the rate of wages elsewhere.

6. Are you ever applied to by young men for information in regard to joining the Force?—Not very often. I do not know of any person who has actually come and asked me how to go about joining the police.

7. There are lots of young men about your district?—Yes.

8. Is it from lack of knowledge of what is required that they do not seek to join?—I suppose it is simply because they can do better in the matter of wages.

9. You think the sphere of selection would be greater if the pay were raised?—Of course it would.

10. How do the men of to-day compare with men of former days, in your experience?—There is not much difference in them. There will always be an odd hard case in the police. The men generally, I should say, are as good as they used to be. A good many are rather younger when they join the Force than they used to be.

11. And have not so much ballast?—Yes.

12. Do you think it would be a good thing to extend the period of probation before final enrolment?—Probably; I would extend it six months.

13. You would have three months in the training-depot and three months on probation in the Force?—Yes.

14. What should be the maximum age for the promotion of men?—It would not be wise to promote a man to be sergeant after forty-five; it would not be in his own interest, I think.

15. How did you stand the sectional duty after your promotion?—I considered it the hardest work ever I had in the police.

16. You would not compare it with work in charge of a station?—No. I heard the last witness talk about being in charge of a station. Of course, a man does have long days occasionally, but he is his own master at other times.

17. A man should be physically sound to take a position as sergeant?—Yes.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When you were transferred you were not asked whether you were willing to be transferred or not?—I think the Inspector sent me a telegram to ask if I would take charge at Masterton.

19. You have had some little trouble up there in consequence of carrying out your duties strictly?—I have done my best.

20. They are inclined to want you removed, are they not?—Yes.

21. *The Commissioner.*] Who?—Some of the people.

22. What have you been doing?—I believe it is in connection with the liquor trade.

23. Because you have enforced the law?—Well, I have been trying to do my best.

24. What class of people?—Well, I have been repeatedly told, and it has been currently reported, that I was going to be shifted.

25. Who was interested in doing so?—I do not know where the reports originated, but they were current.

26. Now there are no hotels you will have a happier time?—I do not know.

27. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Anyhow, you have not been shifted?—No.

28. Have you ever had occasion to make inquiries in respect to candidates for enrolment in the Force?—Yes.

29. Are they carried out strictly?—Yes; I have always done it to the best of my ability.

30. As to the conduct of the men generally?—The men are just as good now as they were in the old times.

31. As regards physique?—We have some very good young men in the police, and some are not so good; it was always the same.

32. As regards the efficiency of the Force at present?—I think it is just as good now as it was at any time.

33. Is discipline well maintained?—Yes, certainly, as far as I know.

34. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in regard to the present control?—No.

35. There will always be a few dissatisfied men in all Forces?—Yes.

36. What do you say as regards the system of promotion? Do you believe the Inspector should recommend men?—Certainly.

37. He is in the best position to judge of their qualifications?—Of course, he should be, and he should have the say whether a man should be promoted or not.

38. Should the standard of education be lower, or kept up to the Fifth Standard?—I think it is high enough. If a man is not very well educated when he joins, if he is inclined to learn his duties and to improve himself, he would soon be very well fitted for a policeman if he had only passed the Fourth Standard.

39. We send out application forms, and a great many are not returned because the men have not passed the Fifth Standard, and will not apply: do you think, if we reduced the standard, we would get men of the farming class, who would make good constables?—You might get an odd man who would make a good constable if inclined to improve himself.

40. You have no grievance yourself?—No.

41. *Inspector Ellison.*] Do you think young farmers are likely to join the police?—I do not think so.

42. They are much better off farming?—Yes.

43. They would make as much at farming in one year as they would in the police in ten?—Yes.

44. You have heard it suggested that farmers' sons were likely to join the police: do you think it probable?—It would be the exception.

45. They would be men who were failures at farming?—Yes, and an odd farmer's son occasionally; there is one stationed with me who is a very good constable.

46. But, as a rule, they are not likely to join the service?—Certainly not.

47. You have served under me here and in Masterton. A constable made an allegation yesterday that I was reported not to carry out the licensing laws, and that I was a bully: do you know anything of that?—No, not while I was under you; and since I have been in Masterton you have always assisted me in every way to carry out the licensing laws.

48. Has my conduct to you been reasonable?—Very; and I never heard otherwise.

49. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Was no-license in force when you were at Gore?—Yes.

50. Were you active in prosecuting sly-grog sellers?—I cannot say I was; I was connected with one or two cases.

51. You prosecuted some persons for sly-grog selling?—There were some prosecutions, but I was not exactly the originator.

52. But they took place in your time?—Yes.

53. Did that make you unpopular in the district?—I do not know that it did.

54. Then, why were you transferred?—I do not know.

55. As far as you know, there was no just reason for your transfer?—I do not know.

The Commissioner: The answer would be probably that it was in the interests of the service, unless it can be shown otherwise.

56. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Masterton is a "dry" district?—Yes.

57. I presume, as a sergeant, you are loyal to the licensing laws of the country?—I try to be so to all the laws.

58. If you are known to be a faithful officer in administering the licensing laws that may account for the desire for your removal from Masterton?—Probably; but it was ever since I went to Masterton.

59. Do you connect the seeming hostility to you with your administration of the licensing laws?—Yes, certainly; I believe that is how it originated.

60. So far as you know, you are a good and capable officer, and do your work satisfactorily?—Yes, I do my best.

61. There are no black marks against you?—Oh, I dare say there are.

62. Seeing that when you first went to Masterton it was a licensing district, the hostility to you must have come from the same section of the community who heard of your work at Gore?—I suppose it did.

63. Is it your opinion that if a man successfully enforces the licensing laws against licensed victuallers he will not be promoted?—I do not think so. I always try to enforce them, and I believe I was at one time shifted from a station through doing so.

64. From where?—Mosgiel many years ago.

65. You were shifted from Mosgiel and Gore, and at Masterton there was an agitation to shift you again?—Yes.

66. It seems, then, when a police officer takes a stand in administering the licensing laws he is liable to be harassed and punished?—He may be.

67. Do you not think, if a man on a station allowed the licensing laws to go by default and winked at breaches of the Act, he would get on better?—He would not get on very well for long.

68. It seems fairly clear that because of your efficiency in the administration of the law you have at least been shifted about?—Well, I never blamed that for shifting me except from Mosgiel.

69. Is it not a coincidence that you should be shifted from Gore?

Inspector Ellison: You were specially shifted from Gore as a good man who was willing to come to Masterton, where we wanted a good man.

Mr. Wright, M.P.: It is a pity he was not told that.

Mr. Dinnie: We wanted a good man there, and we got one.

BARRETT RUTLEDGE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 260.)

Witness: I am in charge of the Mount Cook sub-district. I have nineteen constables, three sergeants, and an acting-detective under me. I was enrolled in the Armed Constabulary in 1885, and transferred to the police in 1886. I was promoted sergeant in 1904, and did sectional duty on Lambton Quay till 1907, with the exception of six months at the Christchurch Exhibition. I have been in charge of Mount Cook since September, 1907—that was my first charge as sergeant. All I have to suggest has been already mentioned. I consider constables should start at 8s. a day, rising by increments every three years to 10s. I think recruits should be on probation for twelve months.

1. *The Commissioner.*] That is nine months beyond the period in the training depot?—Yes. A constable should go into the training depot for three months, then come out and be still on probation, and at the end of nine months the Inspector of the district should be called upon to report on him, and also the sergeant he was under. If he is not then considered suitable, his services should be dispensed with.

2. I quite agree with a period of probation, but it has been suggested that if the period is made too long it might be a bar to men entering the service, with the risk of losing twelve months if not retained?—It would not be a bar if the term of probation were allowed to count for seniority if he is accepted. During probation the pay should be 7s. 6d., and afterwards 8s. on acceptance. In regard to the standard of education, no doubt it keeps a number of men back in a way. I have known men to come to me and say they could not pass the standard. If the standard were reduced to the Fourth it would no doubt be a greater inducement, because it is not the best educated man who makes the best policeman—far from it.

3. You would make it more elastic?—Yes. I consider the present house-allowance should be increased to 1s. 6d. a day for a constable; a sergeant and detective should get 2s. A sergeant's pay should start at 11s., and go up to 15s., the same as detectives, by an increase of 1s. every four years. Station sergeants should get 16s. 6d., as Chief Detectives do. In regard to travelling-allowance for married constables and sergeants, I think, when travelling on transfer, saloon passages should be granted on steamers, and the same to constables, except when on escort duty with prisoners. No man should be promoted to sergeant over forty-five years of age; they should be medically examined, to see if they are capable of doing the work, because sectional duty necessitates a great deal of running about—more than the charge of a station; and if a man is not medically fit, he cannot get about to visit the men on the beats, which is a most necessary duty. There is a great amount of duty thrown on the police which could be done by other departments—the Education Department, for instance. On my station it takes one man to do the work of that Department, if he worked eight hours a day; there are inquiries, and the collection of maintenance fees in connection with industrial-school children, and matters of that sort.

4. Is there anything to do outside the Industrial Schools Act for that Department?—There is the maintenance money for boarded-out children under the Infant Life Protection Act. Then there is the inspection of machinery-work, old-age pensions, &c.; in fact, in my district alone two men are kept going; and they could not do it in eight hours a day. There is another thing I would urge. The police should not be Inspectors of Weights and Measures in the main centres; I submit civilians should be appointed for that work. In country places, of course, the police might do it, where they act as Inspectors of Factories. I advocate that the four men now employed on this work should be employed in ordinary police work.

5. Is this not regarded as work for men who have ceased to be capable of active police duty?—Not in all cases.

The Commissioner: It is so, Mr. Dinnie, is it not, very often?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, when we have a man of that description.

Witness: There is another matter. When the Commission sat in Christchurch Sergeant Hodgson made certain allegations about the discipline at Mount Cook. I should like to hear his evidence on that point. [Evidence read.] When I took charge at Mount Cook I had a batch of probationers, and I adopted the system carried out by my predecessor; but I made certain alterations, so that I could see everything went right during my absence. I produce the kind of list made out by the probationers, which shows what time they go out and what time they return. The probationers' list is also attached—so many men in reserve, so many on leave till 10. The watch-house keeper's duty was to visit the rooms at 10, and see that each man was present, and after making the visit he had to note it in the way you see in these papers. The rooms were occasionally visited by sectional sergeants. I also visited the rooms occasionally myself. Although I am living some distance away, I frequently go back to the station at 11 or 12 on Saturday night. There was an instance where we thought a couple of men were overstepping the mark, and I used to wait at the top of the stairs for them. Sergeant Dart also came there occasionally and watched with me, and we inspected the men after they were in their rooms at 10. I had charge of the men from 5, when Dart left, till 9 the following morning. These men were told off for various duties. It was laid down in black and white what each had to do: they had to be up at 6, so many cleaned the yard, so many one thing and so many another, and if a man did not do his portion he had his leave stopped that night, and was kept on reserve. As for drunkenness and hoodlumism, there was none of it during my time, and had there been the watch-house keeper would not have neglected to report it. The men in the watch-house were picked men, who could be relied on.

6. How do you suppose Sergeant Hodgson got his information, or what he imagined to be information, for he seems to know nothing himself?—He was very unpopular amongst the men; he was in charge at Manners Street, and promoted to be sergeant from there.

7. His unpopularity would scarcely be sufficient explanation of his statement?—Night-duty men and others had to visit the Manners Street station, and my own men complained to me about the treatment they received from him; he would not let them have the use of the w.c.

8. Did you ever report it?—No; it was only a trifling thing. My men kept away from him afterwards. This was the system adopted right through till the probationers left for the training depot, where they are now, in the latter end of last year. I wish to touch on a point mentioned in evidence yesterday, in reference to sergeants visiting the rooms after 11 at night. At Mount Cook the rooms are visited every night regularly. The sergeant opens the door, turns the light on, and sees that all are present, and goes out again. No noise is made.

9. That is not sufficient to wake them if they are sleeping?—No. I want to show it is necessary to have the visit, as some are agitating against it. When first I went to Mount Cook they were getting out after hours, and the sergeants were not visiting the room; but they are paying visits to the rooms now, and have been ever since I have been there.

10. The object of the agitation, then, is to obtain a laxity of supervision?—That is so; and if leave were granted till 12, men would not get their proper rest. There is no trouble in a man making application for leave; the forms are there, and they have only to sign their names. No leave is refused unless a man comes off at 9 and has to go on at 5 a.m.

11. Do you always require reasons to be given?—No. If a man applies for leave after coming off at 9, and has to go on at 5, then I want to know the reason. There is another matter: Besides being in charge at Mount Cook, I am Acting Clerk of the Court. Justices sit there in the morning.

12. *The Commissioner.*] You keep the records, and report to the Clerk of the Court?—Yes; and the money and the charge sheets are sent down. Since January, 1908, up to September this year £378 has been paid in. This shows the work that is done. I get no remuneration for it.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards Willetts, is this your report in regard to him?—Yes; it is based on what I observed myself: "I beg to report having known Willetts for four years; I have found him a sober, steady man."

14. Do you know anything about the inquiries made in respect to applications for enrolment in the Force?—Yes.

15. Are they not more strict than they were hitherto?—A great deal more. An applicant last night refused to furnish particulars, on account of the inquiries being so strict.

16. You think they are satisfactory in every way?—Yes. The trouble is this: A lot of people employ persons, and they give them the best of characters, and will not tell any one who inquires what was the cause of their leaving, because they do not want to injure them.

17. Then, unless there is something very serious, the police might not get to know?—No; unless it leaks out in some other way.

18. What do you say as regards the system of training probationers, having seen a great deal of it?—It is very good, but, as I stated, I think they should be three months in the depot and nine months on practical probation before final acceptance by the Commissioner.

19. You think three months is sufficient on the drill ground?—I imagine so. They are on their best behaviour then, and after they come out of the depot, and are sworn in, a man may be found to be a bit of a "waster," and it is difficult to get rid of him.

20. Do you not think six months' probation would be enough?—As long as there is some kind of probation. The men want to be on the street for a certain time, to see how they get along. They are on their best behaviour in the depot, because they know if they commit themselves they will be bundled out.

21. What is your opinion as regards the efficiency and discipline in the Force at present?—I have been twenty-four years in the service, and the discipline is better now than when I joined.

22. Do you think the standard of education should be reduced?—I think it should be reduced to the Fourth. I only passed the Third myself.

23. You have improved yourself since?—Yes.

24. A man can always do that if he wishes to get on?—Yes.

25. Do you know anything in regard to influence?—I challenge any one to say I have used it, either directly or indirectly, to benefit myself.

26. Do you know of any case in which it has obtained?—I cannot say I do; I hear rumours.

27. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction as regards the control of the Force at present?—There are men who would be dissatisfied if they were made Commissioners. I know of no general dissatisfaction.

28. Do you consider the physique of the men as good as it has been?—It varies. Years ago, when I first joined in Dunedin, every man in the MacLaggan Street Station was 6 ft.

29. A batch went out not long ago averaging 6 ft., did they not?—Yes. At present we have at Mount Cook as well-built a set of men as you could get.

30. *The Commissioner.*] Do you attach much importance to physical training?—Not so much; a little is right enough.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think police ought to be able to shoot well?—A little drill does no harm.

32. Military drill?—Yes.

33. Have you heard anything about a "special" man?—Not till the Commission started.

34. You know Constable Green's history pretty well?—Yes.

35. What do you know of him? What occurred in respect to the matter in which he was reduced?—I was in Dunedin at the time. He was charged with being absent from barracks, with assault, and drunkenness.

36. Was the charge proved?—He was reduced for it.

37. How do you regard him?—As a man I would not tell anything to.

38. Is he not a bit of an agitator?—He has always been termed so.

39. *Inspector Ellison.*] You have rather a good set of men at Mount Cook?—Yes.

40. You have been in Wellington since I took charge?—Yes.

41. Have you ever seen any incivility or discourtesy in my conduct to yourself or other members of the Force?—No; the first I heard of it was yesterday. I have been treated well, and with every civility, by you.

42. You heard the suggestion made by Constable Taylor yesterday that I did not enforce the licensing laws fairly?—I was surprised to hear it, because I know when you took charge here you did more in regard to the hotels than had been done previously, and saw that they were kept in order.

43. What is your experience of how the hotels are conducted now?—They are well conducted now. We have no trouble over after-hour or Sunday trading.

44. I have frequently consulted with you about the conduct of the hotels?—Yes; you have spoken to me about it frequently, and have given me instructions to have them visited at certain hours, and have also given me instructions how to go about it.

45. And that has been done?—Yes.

46. You know Constable Taylor: would you like to have him at your station?—I do not want him.

47. *Constable Taylor.*] Did you ever tell me to put in an application for Mount Cook?—You asked me some time ago did I think, if you put in an application for mounted duty, you would stand a show. I said you had no show, because there were two men already in the position.

48. Did you not ring up Wellington South, and say that a constable was in some trouble over some woman, and was likely to be disgraced, and I would be wise to put in an application?—Ridiculous.

49. Did you mention to any one in a car to-day that I was a fool to lodge a complaint against a superior officer?—I did not use the word “fool.”

50. *The Commissioner.*] What did you say?—I said it was foolish to lodge a complaint against any person unless you were in a position to prove it.

51. *Constable Taylor.*] You were not aware it was my father you were speaking to?—No; and it would have made no difference to me if I had, because I would say it to your face.

52. You did not ring up and tell me to put in an application?—No; the thing is ridiculous. Why should I ring up and tell a man to put in an application for a position over which I had no control?

53. Did I ring up and ask if there was some trouble at Mount Cook, and ask if it was any use my putting in for mounted man?—You rang up, and afterwards saw me on the street. You did not ask me about any trouble at Mount Cook.

54. Did you not say you were forwarding a complaint to the Inspector, and advise me to put in an application at once?—No.

55. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think this man ought to be under a sergeant?—I do.

56. At what age were you promoted to be sergeant?—At forty.

57. How old are you now?—Forty-four.

58. What period of sectional duty did you have?—About two years.

59. After your experience, what is the maximum age at which a constable should be promoted, having regard to the fact that he would be required to do sectional duty?—Not after forty-five years of age; and he should be submitted to a medical examination as to his fitness previous to promotion, because a sectional sergeant has very hard work to perform. I had twelve men to visit, and only for using my bicycle at night I could not do it. A number of men stay in the police for years, get varicose veins, and are not fit to carry out the work properly; they cannot get around the beats.

60. There is a constable in Canterbury who called a great deal of evidence in regard to being passed over in the matter of promotion. After calling a number of witnesses, he specially requested that you should be asked regarding his qualifications. I refer to Constable Jackson, at Addington?—He was stationed in Moawhanga. I would not wish for a better man. The only thing is that he has not got the best of education. I know sergeants who would not come up to him.

61. Certain sergeants have stated that he was a good constable: would he make an average sergeant?—He would make a sectional sergeant, but to place him in charge of a station would be out of the question.

62. Is he up to the standard?—He is up to the standard of many sergeants now.

63. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose there are other constables you could speak the same of?—Yes.

STUART RICHARDSON, Electrical Engineer, examined on oath. (No. 261.)

Witness: I am tramways engineer, and manager under the City Corporation.

1. *The Commissioner.*] A case was mentioned yesterday of a man formerly in your employ as conductor named Willetts. It seems from his statement a complaint was made by a lady on account of some incident which occurred on the car of which he was conductor: have you any correspondence in regard to the matter?—Yes; here is the file:—

“Report *re* complaint by Mrs. —, Tinakori Road.—Mrs. — stated that she and her daughter boarded an Oriental Bay car at 11.25 on the 3rd instant. When she tendered the fares to the conductor he remarked, ‘What have you got in your purse?’ Mrs. — was surprised at the remark, and replied, ‘My money, of course.’ He then repeated the remark, and on looking at her purse Mrs. — saw there were two small crabs in it. She immediately dropped the purse, and on recovering from the shock she picked it up and closed it, and rang the bell for the car to stop at the next stopping-place. As they prepared to alight the conductor said to her daughter, ‘What is that behind you?’ On looking, she noticed a crab on the seat alongside her. She screamed, and rushed across to the other side of the car. On alighting from the car Mrs. — shook the crabs out of her purse, and in doing so she dropped a trinket, but did not discover she had done so until she was in Cuba Street. She was obliged to return to Oriental Bay again, and

managed to find it, after some trouble. On the trip to Oriental Bay in the morning she asked the same conductor if the car stopped at Hay Street, and he replied, 'You mean Straw Street.' Noticing that he was inclined to be impertinent, she said no more, but rang the bell when they approached Hay Street. When she rang the bell the conductor remarked, 'What did you ring the bell for after asking me to stop the car there for you? Will you ever know that cars stop at Hay Street?' Mrs. — and her daughter were very much upset at the incident."

"To the Manager, W.C.E.T.—SIR,—I would be pleased if you could accept my resignation. —Yours sincerely, Conductor WILLETTTS."

"S. RICHARDSON, Esq., City Electrical Engineer.—SIR,—Will you please furnish me with a copy of my application for my discharge from your employment; also a statement from yourself stating whether I gave satisfaction when in your employ, specifically setting forth whether at any time 'I was guilty of making immoral or indecent suggestions to lady passengers,' and in consequence of which I was dismissed from the tramway service? You will observe that is the allegation made, and, as it is without the slightest foundation, I contemplate taking steps to vindicate my character from the stigma placed upon it. Thanking you in anticipation of an early reply, I remain, yours, &c., JOHN WILLETTTS, Constable."

"Constable John Willetts.—DEAR SIR,—In reply to your request of the 27th instant, I enclose herewith copy of your resignation from this service. Regarding your inquiry whether at any time you were guilty of making immoral or indecent suggestions to lady passengers, I beg to inform you that I have no knowledge or record of any report to this effect. If necessary, I shall be pleased to answer any inquiries or produce your record of service should the Commissioner desire it.—STUART RICHARDSON, Engineer and Manager."

2. *The Commissioner.*] Did you have an inquiry?—Yes, and that is the result. These are my remarks: "Conductor Willetts was in the Permanent Forces eight years, and much of his duty consisted of training recruits. In dealing with the public he cannot get out of his abrupt and sarcastic methods of dealing with recruits, and to this the public object. He is not suitable for conductor for this reason, but is said otherwise to be about the average run of conductor."

3. Were you applied to by the police for information in regard to the man when he applied to join the police?—Not that I know of. I have no recollection of it.

4. Had you been, what would have been your attitude, because it might be a matter of opinion whether a man who behaved in this manner would be suitable for enrolment?—I cannot do better than refer you to the note I made—I would have conveyed that to the police.

5. This is the report of Sergeant Murphy: "I respectfully beg to report that I have interviewed Mr. S. Richardson, tramways and electrical engineer, and he states that the attached testimonial was signed by him, and speaks very highly of John Willetts." Willetts also encloses in his application a testimonial from Humphries Bros., builders and contractors, as follows: "To whom it may concern. This is to certify that Mr. John Willetts has been in our employ for the last three months, during which time we have always found him sober, honest, and an industrious worker." The testimonial from Mr. Richardson is as follows: "To whom it may concern. Mr. Willetts was in the employ of this department as conductor from the 15th February, 1907, to 5th December, 1907, and resigned from the position as he found the work was not congenial." Do you trace any connection between the complaint against Willetts and his resignation?—Not in that.

6. On what ground did he state he found the work not congenial?—He merely stated it to me.

7. He does not state so in his letter of resignation?—No.

7A. It was the result of a conversation you had with him?—Yes; apparently before he handed in his letter of resignation.

8. I notice there is no recommendation at all in this document?—No; I did not wish to say anything against him. I have nothing particular against him, except his manner.

9. This incident seems to me a very grave act of incivility and discourtesy to the public on the part of a man in the employ of the Corporation: would you not consider it so?—Yes.

10. Would you consider him a fit and proper person to continue in your service as a conductor in the face of that?—No; I stated he was not.

11. The point I want to get at is whether such steps were taken by the police as would insure them getting the necessary information regarding this man, to enable them to judge whether he was a fit and proper person for the Police Force?—I do not remember any application being made to me by the police.

The Commissioner: If the Commissioner had been made aware of the circumstances under which he left the employ of the Corporation he might have hesitated to enrol him.

Mr. Dinnie: I may say at once, I would not have accepted him.

The Commissioner: I am glad to have your assurance. It seems to me a very serious matter that you are not, whatever inquiries you may make, placed in possession of the fullest information in regard to the conduct of an applicant—a very serious matter indeed. I am glad Mr. Richardson has the opportunity of stating how the information was not given when application was made to him.

Witness: I do not remember any application being made.

The Commissioner: We are trying to secure that the suitability of all candidates for enrolment shall be ascertained before enrolment, and here is a case which points to a very weak spot in the system, if responsible officers do not think it their duty to supply the Government with the fullest information.

Witness: This was not for the Government, was it?

12. *The Commissioner.*] According to the sergeant's evidence, he applied to you, and this is his report?—But that was not given to the sergeant.

13. No; but on the strength of that the application was made to you?—There were no further inquiries made of me that I remember.

MICHAEL MURPHY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 262.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You know Willetts?—Yes.
2. Do you remember the fact of his making application to you to be enrolled?—Yes; I remember getting the papers connected with his application.
3. Do you remember making this report?—Yes.
4. What did you do so far as Mr. Richardson was concerned?—I was instructed to see him, and I asked him whether the signature to the character was his. He said it was. I asked what sort of man Willetts was. He said he was a very good man, that he had resigned from the tram service.
5. You are quite sure he said he was a very good man?—Yes.
6. You reported accordingly to the Commissioner?—Yes.
7. That was all that passed?—Yes.
8. *Mr. Richardson.*] Are you sure you saw me personally?—Yes.
9. It was not the Assistant Engineer you saw?—No; yourself.
10. *The Commissioner.*] Did you tell Mr. Richardson the purpose for which you required the information?—Yes; I said he was applying for enrolment in the Police Force.

STUART RICHARDSON, Electrical Engineer, further examined.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You have no recollection of this, Mr. Richardson?—No.
2. What would you consider to be your duty in a matter of this sort? Do you consider that there should be a complete community of interest between the Commissioner of Police and yourself to see that no unworthy person enters the Force, or do you consider it merely your duty to say he resigned from the tramway service, and nothing else?—I should consider it my duty to put this statement of mine before them.
3. Of course, that would have led to the Commissioner asking you for full information?—Yes.
- The Commissioner.* The Commissioner states that if he had seen that document he would never have enrolled this man.
4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You did not think much of the circumstances if you retained the man in the service?—We retained him for about a fortnight.
5. You could not have thought the occurrence very serious or you would not have retained him at all?—Apart from his manner of dealing with passengers, we got no other complaints against him at all.
6. You do not suggest that the sergeant did not see you?—No; I have a great number of people seeing me, and the circumstance may have slipped my memory.

GEORGE MORRIS, Dairyman, examined on oath. (No. 263.)

1. *Constable Taylor.*] Do you remember the case of the Police *v.* Searl for theft?—Yes, I was a witness.
2. Do you remember being taken to the district office to get witnesses' expenses?—Yes.
3. What happened?—Constable Taylor asked me, after the case was over, to come over to the central station to get my expenses. While I was there Inspector Ellison came along the corridor, and said to Taylor, "What are you doing there?" He replied, "Getting the witness his expenses." Mr. Ellison said, "Get out of this; don't you know the expenses have to be paid in Court?" I went outside, and heard nothing more. I thought it was a very poor way for one man to speak to another. If it had been my case, I would have handed in my uniform.
4. Did you speak to any one about it?—I mentioned to Sergeant Mathieson the way in which Inspector Ellison dealt with you.
5. Why?—Because I did not think it was a right manner to speak.
6. Did you ever hear any other man speak to his subordinate like that?—No.
7. Did he say anything about me learning my duty in the district office?—Yes; he said you ought to know your duty by this time. He said, "Don't you know expenses have to be paid in Court?"
8. *Inspector Ellison.*] Will you state the exact words you heard?—To the best of my memory, I have repeated them.
9. Did any one remind you of the words after you left?—No.
10. Have you been speaking of them with Taylor or the sergeant?—No; only on the night of the case I mentioned the matter to Sergeant Mathieson. The next I knew was when the constable came to me for a report.
11. When was that?—About last Thursday.
12. Were the words I used not, "You know you should not be here; you know this is not the place to get expenses—that they should be paid in Court"?—No. You said, "You must get out of this; you ought to know your duty by this time—that expenses have to be paid in Court."
13. *The Commissioner.*] Why did you mention the matter to the sergeant afterwards?—We were talking over the case and I happened to say that it was no easy game being in the Police Force if a man was spoken to in that way.
14. *Inspector Ellison.*] There were no offensive or "swear" words used?—No; it was the manner in which it was said that I noticed. There were no "swear" words used.
15. Did I seem to be in a hurry?—You were standing in the corner, I think, when we first went in.
16. Did I not walk straight up the corridor into the office?—Yes.
17. Did I come up quickly?—Just an ordinary gait.
18. Then you went out?—Yes; and you called Taylor back and spoke to him.

EDWARD WILKINS WATSON, Civil Servant, examined on affirmation. (No. 264.)

Witness: I am an officer in charge in the Land Tax Department. There was a lady who was slightly mentally deranged. Her husband, who was a steward on a boat, was away in Port Chalmers, and there were two little children, of eleven and thirteen, at home. Dr. Ewart and another doctor attended her, and Dr. Ewart would not take the responsibility of allowing her to remain by herself, and passed the matter over to the police. I thought the best thing I could do was to see if I could arrange for the matter to be dealt with as quickly as possible—for her quiet removal to the mental hospital. I talked the matter over with Sergeant Mathieson, who had the case in hand, and he said, "I have instructions to do certain things; you had better see the Inspector." I saw him, and told him I was representing the woman's husband, and I asked him if he could arrange for Sergeant Mathieson to go with the woman—that he was in the woman's confidence, and she would do anything for him—that we wanted to avoid a screaming woman being taken away by a policeman. The Inspector said he did not want instructing in the way to conduct his office—that he was quite competent to do it himself. Then I went out. At 1 o'clock, when I left my office, I saw the Inspector in the street, and he nodded to me. I asked if anything had been done. He said he did not know anything about it; "You inquire at the watch-house; the police want their dinner like any one else." That was the treatment I got.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How do you think subordinates would be treated under the Inspector?—If they were treated the same way as the public, God help the subordinates; that is all I can say.

2. *Inspector Ellison.*] When you spoke to me about this lady, did I not take you to the sergeant's office?—Certainly not. I walked out of the office. When I saw you at dinner-time you told me the police wanted their dinner, and I had better inquire at the office. Then you apparently thought better of it, and came back off the street, and followed me, and told the sergeant to give me any information I wanted. He certainly did that. I was in a position to pay, and would have paid £50 to get the woman away with as little fuss as possible.

3. Did I not tell you the woman would be taken away in the usual manner—that I could not take the responsibility of leaving her another day—that Dr. Ewart said it would be dangerous for the children?—Nothing of the sort.

4. What time was this?—Nine o'clock sharp, or about three minutes to.

5. Did I tell you I had seen Dr. Ewart?—I would not swear whether you did or not.

6. Will you swear you were in my office at 9?—Yes; I was in my own office at seven minutes past—just too late to sign the book.

7. Did you not leave your office to come to mine?—No; I went into your office on my way down.

8. Did you not want the woman left a day or two longer?—No; it was suggested originally, but not by me.

9. Did you not tell me about it?—No; I said Sergeant Mathieson had arranged with the hospital people. You said he had got his instructions from you.

10. As a matter of fact, I never spoke to Sergeant Mathieson on the subject?—He gave me to understand he got his instructions from you.

11. What did I say when I came back to the office?—You told the sergeant to give me any information I wanted.

12. What information did you get?—He told me the position—that the Matron and some one else were going up in the afternoon.

13. Did I not tell you, in the presence of the sergeant, that Dr. Ewart said the woman could not be left safely with her children?—No.

14. And that we would try to get a woman to look after her—that the Matron might know of one?—No; Sergeant Mathieson and myself had already installed a woman in the house—a woman from Island Bay.

15. Did you not tell me the woman was alone?—Yes.

16. And I said I could not take the responsibility of leaving her?—I would not say whether you did or not.

17. Did I not say that the Act laid down certain things for me to do—that I would send an officer to see her, and we would have to report before the Magistrate on oath?—No; you said the Act laid down the rule that Sergeant Mathieson was to follow.

18. Did you not come into my office last Saturday night?—Yes.

19. Why?—To tell you what I thought of you.

20. What did you say?—I said what I thought of you. I told you I had been persuaded by one or two of my friends to appear before the Police Commission and state the treatment I had received from you. I told you in plain language what I really did think of you.

21. Who persuaded you to come?—Several of my friends.

22. Will you tell me the names?—I do not see that it concerns you.

23. Did any of the police tell you to come?—No; none of the police knew anything of my coming. As a matter of fact, Sergeant Mathieson has only been a friend of mine about three weeks.

24. *The Commissioner.*] When did the incident occur in the Inspector's office?—About four weeks ago, on Saturday or Monday.

25. What took you to the Inspector's office on Saturday?—To tell him my mind, and to tell him I took no man unawares.

26. You had intended to give evidence here?—Yes; I told him I took no man unawares.

27. *Inspector Ellison.*] Did you not tell me, "I will settle you; I will make you sit up"?—No.

28. Did you not say, "I am higher in the public service than you"?—No.

29. Did you not say that the woman was an Irish American, and required careful management?—No.

30. Did you say you would take the case to the highest in the land?—No.

31. You swear that?—Yes.
32. Did you say, "In fact, it has gone further now"?—No.
33. That you had made up your mind to go to the Commission?—Yes.
34. You were excited when you came in?—No.
35. Did you not take your hat off, and prance round the room?—No, I am not a prancer.
36. You say you did not use these words: "I will settle you. I will make you sit up"?—No.
37. Did you not say, "I am higher in the public service than you ever will be"?—No; I could not say that; your pay is higher than mine.
38. Did you say you were longer in the service than I was?—No, because you entered in 1872, and I entered in 1886.
39. You have been looking it up since?—No.
40. Did the conversation with me suggest to you to look it up?—Oh, no.
41. Did you say you knew all about the law on the question, and only came in to try me?—No.
42. Did you say you knew more about it than me?—No.
43. You were excited?—No.
44. Did you not wave your hat up and down in your hand?—I would not say I did not.
45. What was your object in coming to me?—I told you I would appear before the Commission.
46. Did you not come in to try and insult me, and make me commit a breach of the peace?—Certainly not.

MICHAEL GREENE, Constable, further examined. (No. 265.)

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You handed me some names of men who you allege visited my office and saw Sub-Inspector Wright?—I did not say they had visited your office, but that they had come to Wellington for the purpose of seeing him.
2. How do you know that they came here for the purpose of seeing him?—I saw them, spoke to them, and they told me what I stated yesterday.
3. What did McIntyre say?—He stayed at the Club Hotel. I saw him there several times.
4. What did he say about visiting Wright?—That he wanted to see him relative to being relieved of uniform duty; and that he had seen Wright, who told him that he was not to revert to uniform duty—that he would be promoted to the rank of sergeant; otherwise he might have a difficulty in doing away with the uniform duty.
5. Do you know that he saw him?—No; but I heard so since.
6. When did you hear that?—Through the Commissioner I learned that.
7. How do you come forward and say that he came to see Wright?—I believe that I saw in Dunedin that he mentioned that he saw you.
8. Was not the evidence to show that he came purposely to see me for promotion?—He mentioned Wright's name to me, not yours.
9. What was the evidence he gave?—I forget what he stated in Dunedin, but he mentioned nothing to me about you.
10. After that, what did you think?—He mentioned nothing to me about you.
11. Now you know that he did see me?—Only from some report in the newspaper, that he mentioned that he went to see you.
12. You never found out whether this man had seen me or not?—His word to me was that he went to see the Chief Clerk.
13. Then, you believed him—that he did not come to see me at all?—He did not mention your name.
14. Yet you go and spread this tale—that he came to see Wright?—He did not mention your name to me.
15. Do you know that Constable Hammond, of Canterbury, came to see me?—I met them in front of the post-office.
16. Do you know that he came to see me about being reduced?—I do not.
17. *The Commissioner.*] What did Hammond tell you?—That he wanted to see Wright regarding promotion.
18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that Constable Ryan, of the West Coast, came to see me?—He did not mention your name.
19. Are these three men promoted?—No, sir.
20. Then, who gets them promotion? If they came to see Wright, how is it that they did not get promotion?—I believe that some time ago the late Minister of Justice allowed Sub-Inspector Wright and yourself to do as you wished, but that the present Minister holds a tighter rein.
21. Can you show any instances of where what you say in regard to promotions took place?—I cannot show any instances.
22. *The Commissioner.*] What do you say about the late Minister of Justice?—That he did not look as closely into matters of promotion as the present one.
23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] He gave me a free hand. Why should he not? Sergeant Eales is the next. Do you know anything about that case?—No.
24. Then, what do you repeat this statement for?—To show the facts before the Court.
25. If a member of the Force came to see Inspector Ellison, would you report that?—If it happened to be brought before me in the same way as in regard to Sub-Inspector Wright I would.
26. You say that it is the general opinion of others that Wright was really the Commissioner. Who are the others?—Many others.
27. I want to know who they are?—These are four of them.
28. You do not know what they believe?—I was only saying what they said to me.
29. Are there any others?—I do not pay any attention to them.

30. You evidently did pay attention to them?—I did not.

31. Can you give any other names except these?—There is no doubt that there are many more.

32. I should be very glad to call them?—You should call upon those I gave you.

33. You say that one sergeant compiles four small pages of a *Gazette*. Look at that report—the very words repeated in the newspaper Press?—This cannot be correct; it says, three sergeants in the Inspector's office.

34. Read the underlined portion. It states, "One sergeant compiles four small pages of the *Gazette*, printed fortnightly"—I understood it was his work to compile it.

35. *The Commissioner*.] Are not these words identical with the letter in the Press?—I know nothing about the letter.

36. You have already denied being the author of it?—Undoubtedly.

37. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] If the men you have referred to had come to see the Commissioner, they would have asked for the Commissioner, would they not?

The Commissioner: The constable is only relating a conversation he had with each of these men, and they merely mentioned that they had come in, and intended to see Sub-Inspector Wright, who happens to be Chief Clerk in the Commissioner's office.

Mr. Dinnie: I do not know what position Mr. Wright holds here.

The Commissioner: I have already ruled that a member of Parliament holds a unique position, and that he is in a position to ask questions.

Mr. Dinnie: It appears to me that he is in a position to prosecute me.

The Commissioner: He has not gone so far yet; he has been asking information about licensed houses, and I am waiting to see how far he goes. (To Mr. Wright): Again I ask you not to enter into any question personal to the Commissioner, because immediately you do so, he is entitled to twenty-four hours' notice of it.

Mr. Wright, M.P.: Then, I understand I must not ask questions that affect him personally?

The Commissioner: If you have any information in your possession reflecting on him or his conduct of the police, I will see that he gets proper notice. Under the order of reference, I am required to give twenty-four hours' notice to any member of any matter reflecting on him.

38. *Mr. Wright, M.P.* (to witness).] When these men came to you they asked to see Mr. Wright, did they not?—No.

39. What did they ask?—I met them in the ordinary way, in the post-office. I met one who did not say that he was going to see the Commissioner, but the Chief Clerk.

Mr. Dinnie: Every one who comes to see me comes to see Sub-Inspector Wright; they must see him in the first instance.

Mr. Wright, M.P.: I am not referring to you at all; I am referring to Sub-Inspector Wright.

The Commissioner: Sub-Inspector Wright is in exactly the same position. Notice must be given of anything that has reference to the personal conduct of a police officer. It is simply a question of veracity and fact.

WEDNESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

GEORGE HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, examined on oath. (No. 266.)

1. *The Commissioner*.] I believe you have been good enough to prepare certain data in regard to the qualifications of persons who have passed certain standards, the number, and so on?—Before giving you that I ought to say that the individual passes in the centres were abolished partly in 1899 and absolutely in 1904, so when I use the word "pass" as applied to the period since 1904 I mean those who have the educational qualifications equivalent to a pass. In regard to the educational qualifications which are considered sufficient for promotion to a higher class, any one who wishes to get evidence of the possession of such qualifications can get it by applying for a certificate of competency, and an Inspector of Schools is bound to give it to any one who is qualified. The number of applications for certificates of competency is not very large. There has to be a declaration that the applicant is a candidate for employment in the public service or otherwise, or that he wishes to obtain exemption under the Attendance at School Regulations. It is not given to those who are studying at school to go into another class, but it can be given at any date afterwards in the school record. It is only held to be in form if signed by the Inspector. He can give it on the school record, without examining the candidate.

2. Is there any record of those who have applied during any time for such certificates?—No.

3. Would it be regarded as proper by your Department that any individual schoolmaster should give a certificate of this nature?—No; it is not recognised. When other departments apply to us we tell them it is informal, but that if they wish we will write to the Inspector, send him the certificate, and ask whether he feels justified in making it in the proper form, and signing it.

4. Have you ever been applied to by candidates for enrolment in the Force?—It is possible, but the applicant might not come before me personally; I do not remember any case.

5. There seems to be ground for believing that certain men who have been applicants have gone on their own motion to certain teachers and obtained a certificate of qualifications equal to those required for passing the Fifth Standard: does the Department encourage that?—No, it is improper; but a teacher so applied to could make it easy for a candidate who was really qualified to get it, because he could at once look at his records, and forward them to the Inspector.

The Commissioner: Perhaps you can tell me, Mr. Dinnie, what sort of certificate is sent in, as a rule, where a man is unable at the date of his application to produce the necessary certificate of his qualifications? What is furnished to you?

Mr. Dinnie: A short letter from the headmaster of the school, saying, "So-and-so has been examined by me, and I consider him equal to the Fifth Standard."

The Commissioner: Suppose he has not attended any public school?

Mr. Dinnie: He goes before any schoolmaster.

Witness: We give certificates in the same way in the case of private schools.

6. *The Commissioner.*] There has been a suggestion of extreme laxity in this direction on the part of individual teachers in giving certificates?—That is possible; but the cure for that would be if the Police Department did not recognise any such certificates, knowing that there is no real difficulty in the way of getting certificates.

7. Possibly any irregularity of that sort will be stopped by public attention being drawn to it?—I think so; but there might be a few who would issue them in spite of that. I believe they sometimes get a small fee. There is no authority for such a fee. I suppose he demands it in return for services given. There is no authority for such a fee. There is authority, when a special examination has to be held, for a fee for an Inspector, but most of the departments pay that themselves.

8. Do you think there would be an advantage in having a regulation prohibiting teachers from giving such certificates except through their departmental head?—Only in a sense can the Inspector-General be called the head. Speaking as the official head of the Department, teachers are really the employees of the Education Board, and are to a certain extent independent of the Inspector-General. Such a regulation could be made in other indirect ways, but I do not think it would be desirable to make a regulation of that kind. It is indicated in the general terms of the certificate. All certificates of competency or proficiency shall be on forms issued by the Department, signed by an Inspector of Schools, or the Secretary of the Department, or of a Board in accordance with information furnished by the Inspector. In the case of persons attending a normal school or a training college they may be signed by the principal of such college. All the private schools in the colony except one are treated for the purpose of certificates exactly in the same way. In connection with that one, special arrangements are made by which certificates can be issued.

The Commissioner: Are these certificates filed, Mr. Dinnie, or returned to the party?

Mr. Dinnie: As a rule, they are returned; there are some on the files now. I may say, if a man should be successful in obtaining a certificate to which he is not entitled, he is examined when he is taken on, and if not up to the standard he is not accepted.

The Commissioner: If unable to produce a certificate, would you take him on?

Mr. Dinnie: If he had a letter we might; but we would put him through an examination, and not retain him if not up to the standard.

The Commissioner: A man applies for enrolment, and you require him to produce evidence of education equal to that required for the Fifth Standard: if he does not produce that you do not accept him?

Mr. Dinnie: No.

The Commissioner: I am not criticizing the system, but we want to secure uniformity in the system. If he produces it you supplement it by an examination of your own?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

Witness: The point of the certificate is not to prove what a man's education is at the time of his admission, but what amount of training he has had to form a foundation.

9. *The Commissioner.*] I quite appreciate that, and that any man if he has not passed the Fifth Standard might have received such an education as would form the foundation for the further training that he gets in the training depot. I want your opinion on this, because it is a matter of some importance?—I have been associated with this same matter in Great Britain as well as here, having examined for the Civil Service Commission before I came to the colony, and I know what the examinations for constables were at the time I was doing work for that Commission. This is the position: Those who pass the Fourth Standard only receive the training which the average boy of eleven years old ought to receive, and no more. The number who actually pass at the end of the year—there is less rigidity about this than before—is a very large proportion of those who present themselves. The ones who do not pass may be classed as those who are naturally dull—the "duffers"—those who are idle and who are either neglected by their parents or irregular in attendance, or even more than dull—mentally defective. I do not suppose the last class ever comes in, but if you take those who never do more than pass the Fourth Standard a large proportion will be those belonging to the mentally dull—not compared with those of higher attainments, but with the average intelligence of the community. Everybody else has the opportunity of getting through, and does get through. Of course, there are exceptions to this, such as in out-of-the-way parts of the colony, where boys go to school at a late age. But, generally, very few do not pass the Fourth Standard who are not very markedly below the average capacity. I do not refer to book learning, but the power of grappling new circumstances, which is very important to a constable. I produce the figures. The country districts outnumber the town districts very largely. If you take the four chief centres added together there are under 300,000, which leaves 700,000 for the rest of the colony. But if you take eight or ten other towns, and get the proportion of town and country, the latter will be about twice as large as the towns. I think as soon as you get outside the four centres there is no difference between town and country while at school. After they leave school a boy either from the town or country may work on a farm, and from fourteen to nineteen get a physical development in consequence of living in the open air. That is a very important thing indeed. The proportion of town boys who pass Standard IV is one out of three; and of those who pass Standard V, three out of eight are town boys; five are country boys, so if you take a boy who has passed Standard V it is five to three you get a country boy. One thing about Standard V: it is a standard of examination; it is recognised as the standard boys must pass before

they are allowed to leave school, unless they have reached the age of fourteen. The question arises whether what you require as absolutely necessary for the whole population you should require as a necessity for the guardians of that population.

10. Is there any other point to which you wish to draw attention?—No; I am quite willing to give any other information I can.

11. It seems a matter of considerable importance to consider whether, assuming we want to recruit to a larger extent than there is material for at present, it would not be dangerous to lower the educational standard?—I think it would. Speaking generally, dull boys are physically inferior to clever boys—I mean boys below the average. A strong boy is an average boy mentally as well as physically.

12. Do you include in that boys who have failed to pass the Fourth Standard in the way you have described?—Yes, that is one point. Another point that occurred to me is this: that I think a test is very desirable at a later stage. Even if a boy has passed the Fifth Standard he forgets the details after he has left school some time, and might not be able to pass it. But if it has done him real benefit it has increased his power of comprehension of language and of expressing himself, and has increased his powers of observation. It is still necessary to find out whether he has gone on with self-education in these important details. Where his powers of understanding language and of expressing himself, and his power of observation—in which I include knowledge of men—have increased, his arithmetic ought to be, not equal to the Fourth Standard when admitted, but he should have a fairly intelligent comprehension of distances and weight; he should not be liable to make such a mistake as the candidate who thought there were 5 chains in a mile and a quarter. He ought to have some idea of how many hundredweight there are in ten sacks of coal on a cart, and things like that. He ought to have some knowledge of values; that is the kind of arithmetic I would teach him.

13. You would make it as practical as possible?—Yes; and the test I should give him would be somewhat similar to that applied to the Metropolitan Police at one time. He has read to him, or reads, some passage relating to an every-day occurrence; he has it read to him twice, and he has then to give in his own words a clear and connected account of the same thing—not an abstruse thing, but some common occurrence. This would meet what is wanted as an educational test. The school test should be evidence that he has gone through a certain training.

14. I have in my mind a man who is capable of compiling a very clear, intelligent, and intelligible report on any matter he is called to report on. His composition is good, but every second word is most vilely spelt: would that be possible in the case of a man who has passed any standard?—It is very unlikely, though there are certain persons whose visual sense is weak: the relation of their visual sense to their hearing is weak, and they will spell badly to the end of time.

15. You would not regard that as a disqualification?—I am afraid I hold lax views in regard to spelling—I think too much emphasis is put on accuracy of spelling.

16. And the same with handwriting?—Yes; the great thing is to be able to read it easily, and to write with sufficient speed to use it as a proper instrument. The case you refer to may be due to the fact either that the man has not read enough or that he has the mental fault I have referred to—a want of co-ordination between his visual sense and his hearing.

17. Is there anything further of importance you can think of?—It seems to me, if we want to improve the efficiency of the Force, the best way is to improve the pay. Speaking as a citizen, it seems a great pity to be satisfied with a lesser degree of intelligence—because that is what I am certain it would mean. It would be better, if possible, to have a smaller number of constables well qualified.

18. That is not possible, because there you have to consider the physical side of the question?—I dare say it would be impossible, especially with our great distances in the country. The only course seems to me to improve the pay so as to make it compare favourably with a really skilled trade such as that of a carpenter.

19. The other man gets security of employment?—Yes, but he is always on duty; the carpenter, if he works overtime, gets paid for time and a half, and the constable gets no more than ordinary pay.

20. There is one other matter I want to mention. My attention has been drawn to the fact that an enormous amount of work is done for your Department by the police in connection with industrial schools, inmates and ex-inmates, the collection of maintenance-money, and so on; this is taking away men from what one might call the more legitimate and actual work of the police officer. How do you find the work done?—As to who should do this, it is a matter of State policy. It has to be done—

21. The only point I am concerned with is, how far it affects the efficiency of the police and the organization, having regard to the fact that the men are taken off their legitimate duties?—Well, it depends on one's conception of legitimate police duties. It is part of the duty of keeping the State in an orderly manner.

22. Legitimate duties I take to be those originally cast on policemen as statutory duties?—That is so, but one's idea of what is usually cast on policemen would be modified as the functions of the State are modified, and this is a direction in which they have been greatly modified of recent years.

23. Do you think it is better done by the police than it could be by any other person?—I think so. We are very grateful to the police for assisting us in the work; but I think possibly there is a disposition to exaggerate the amount of work with a certain number of the police, although most seem to do it well and willingly. Sometimes they make a mistake in thinking we want more than we do. For instance, in regard to inquiries as to former inmates: I should like to say the amount of this work last year has been a little greater than it should be, because we are understaffed in the Education Department, as the work increases faster than the Department. The consequence is

the records of past inmates—which it is very important for many reasons should be kept—were allowed to fall in arrear to a certain extent, so that the inquiries that have had to be made the last year or two have been to cover lost ground and keep the sheets up to date. In future they will be very much less, because there will only be the inmates who left three years before. While we want the inquiries to be reliable we do not want them to make very searching inquiries, and we want them to avoid any inconvenience to the inmates; that is one thing we are particularly anxious about. I believe in nearly every case the police do avoid inconvenience to inmates. Now and then a man is a little injudicious, and makes inquiry from the inmate himself, or some one who would speak to him, which is entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable; but I do not see how any one in charge could guard against an occasional mistake of an individual constable like that. The wording of the circular is very clear: “It is not expedient that very searching inquiries should be made for any person who cannot readily be found.” This indicates very clearly indeed not to disturb the inmate at all. We want to see whether our work produces a permanent effect; every country attaches great importance to the final results of such work. In the next place, it is important, in regard to the payment of former inmates of earnings, whether they are worthy to receive the remuneration and earnings which would otherwise belong to the public purse in return for the work done for the inmate. Ninety-seven per cent. get their money, and the other 3 per cent. would only put it into the publichouse or to some worse purpose. Therefore, from police inquiries we find out whether the public money would be really thrown away. We shall always attempt to reduce the work as much as possible, but hope the police will continue to do it.

24. If it were not done by the police you would have to have special officers to do the work, and to pay them accordingly?—Yes; and they would find it more difficult, because the policemen are resident in the district, and often do not have to go outside the house to answer the inquiries.

25. Assuming it to be desirable to show the cost and value of work done by each department, and acting on the same principle as the Postal Department applies to the public, do you think it would be desirable to have the Police Department credited with the value of the work done?—It would be extremely difficult to assess the value of the work done.

26. Difficult to accurately assess it?—To place any value on it at all. Personally, I believe that credit ought to be given for work very carefully, but to give the credits of one department to another I do not know that I approve of.

27. What is the difference between this Department and the Postal Department? The only reason why the Postal Department requires offices of State to pay for the carrying of the mails is to show the value of the work done. If that applies to one Department, why not to others?—I see no objection to it except the difficulty of assessing it. Who is to assess it—the officer who does the work or the head of the Department?

28. I do not see any difficulty in asking you to assess what you consider the value of such work done for your Department. I think the difficulty is more imaginary than real?—Do you mean it should be assessed in a lump?

29. In any way you think proper, in order to credit the police with the approximate value of work done for you?—We might arrive at some amount if necessary. If that is desirable, should we charge every department for work we do for them—examinations?

30. The position is not analogous. I differ from you there. Here is direct and actual work done for your Department, which you admit could be done quite well by your own officers specially appointed for the purpose. Instead of that, it is being done by the police?—The analogy to the Civil Service Senior Examination is very close, because a good many departments could examine their own officers.

31. But that is done for uniformity, and to secure equality of treatment, &c. However, I am only trying to get information?—I do not see any insuperable objection to putting some figure down.

32. Could we not put it in this way: that the amount of work done by the police for your Department is known to you. You say you might appoint special officers for it, whom you would have to pay so much a year: what difficulty is there there?—Would not that lead to a demand on the part of the officers to get paid for this work?

33. I do not think so?—I am not so sure it would not, judging from my experience, which is very wide.

33A. It really only touches the question of the value of the work done by the Police Department for the State. If Parliament is asked to vote a considerable amount in addition to the amounts voted in the past, in consideration of extra charges, &c., it is quite reasonable to point out through the estimates the value of the work done by the police for other departments; otherwise it would be thought the police officer is merely a thief-catcher or protector of the public?—I see nothing unreasonable in the idea of crediting the police with the value of the work, but I see some disadvantages. The work is done, and very good work too.

34. *Inspector Ellison.*] Have you any practical knowledge of the amount of clerical work cast on an Inspector of Police by the inquiries from the Education Department, and in connection with recovering debts for the maintenance of children in the industrial schools?—I have a fair idea of the total amount, because the reports are on our files.

35. But have you any practical knowledge from seeing the work passing through your hands?—It does not pass through my hands now, but a year or two ago it did. There is a special branch now, and I only see the cases of difficulty. I have a practical knowledge of the amount of the work.

36. Do you know it has doubled, and more, within the last five years?—I know it has increased probably in connection with the collecting: it is probably safe to say it has doubled. I know the police have been so successful that the amount of recoveries from parents who could pay has probably doubled in the same time.

37. Would you be surprised to know the amount of clerical work an Inspector of the Wellington District has to do keeps him one to two hours daily in the office when he should be attending to police work outside?—I do not think, on an average, it need keep him so long.

38. I can assure you it does; and I have seen the work come back time after time with the same questions that have been asked before asked over and over again?—I could not see how it could possibly take that time, because I know what time the whole colony takes.

39. Do you know that occasionally the actual cost to the police—the money out of pocket—exceeds the amount collected in some instances?—It is possible. A debt to a public body sometimes costs more to collect than the amount of the debt, but that is no reason why you should let the habit grow up of people thinking they are not bound to discharge their responsibilities.

40. My question was intended to show that the Police Department is debited with the cost of actual money out of pocket?—I quite admit the police do very important work; the amount out of pocket should be charged.

41. There are constables' wages to be considered, who have been doing nothing but executing notices under the Destitute Persons Act, &c. This has never been charged to the Education Department. I have had to send as far as White Rocks?—We do not expect them to go on a journey like that.

42. Orders of Court have to be complied with—distress warrants and warrants of commitment?—When it comes to an order of the Court it is going rather far to ask that all the consequences of certain omissions of which the law takes cognisance should be charged against the Department.

The Commissioner: That would be a proper charge against the Police Department.

43. *Inspector Ellison.*] In regard to inquiries about ex-inmates of the industrial schools, and the desire of your Department that the police should avoid making it known that inquiries are being made, the police need not make known the nature of the inquiries; but I will give you an instance which is one out of a dozen: We are inquiring for a former female inmate; at her last place of residence we find she went to Masterton and got married; we have to find out her name; she is interviewed by a constable, who goes generally in plain clothes; it is not evident what he goes for, but how is it to be avoided that the neighbours should want to know why she is interviewed?—It is generally a misapprehension of the information we want; if the constable knows as a matter of report that she is leading a respectable life, he need not go near her.

44. But he does not know. A young woman who has been an inmate of an industrial school four years previously has been living, say, at Feilding. The Feilding constable says, "I do not know this woman, but I am told that another person living at Masterton knows where she is." The latter says she is living at Auckland. It goes through three hands, and the third person finds she is living decently, or the reverse. He must go to some one to identify this woman, who has changed her name, and he has to make inquiries to find out where she is. It is known that the police are making inquiries, but it is not known why. The neighbours want to know why. How is this to be avoided?—In most cases, unless there is distinct evidence that she is not living respectably, I think the police should be satisfied by saying that nothing is known against her.

45. But the difficulty is to find her first. I have had more than a hundred in my hands in June and July?—If a little more time were taken to ascertain where they were it would not be quite so pointed.

46. We have to go from one to another to trace them, and some of the forms of your Department have got as many as thirty or forty reports attached to them before being filed?—I think you are taking one or two cases as representative of all.

The Commissioner: What is the proportion of those who are found and known?

Inspector Ellison: We are able to find about one-third; the rest we have to go from one station to another to find.

Witness: But that does not necessarily mean a large amount of hunting up. I have been told by officers of the police who have been a long time in the service, and who have done the work exceedingly well, that it is perfectly true that the amount of work is frequently exaggerated by constables. I feel pretty sure about that. The work is large, but it is easy to exaggerate the amount of it. It is about twice what it was some time ago. I have already said we are overtaking arrears. We are quite willing to reduce the amount to the smallest amount compatible with efficiency.

47. *Inspector Ellison.*] In any case, where the police are out of pocket you would agree that should be chargeable to you?—Yes; I am speaking, of course, without the Minister, who would have to authorise a new policy. But I recognise if the police are actually out of pocket for other than processes of Court, it is reasonable our Department should be charged with it.

NORMAN DOW ABBOTT, Acting-detective, examined on oath. (No. 267.)

Witness: I am stationed at Mount Cook. I was enrolled the last time in 1908. Previously I joined in 1891, prior to which I was in the Permanent Artillery, and was transferred with a good record. In Christchurch I served under Inspectors Pardy and Broham, and came to Wellington and served under Inspectors Pardy and Ellison. When I joined the service first I was stationed in Christchurch a few months. I went as second man to Sydenham; was transferred to Wellington as mounted constable, and remained about nine years. Then I was in charge of Levin for two or three years; then was transferred as mounted constable to Wellington. I was appointed principal watch-house keeper on Lambton Quay; was then appointed to the charge of Wellington South, with two under me; was promoted sergeant and sent to Auckland in 1906. I was stationed at Newton under Sergeant Sheehan. After some time there I resigned, and was out of the service for eight months, going into business.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you resign to go into business?—No; I refused to do duty under Sergeant Sheehan; my papers will show for what reason. The business was not sufficient for two partners, and I had to take bills to go out. I could not utilise my money to go into business again, so I rejoined in Wellington, and did constable's duty and inquiry duties till April of this year, when I was appointed acting-detective. I am getting 7s. 6d. a day, and 1s. plain-clothes allowance. I am a married man, with a family of ten. Since I have been in the Department I have had a good record. I had a good discharge from the Artillery, and the best discharge from the present Commissioner. I never had a mark against me. I hold a long-service medal, and hold good records for merit. I have sixteen years' unbroken service and three years in the Permanent Artillery. Sergeant Sheehan made it appear that I was responsible for an article written to the paper, and also for the dissatisfaction that existed at the Newton Station. The paper reports showed that I was the cause of dissatisfaction at Newton Station—that I had tried to injure Sergeant Sheehan, and got up a petition for his removal; that I was in touch with the Sub-Inspector at Wellington, and conveyed information to him which was intended to reach the Commissioner. I wish to give an emphatic denial to this. I never supplied information to any person concerning Sergeant Sheehan or Inspector Cullen. I never acted as a pimp or handy man for any one. I further wish to deny the statement Sergeant Sheehan was supposed to have made that I ever discussed my age with him. My age is on record.

2. What was your age at the time you were allowed to rejoin?—I was under forty. I also deny sending any information to Wellington, and being a personal friend of Sub-Inspector Wright. He was in the district office when I was stationed here, and I simply knew him as any other sergeant. I never received nor asked any favour from him, or approached him in any way. I can give an explanation as to why I refused to serve under Sergeant Sheehan, and how I was treated by him.

3. That matter was already dealt with by the Commissioner, who was satisfied as to the condition of affairs at Newton, and practically exonerated Sergeant Sheehan from any suggestion of improper conduct. If you wish to give any information relative to Sergeant Sheehan I should have to give him notice, as I cannot allow evidence to be given personal to any member of the Force if it reflects on him unless he has had twenty-four hours' notice, and I do not see that a personal dispute between one sergeant and another comes within my order of reference?—He gave evidence with respect to my having done certain things, and I never received notice. Did Inspector Cullen have anything to say against me?

4. I do not think so, because in every case where I have noticed any inclination to cast a stigma on a man I have always given that man notice through the Secretary, and have never gone into any question of that sort in detail. I cannot avoid a man mentioning a name or outlining a matter, but I never allow him to go into details. If you followed the course of the inquiry you will admit that wherever there is a reflection cast upon a man, directly or indirectly, not only as regards his conduct as an officer, but also in regard to the question of promotion, I have always had the names written down. In cross-examination very often names have been given improperly, but still it has been done, and I have passed it?—Coming to Wellington, in regard to what Constable Taylor has mentioned, in connection with me: according to the papers, he stated that I was condemned on the floor of the House by the Hon. Mr. McGowan, and that after that I got in to the detective office.

5. *The Commissioner.*: What *Hansard* would that be in?

Mr. Wright, M.P.: In No. 9, 1901.

6. *The Commissioner.*] Mr. McGowan says, "Now, with regard to another appointment—namely, Mounted Constable Abbott, of Wellington, the honourable member requested that he should be appointed to detective-work. The plain explanation of the refusal is that he is not fitted for such work, and I shall not, even at the request of a member of this House, appoint an officer to a position which he is not fitted to fill. I must have confidence in my officers; if I have not, then I shall remove them; but I shall not do so until I find them unfaithful to the service, or unsuited to the position which they fill. While I find they are anxious to do their duty it is my place to protect them" (*Hansard*, No. 9, 1901, Imprest Supply Bill No. 2)?—The reason of that is that the late Mr. Fisher had asked that I be made a detective. I had not asked Mr. Fisher to intervene for me; but at this time Mr. Fisher and Mr. Tunbridge were having a wordy warfare in the House.

7. That is in connection with ex-Inspector Pender?—They were at daggers drawn, and the answer was that I was not fitted for the position.

8. How long were you in business?—Close on eight months.

9. And you rejoined?—In 1908. Things were unsatisfactory before I resigned; but as to being condemned on the floor of the House, there is the explanation in *Hansard*.

10. The Minister says, "I shall not appoint an officer to a position which he is not fitted to fill"?—A man cannot be made a detective; he must be an acting-detective first.

11. These words are taken to support, or otherwise, a statement made by the constable?—I can support what I say by the application I made at the time.

12. Were you recommended by the Inspector?—Yes, sir, when I applied; but I did not ask Mr. Fisher to intervene for me, because he was the last man I should have gone to if I wanted influence, as he and Mr. Tunbridge were fighting at the time, and a man who approached Mr. Fisher would be likely to do himself harm.

13. The Minister says, "The honourable member requested that he be appointed to detective work"?—Yes, but I had my application in. With regard to Taylor's statement, that I was two years out of the service, it was only a matter of months—I think about eight months—when I rejoined.

14. Is there anything else you wish to refer to?—No, sir; that is all.

15. Was there any difficulty raised about your rejoining on account of your age?—None whatever.

Mr. Dinnie: He is entitled to rejoin up to forty, if he has been satisfactory.

The Commissioner: There was a dispute as regards his age.

Mr. Dinnie: Of course, the Department had proof of his age.

Witness: I desire to say that it was evidently done with some malicious intent to injure me in the city where I am well known. I have the highest credentials here.

Mr. Dinnie: I will put in this notice of resignation, and the reasons are given there. [Document handed in.]

The Commissioner: It states, "I respectfully give as my reason for tendering my resignation that I decline to do duty under Sergeant Sheehan; and in that I am no exception, as another sergeant did the same, and constables have applied for transfers from his district. However, not wishing to do likewise, I elected to resign, and have concluded arrangements to enter into business on the 1st September, and trust my discharge will not be delayed.—H. L. ABBOTT." The resignation was accepted as from the 31st August, 1907.

16. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] Prior to that there had been some dissatisfaction at Newton?—Yes.

17. You have been stationed here in Wellington for some considerable time?—Yes.

18. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction here in respect to the control of the Force?—No.

19. I suppose you know there are a few dissatisfied men attached to Lambton Quay?—There are; you will find them everywhere.

20. One or two, whom I suppose you might term "agitators"?—Professional agitators.

21. Would you care to put their names down on a piece of paper?—The position is that there are a lot of men who practically amount to that, but to prove it is another thing.

The Commissioner: It is only a matter of individual opinion on your part. Another man might be called, and the name put in his hand, and he might not think the same. If you are not able to prove it, it is better not to go any further.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I mean there are one or two who are generally looked upon as agitators?—Yes.

23. You think that the remarks made by Mr. Arnold with regard to what he says is going on at Lambton Quay have caused dissatisfaction and unrest?—They certainly have.

24. Prior to that there was none?—Not that I am aware of, and I come into contact with the men.

25. Is the morality of the men there good?—Yes; I have nothing to say against them.

26. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know that men have been punished for creating a disturbance in the barracks?—Being married, I live outside, but I had never heard of it. Of course, in every barracks there is a certain rowdy element amongst the young men.

Mr. Dinnie (to the Commissioner): Did you say that men have been punished?

The Commissioner: I saw it on record.

Mr. Dinnie: In regard to the last few months?

The Commissioner: In regard to a man dismissed who was reported by Inspector Ellison for creating a disturbance and fighting in the barracks.

27. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] What do you say as regards the efficiency and discipline of the Force?—It compares just as favourably as in past years, although, of course, being an artilleryman myself, I consider that a number of the artillerymen had more training and discipline than other members; but the amount shown since that has been done away with compares favourably with past years.

28. *The Commissioner.*] Is discipline stricter?—There is no comparison. The Artillery in my time was stricter.

29. One is absolutely military, and the other *quasi*?—In the Artillery a man might go on parade unshaved, and might get half a day's pack drill.

30. But the conduct of the men?—They were told that if they got an order from a senior gunner that that order must not be disregarded any more than if it had been received from the sergeant-major or the major. But with a lot of young men who begin in the police, when they receive an order, they speak back.

31. But the young men have to be trained in the Artillery also?—They are kept at it there every week.

32. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It is part of the duty?—Yes.

33. Do you know anything of the inquiry made in regard to candidates for the Police Force?—Yes, in Wellington South and Levin.

34. Are these inquiries carried out strictly now?—They are.

35. It was suggested by Sub-Inspector Hendrey and Sergeant Sheehan in Auckland that you were the means of communicating information to my office?—I absolutely deny it. I never put my pen on paper to write to you, or Sub-Inspector Wright, or any person concerning any one.

36. And did you forward me any paper containing it?—There was *Sport*, the *Observer*, and *Truth*. Sergeant Sheehan's name figured in them every Saturday night. They called him "Dirty Barney Sheehan." When I resigned I could have made a lot of trouble, but I did not wish to stop there to wash any dirty linen; I was absolutely sick of it.

37. What was it? Strictness of discipline?—The way that pimping and crawling were encouraged there. He should be the last man to talk.

38. *The Commissioner.*] You know the way that he is spoken of by Inspector Cullen? Nobody could be spoken of more highly?—That brings the matter of a "handy" man back to Sergeant Sheehan and Inspector Cullen, because one is a shadow of the other.

39. There is something radically wrong when we get this sort of thing?—When I went to Auckland, Inspector Cullen told me he was absolutely satisfied with the way I was doing my work; but when I fell out with Sheehan it was different.

40. After you left the Force, and found business did not pay you, did you consider any other walk of life?—Yes; but going out of the business, my money was tied up.

41. Are there other avenues of employment more attractive to a man?—I looked at it in this way: that I had spent the best part of my life in the police, and I was looking for some little return.

42. Were you not a bit hasty in throwing up all those years of service?—Yes; one can see that on reflection.

43. If the real cause of your desire to leave the service was due to a quarrel between you and Sergeant Sheehan, could you not have dealt with that in some other way?—I spoke to Mr. Dinnie about a transfer, but there were so many applications to get away that it was difficult to get one. Sergeant Ramsay had refused to do duty under Sergeant Sheehan, and I took his place. A record of the men transferred from the Newton Station would show what the feeling there was.

44. I have the senior Inspector in the Police Force giving the highest character to Sergeant Sheehan, and you not only decry the sergeant, but decry his Inspector?—Further, in that case, I wish to make a charge against Inspector Cullen.

The Commissioner: Very well, then, I do not wish to hear anything more from you.

WILLIAM MATHIESON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 268.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] Give me your service?—Twenty-four years and two months. I am now stationed at Wellington South.

2. When were you promoted?—On the 1st February, 1906.

3. Did you do sectional duty afterwards?—Four months.

4. Where were you sent then?—I was in Lumsden, a country station, and was promoted to Dunedin to do sectional duty.

5. How did you come to be transferred so quickly?—I cannot say; I was ordered to Invercargill, but prior to being transferred there a vacancy occurred in Auckland. I can name three others who were offered the Invercargill vacancy, but refused it. I understand a number of others also refused it. The station was literally hawked about.

6. Do you know of any reason for their refusing it?—I heard they were afraid of going under Inspector Mitchell, who is a very strict officer; and then, the climate is bad and wet. I was transferred and went there.

7. Did you get the option of refusing?—No, sir.

8. Does that not strike you as a rather extraordinary thing if all the others got the option?—I know it was refused by Sergeant Williams, Auckland; Sergeant Mabin, Christchurch; and Sergeant Ryan, of Dunedin. I was perfectly satisfied there. I was in charge of Invercargill and three suburban stations until my transfer to Wellington South in March of the present year.

9. Were you doing duty in Invercargill?—I was in the administrative part of the work—in charge of the station, under the Inspector. A month after I went there a sergeant was appointed to do street duty.

10. Do you wish me to understand that it was owing to the difficulty of getting somebody to go there that you were ordered there after only four months sectional duty?—Yes, sir. What I wish to deal with first is in regard to promotion. When stationed in Lumsden, in 1904, I made application to the Commissioner, who came with Inspector Mitchell to inspect the station. I had then nineteen or twenty years' service. I mentioned to Mr. Dinnie at the railway-station, in the presence of Inspector Mitchell, that I was looking forward to promotion at the close of twenty years' service, and having a good record, although none of my juniors had been promoted over me at that time, and I had nothing to complain of. I mentioned the matter to see if I would get a chance from him. He said, "Mathieson, your name has been submitted to me, and as soon as I have disposed of one or two of your seniors, I shall do it." I said that I was perfectly satisfied to wait my turn, and did wait. In December of that year, to my surprise two of my juniors were promoted over me. I thought it strange, spoke to the Inspector about it, and asked him what was the best course to adopt. He said, "Make application." I did, and received the Inspector's recommendation, and received a reply that my application would be considered with others. I continued on in my station. The following year—some time in April—three more of my juniors were promoted over me. I forget whether I applied again or not. Things went on. I mentioned the matter once or twice to the Inspector—that in face of Mr. Dinnie's promise I thought it rather strange that I should be treated in that manner. I was promoted on the 1st February of the following year. On that point I wish to know if you have power to consider my application for reinstatement, as I have lost fifteen months seniority through five men being promoted over me, and they have now got prior claims to myself. The next point I wish to deal with is in regard to my transfer. Although Invercargill was a despised station, and a number of others had refused it, the Commissioner found it convenient to remove me from there to a station much inferior in status. There are only two constables and myself where I am stationed now. The station itself is perfectly comfortable—the quarters and all that—but I was put to the expense of removing my family, and a great deal of expense that the Department did not refund. My removal was practically a disrate, and no reason was assigned for it. I put it that there was some motive underlying it. I cannot say what the motive was; I can only conjecture. I spoke to Mr. Dinnie, and asked him to supply me with the motive, but he said he thought these transfers were desirable. I put it to you if the transfer was a fair one. On that point I wish to be perfectly

independent of anything the Commissioner or the Inspector will say. I wish you to ask for a report from the Magistrates at Invercargill and Naseby, the Inspector at Invercargill, and the Crown Prosecutor, as to whether there was any cause for my removal. At that time not only was I transferred, but the other sergeant also—Sergeant Black—and the district clerk. The sergeant's transfer meant promotion, and the district clerk was sent to a better climate—Napier. We all were removed at the one time, and replaced by three strange men. There were a number of other transfers at the same time, but prior to being carried out the men were asked if they would accept them. The man who replaced me told me he was asked if he would like to go to Reefton, but he did not like it. Another sergeant named Barrett makes a boast that he had half a dozen stations offered to him. It seems that there is fish made of one sergeant and fowl of another. There must be some reason underlying the whole thing. Another matter I wish to touch upon, and which may give a hint as to the motive for transferring me to South Wellington, is that I had not served under Inspector Ellison before, and knew nothing about him, except that I had met him in Auckland as a district clerk. I did not start to make trouble, but after commencing my duties under Inspector Ellison I found that matters were most unpleasant—nothing that I did, or the constables under me, was right. The fault-finding went on—my reports were too long, and the charge-sheets not properly made out. I put up with it for a time, and thought that probably I would get to know him, and we would understand each other better. I continued to push on with my duties, and was very successful in detecting crime. The detections of crime trebled during the six months—from forty to forty-six during the previous six months to 130 or 140. I found a two-up school in progress in a plantation close by, and one which, according to the report, had been in progress for years, and which the detectives had failed in trying to break up. I undertook the detection of that, and was successful in recording twenty-five convictions and £78 in fines on the guilty. I followed that up by instituting a series of prosecutions for warehouse thefts, arresting five persons, three of whom were convicted, and are now serving sentences. The Inspector tried to bring out yesterday, in cross-examining a constable, that the station was as well managed under a constable as it is under the sergeant; but if you examine the records you will find that almost daily thefts were reported, and clothes-lines were robbed; the detectives were watching, but failed to discover the thief. If you will make a comparison with the present time you will find that not one theft has been reported in a month. I do not take the whole credit; I give credit to the constables serving under me, who have been very good and energetic. Following up the dissatisfaction with Inspector Ellison, matters continued until some time about July; he continued his fault-finding, principally in writing. When he visited the station he had very little to say. There came along for inquiry an educational file, with instructions, as far as my memory serves me, that a certain man was to be seen with regard to the adoption of a child, and that it was to be ascertained what amount of money he paid towards the adoption of the child. I minuted it to Constable Taylor to carry out the inquiry; the constable did so, and made a report which, as I thought and knew, was a complete answer to the Inspector's minute. I heard nothing more of this inquiry until I heard that a junior constable was sent from Mount Cook to complete the inquiry. I accepted that as a direct insult from the Inspector. If the inquiry was incomplete I claim that it was his duty to send it back to me, and point out where the deficiency lay. He did not think it proper to do so, and, as I felt that matters had to come to a head, I reported it, drawing his attention to the fact. I ask for production of the files, which speak for themselves.

Inspector Ellison: I can get the file; it is a Magistrate's Court file.

Witness: I drew attention on the minute. His reply was a very "loud" one, telling me that he was Inspector in charge of the district, and so on. But, unfortunately, or rather fortunately, for me, the papers announced that you were going to sit as Royal Commissioner, and I again replied to the Inspector's minute, in compliance with section 72 of our regulations, which points out that if a constable has a grievance he is not to brood over it, but to make it known to his Inspector; and the reply I received was of a different nature. I simply noted the correspondence, and sent it back. That is something close on three months ago. You will mark the change. Not one word of fault-finding has there been since, and not one sarcastic minute received. I doubt if I had any communication with the Inspector since. The point I want to make is that he was purposely harassing and annoying me, that he was either overdoing his duty then or that he has been neglecting it since. Seeing my transfer from Invercargill, and the harassing that followed here, I concluded that I had been brought here purposely to be driven out of the service. After serving for a quarter of a century, I did not feel that I should leave the service at this juncture; probably later I will find it convenient to do so. I may say, with regard to the administration generally, that the feeling in Invercargill was that Mr. Dinnie was merely a figurehead, and that anything done here was through Sub-Inspector Wright—that he was the dominant influence. I have no grounds for asserting it, but that was the feeling. When I came to Wellington I was carefully warned on arrival to stand aloof, and keep to myself. I very carefully observed that caution until I found out how things were. The first indication I had that Sub-Inspector Wright was really the Commissioner was from a constable whose name I will hand to you, and whose application for a certain station had been refused by the Inspector; he interviewed Sub-Inspector Wright, and got the station all right, and he is there now. There are other names I could give you also, but it would be a breach of confidence to do so. A further matter I wish to bring before you in connection with my transfer from Invercargill is that a constable who had got into trouble there, and who was transferred to Wellington, left there with the avowed intention of maligning Inspector Mitchell and myself; he said that he would get even with us; and soon after his arrival in Wellington a publication appeared in *Truth* maligning myself. I associated that article with this constable, and I believe he gave vent to his feelings with regard to myself very freely. Later on a convenient position was found for him, and he is now in a district office.

The Commissioner: I will consider afterwards if it is necessary to go further into the matter. If you will give the name I will give the notice. At present it is nothing.

Witness: There is another matter I wish to mention, as the subject of religion has been introduced—

11. *The Commissioner.*] What is yours?—Presbyterian. It was mentioned that Catholics got preference in the service. Well, I had the privilege of serving under a Catholic Inspector, and I never served under a more upright and more honest man, and he is one of the best officers in New Zealand. But for departmental intrigue I would be serving under him still. It has been suggested by Sub-Inspector O'Donovan that something in the nature of a Board of Review be established. I heartily concur in that. I think that a Board consisting of the senior Magistrate, the Public Trustee, and the Minister, to review all applications, transfers, and promotions, would give great satisfaction.

12. But you would make the Commissioner a nonentity then?—It is the Commissioner we are complaining of. I say now that promotion is not conducted in the proper way, and undue influence is exercised. Under the present system, if a vacancy occurred to-morrow, I would have to wait to secure the Inspector's recommendation; and, judging by experience, I would have to wait until the Day of Judgment. I am at present at the mercy of one man. If he has a down on me he simply says, "I won't recommend him"; and the Commissioner says, "You are not recommended." I would be in favour of a Board of three impartial men, who could hear my complaint, and justice would no doubt be meted out. The next matter I wish to mention is in regard to examinations. I will have to go into ancient history. There have been two kinds of examinations. The *Police Gazette* of 1890, pages 38 and 134, showed the result of those examinations. In the first a man went forward, pushed on by the usual incentive for promotion; a number were successful, and two or three were promoted; a number were not, and I think you will find that they are not promoted yet; a number more went in the last six months; a number passed and a number failed; I think you will find me amongst the successful. You will find that a number who did not pass have been promoted over my head. In connection with the examinations, there are a lot of ugly rumours. I need not refer to them here, but they tend to kill the system. There was one report that at a certain station books were introduced during the examination.

13. That is a question of local control?—Yes. In another case it was suggested that a man got hold of the papers before the examination.

14. You are speaking of ancient history?—1890. Two cases came under my notice in Wellington South; two passed at the same time; but another man who did not go in for the examination, and who was in a nice, comfortable position in the district office, was promoted to Waitara. Of the two who passed, one is still at Wellington South, and the other is second man at the Hutt.

15. Do you attach any importance to the system of examination, apart from the fact that the results may not be what are expected?—Undoubtedly; the educational value is of great service to any man who will take it on. As an instance, Sub-Inspector O'Donovan continued his course of study from the days of 1890 until he qualified as a solicitor.

16. You would not contend that passing alone should be a qualification for promotion?—That it should be one of the rungs of the ladder.

17. All other things being equal?—Yes.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you stationed in the Invercargill District altogether under Inspector Mitchell?—Seven years, approximately, including my time in Tapanui.

19. What is the date on which you allege I saw you?—Some time in March, 1904; it was the first time I met you.

20. Were you recommended for promotion at that time?—From what you said my name had been submitted for promotion.

21. How could I have said that when the papers show you had not been?—I cannot account for that. Inspector Mitchell heard the remarks, I believe. You said, "Your name has been submitted to me for promotion." I am giving you what passed word for word. I understand that there is something behind the scenes—that your predecessor submitted names to you.

22. But that would not interfere with this recommendation?—I do not know.

The Commissioner: Is this man's name on Mr. Tunbridge's list?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes, it is here.

The Commissioner: What is the entry?

Mr. Dinnie: "Recently punished for misconduct, and could not recommend him for promotion at present."

23. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You see your name is not on here?—I see that.

24. There is a senior member of the Force and two juniors?—I see that mine is not there.

25. Would you expect me to promote you under these circumstances?—I would expect that you would do what you said.

26. You say so, but I could not have done so?—The Inspector will say so.

27. You were stationed in Dunedin when promoted?—Yes.

28. And was the transfer to Invercargill an advantage to you?—Yes.

29. You had no objection to that at all?—None.

30. You know it is the custom to give the senior sergeant the first opportunity of a transfer?—I believe it is the custom.

31. The senior man always gets the first opportunity?—I do not know about senior men, but I know that men are offered stations. I was the junior man who was ordered to go there.

32. Do you know any junior men who were offered it?—No, I was the junior sergeant.

33. You referred to Lennon: do you know that on the 21st March, 1907, he applied for office-work? This is his application: "I respectfully apply to be appointed to a district office for clerical work in any part of New Zealand. It has been my desire since joining the service to

get an appointment of this kind. I respectfully ask my Inspector's favourable recommendation to this application." The Inspector minuted, "Constable C. H. Lennon is a very respectable and steady man, and, being a good penman, I recommend his application for favourable consideration." There does not seem to be much dissatisfaction there?—No, it was subsequent to that.

34. Again in May, 1908, he applies: "I respectfully ask for a transfer from Invercargill on the following grounds: It is my desire to get into the clerical branch of the Department, for which I have already applied, and, recognising that my chances of obtaining that position here are small, I respectfully ask to be transferred to Wellington or Christchurch. I am troubled with a weak knee (this I mentioned to Commissioner Dinnie when here paying his annual visit), and unless relieved from street duty it will necessitate my leaving the Department, and that I do not wish to do. I would feel grateful if the Department could see its way to grant my application." Inspector Mitchell recommended it. There was no feeling at that time, I suppose?—That was when the feeling arose. He was brought before the Inspector on either two or three occasions for abusive conduct towards another constable. The Inspector dealt somewhat severely with him by reprimanding him for his conduct, and hence that application for a transfer. I know he went sick with a bad knee.

35. Anyhow, he was transferred in July to Wellington?—Yes.

36. You see his transfer was recommended by Inspector Mitchell, and there is nothing on the files to show there was anything between either of you?—That is so. There would be on the files in the departmental office, I dare say.

37. What do you allege against him now?—That he came here with the avowed intention of maligning Inspector Mitchell and myself.

38. What do you suggest? That I knew anything of it?—That it filtered through to you—not that it reached you as a grievance, but that it reached you.

39. Do you know the reason for your transfer from Invercargill?—I asked, and you did not give me any satisfaction.

40. I suppose you are anxious to know? You know there were certain letters in the Press about that time?—The Invercargill papers?

41. And Dunedin, too?—I never saw them, and have no knowledge of any such thing.

42. They related to myself, and to Inspector Mitchell being made Commissioner?—The only thing I saw was an intimation by Sir Joseph Ward in Dunedin.

43. He had to reply, there were so many letters appearing?—How do you associate me with them?

44. In the same way that you associate me with Lennon. Is this your application, dated 9th May, 1907, for promotion to the rank of station sergeant? You then had only two years as sergeant?—Yes.

45. You were amongst the junior sergeants at that time?—Yes.

46. This is Inspector Mitchell's minute: "Sergeant Mathieson has been practically station sergeant here for close on twelve months. He has proved himself to be a loyal, honourable, and intelligent officer. He is a good disciplinarian, and, whilst exercising firmness in the supervision of the constables, he has the happy knack of avoiding offensiveness. He is particularly good in Court prosecutions, and is undoubtedly peculiarly well fitted to discharge the duties of a station sergeant." My minute is, "Noted for consideration, with others, when vacancies occur"?—Yes.

47. Following on that we have a letter from Mr. Thomson, of Riverton, that was the M.P., I suppose?—I do not know the gentleman at all.

48. The letter is addressed to the Minister of Justice, and reads: "DEAR SIR,—*In re* promotion of Sergeant Mathieson, of Invercargill, to the position of station sergeant, I hear that some alterations in the service are pending, and I should be glad to learn that Sergeant Mathieson's claims have not been overlooked. He is a capable and conscientious officer.—Yours, &c., J. C. Thomson." The reply sent to that by the Hon. Mr. McGowan states, "I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, relative to Sergeant Mathieson, of Invercargill, being promoted to rank of station sergeant, and, in reply, to inform you that this officer was only appointed to his present rank on the 1st February, 1906, and it is improbable that he will receive any further promotion at present, in view of the fact that there are other sergeants of longer service who are entitled to prior consideration when vacancies occur.—JAMES MCGOWAN, Minister of Justice." We have also a letter from Mr. Hanan. You know who he is, I suppose?—I do.

49. He made some personal inquiry. Then, you say you know nothing about this at all?—Nothing. I never spoke to either Mr. Thomson or Mr. Hanan on the subject; and, as to writing or instigating letters to the Press about yourself, I know nothing whatever about it. In fact, it seems as if you have an unhappy knack of casting aspersions on people whom you suspect.

The Commissioner: That will do, sergeant. I cannot allow you to speak in that way to your superiors.

50. *Inspector Ellison.*] Do you suggest that I had anything to do with your transfer?—No.

51. Or had any communication about it since?—No.

52. You mentioned it in your evidence?—That I conjectured.

53. You said I worried you about sheets and correspondence?—You minuted one back because a name was omitted—a pure clerical slip; and to say that it was not properly made out—

54. Have you had any inquiries from other officers about correctness or delay of charge-sheets from Newtown?—I had about delay; but our staff is a very limited one.

55. Do you keep what is known as a "Black-list" book, with memos. and copies?—No.

56. Have you ever shown such a book to an officer or sergeant?—No.

57. *Constable Taylor.*] Sergeant Rutledge said he would not have me at the station. I have been under Sergeant Mathieson, and would ask his opinion?—I never had a better constable; he is very energetic and sober.

58. *The Commissioner.*] You give him a good character generally?—A good character.

59. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] How long have you been in the Force?—Twenty-four years and two months.

60. Have you been active in administering the licensing laws where you have been stationed?—I have been twelve years really in a prohibited area, and during that period I have had forty or fifty convictions, roughly speaking, for sly-grog selling; also numerous convictions for breaches of the Licensing Act in Lumsden.

61. That was not a no-license area?—No.

62. I suppose, then, you were unpopular with a section of the community?—With the hotel section, undoubtedly.

63. Where were you promoted?—At Lumsden.

64. Where were you transferred then?—To Dunedin.

65. Were you active there?—Not during the period of promotion. I have no recollection of any cases during that time.

66. Do you know of any other officers in the Police Force who have been transferred from one town to another because of activity in administering the Licensing Act?

The Commissioner: There is no implication in this case that this sergeant was ever transferred on account of such activity. Now, you ask, "Do you know of any other officers?"

67. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Do you know of any officers?—At present I cannot recollect.

68. Do you remember a case of disgraceful conduct at the South Wellington barracks between two probationers named McGrath and Shannon?—It was before I went there; I have only heard talk of it.

69. Is the training depot at Wellington South under proper control between 5 p.m. and 9 a.m.?—Well, it is really under my supervision during these hours. When I say "mine," I visit the barracks at 10 o'clock, but I have no instructions to do so. Officially, I am not really connected with the barracks at all, but I do visit it, because of the necessity to do so.

70. Should you not have instructions to look after it?—I have acted out of comradeship with Sergeant Dart; it was at his request that I did so; he is the officer really in charge.

The Commissioner: There can be no objection for Sergeant Dart to delegate his authority to another. Had you not better wait and ask Sergeant Dart as to the control of the depot? He will afford you all the information it is possible to obtain.

71. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] All right, your Worship. Do you think a night school would be of some help to the young men whose education is not too good?—Undoubtedly.

The Commissioner: You do not want to make the training too trying. They are doing very hard work all day. The advantage would be to give them longer training.

Mr. Wright, M.P.: The only difficulty is in getting men to pass the Fifth Standard.

The Commissioner: If they got three months' training instead of two, what you are aiming at would be attained. That would give the extra time at the depot, which we all admit should be as long as possible.

72. *Constable Greene.*] I apply to ask Sergeant Mathieson a few questions in reference to what Sergeant Rutledge expressed yesterday regarding myself. How long have you known me?—Roughly, about twenty-four years.

73. Where first?—At Waipoura, near Lawrence.

74. Did you see me afterwards, and where?—We were in the barracks in Dunedin for a number of years. I served under you as a sergeant, and also was with you as a constable.

75. Do you know me as an agitator, or have you ever heard it?—Never, until I came to Wellington. I found you all I desired as a comrade.

76. *Mr. Watson.*] I said that you had informed me that certain action was to be taken: is that correct?—I reported the case referred to, and Station Sergeant Darby came to the telephone, read over the Inspector's minute, and asked me to give effect to it. It was to have the woman looked after in the house from Saturday night until Monday, and then lay an information against her for lunacy. I did so.

77. *Inspector Ellison.*] It is a mistake. Did you get any instructions from me directly?—From Station Sergeant Darby.

78. Afterwards?—I had the minute afterwards.

SAMUEL ADAM BROWN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 269.)

Witness: I am a constable, at present stationed at Masterton. I was enrolled in July, 1905.

1. *The Commissioner.*] On whose behalf are you a delegate?—The Masterton police constables.

2. What are the matters you wish to bring before me?—In the first place, with reference to the pay, we would like to have it start at 8s. per day, and rise by increments of 6d. every three years to a maximum of 10s. per day. The house-allowance for married men is at present 1s. per day, which is totally inadequate. The house-rent in Masterton is 15s. per week, on an average.

3. Are you married or single?—Married.

4. What do you pay?—I have a free house, but living in Masterton is 25 per cent. dearer than here in Wellington; in fact, when here I could live cheaper than in Masterton.

5. How did you get a free house?—There is a constable's house there. We would ask that the house-allowance be increased to 1s. 6d. per day.

6. To have it the same as the sergeants get now?—Yes. With reference to the free issue of uniform, of course, we get the cloth, but we have to pay for the making. We cannot get a uniform made there for less than £2 15s.

7. That is 10s. more than in other parts?—That is so. We would ask that we be granted two pairs of pants and a tunic every twelve months. At present we get a pair of pants every nine months and a tunic every eighteen months after the first twelve. We would also ask that the annual leave be increased from twelve to sixteen days, and be allowed to accumulate for three years as at present; also, that a free railway pass be granted while on annual leave. I have known cases of constables having been called on duty while on leave, and, of course, they are bound to act when called upon. We think they are entitled to a free railway second-class pass. We also ask that saloon passages be granted on steamers instead of steerage when on escort duty.

8. Well, the very reverse has been asked for. On escort you really only require steerage. There is a great difference between transport and escort, and saloon passage on escort duty would mean giving a saloon passage to your prisoner also?—We mean going the one way—for instance, going from here to Christchurch, you very often return empty-handed, and we mean to come back saloon.

CHARLES WILLIAM KELLY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 270.)

Witness: I am a sergeant, stationed at Lambton Quay. I was enrolled on the 31st August, 1892; and promoted on the 1st September, 1907.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you been in charge of any stations?—No; I am a single man.

2. And live in the barracks here?—I am appearing here as a delegate from the sergeants in the Wellington District. I believe that the Auckland sergeants put in a number of proposals. We have had a copy of those proposals sent to us. We held a meeting at which they were fully discussed. We agree with the majority of the proposals, except a few amendments, and I would ask permission to put those in. We say: (1.) That the resolutions of the Auckland police sergeants be approved of up to the word "difficulty" at the end of the last line under the heading "Relative Position of Sergeants and Detectives," with the following exceptions: The words "4 per cent." to be inserted in place of "8 per cent." in second paragraph under heading "Position of Chief Detective," and the word "twice" instead of "four times" in the line following in the same paragraph. That after the word "service" in first paragraph under heading "Relative Position of Sergeants and Detectives," the following words be added: "In view of the fact that the two branches of the service seem to have been amalgamated, we ask therefore that the relative positions of the different ranks of the service be defined as follows: Commissioner, Inspector, Sub-Inspector, station sergeants, Chief Detective, sergeant, detective, constable." We ask that the proposals in regard to station sergeants and senior sergeants be approved, excepting clauses 6 and 7, which were deleted and the following substituted: Clause 6.—Pay of senior sergeants to commence at 15s. 6d. per diem, and advance to 16s. 6d. per diem by annual increments of 6d. per diem, the same as in the case of Chief Detective. Clause 7.—The pay of all other sergeants to commence at 11s. per diem, and advance to 15s. by increments of 1s. every three years, the same as in the case of detectives. Travelling-allowance approved with the following addition: Constable to be allowed 6s. per diem. To be added to clause 4, under heading "Constables," the words "and single constables, except when on escort duty." In clause 10, under heading "Sergeants," increase of pay by 1s. per day instead of 6d. as shown. Clause 18 to be deleted, and it is suggested that the position of clerks remain as at present. In Appendix: Clause 3.—Sergeants, 11s. to 15s., by 1s. every three years, instead of to 13s., by 6d. every two years. Clause 4.—Senior sergeants, 15s. 6d. to 16s. 6d., by 6d. every year, instead of 13s. 6d. to 15s. 6d., by 6d. every year.

3. Is there anything else you wish to add?—I joined the service on the 31st August, 1892. I have been stationed at Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Nelson. I passed the police examination held in Wellington in January, 1907, and was promoted sergeant in September of the same year. I have made no attempt to use influence since I have been in the service, nor do I know of any one else using it. I know a number of men who have been promoted during the last two years—know them personally. We have had a talk about the matter, and they have assured me that they have used no influence. Regarding discontent, there is no discontent amongst the Wellington police, with the exception of two or three disappointed, vindictive men. These men have been the cause of this Commission.

4. How do you mean "the cause"?—By their conduct in abusing the Commissioner during the last eighteen months in the papers—by writing letters to the papers.

5. The Commission was mainly set up on account of a statement made in Parliament?—These men have been carrying tales out.

6. You think that members of Parliament got their information from men in the barracks?—I have no doubt about it, especially after hearing the evidence given here. They have also been telling the reporters things which are untrue really on purpose to get at Sub-Inspector Wright.

7. Why should they try to get at him?—There is an old grievance between these men and him. The last Commission was the same. If the slightest thing happens in the barracks these men carry it out, and within twenty-four hours it appears in the papers.

8. Wellington papers?—Yes. I believe they are in communication with three or four other men in different parts of New Zealand. If the slightest thing happens in the barracks, they exaggerate it, and try to make the Force look as black as possible. For instance, I was on duty when Constable Mills was ordered off his beat. I was the sergeant who took him off.

9. I have seen the papers in connection with that. I will not allow you to touch on that; I am prohibited from going into the matter?—Does the same apply with regard to Constable Hood?

10. You know as well as I do what the reference is?—With regard to the disturbance in the barracks, I have slept in the barracks for two years, and can honestly say that I have never heard a disturbance since I have been there.

11. It would be your duty to keep order?—Yes. I never had occasion to speak to a man on the station. In regard to the efficiency of the Wellington police, I consider they have never been

more efficient than at present. We have a first-rate detective staff—the best in the colony, I consider. As regards the standard of education, I do not think it is too high; I think it should be adhered to. I also think, if it is necessary for a man to obtain a Fifth Standard certificate on joining, it is still more necessary a sergeant, before promotion, should pass the Fifth Standard. It has not been the case hitherto. Constables have no faith in a poorly educated sergeant, and will not take his advice.

12. However good a constable may have proved himself, if uneducated, the men do not place any value on his opinion?—There are any amount of fairly well educated men in the Force who have no confidence in an uneducated man. I think the training depot has been a success, and I think the probationary period should be extended for three months.

13. Would you extend the period in the depot?—I would, to three months.

14. And there should be three months' probation in addition?—I think it is desirable to have six months' probation after the depot, making nine months before the men are enrolled. If it could be worked, it would be a good idea if, after a man has been serving twelve months or two years, he were sent back to the depot. We have a first-class instructor, and any man would be glad to receive another couple of months' training, and they would know what to learn and what not to. At present they learn a lot they should not, or, rather, too much in advance—they learn too much by heart.

15. You said the training was excellent?—It could not be improved.

16. But no training is excellent which is cramming?—Well, the men do not know what to learn.

17. How do you think the training could be strengthened?—It would be better if the men, after doing twelve months' service, could go back when they had some practical knowledge.

18. Do you not think many would object to going back to school again?—They would be only too pleased to do so. Another thing, I think all constables from other Forces should be compelled to go through the depot on enrolment, because the conditions here are different and the law is different. In regard to constables here complaining about having to go to Court after night duty, I think it would be a good thing if some arrangement could be made to give them time off, or, if the Magistrate would allow it, for the defendant to come up, and, if he pleads not guilty, allow him to stand down till the afternoon.

19. I should not object to that, but some Magistrates might?—I have been told that is what is done in the Old Country. It is very hard on the men at present, and they shirk their duty in consequence; they will take a drunk off their beat, and put him on another. A man on beat in Wellington would be at Court every morning if he did his duty strictly. I think also there should be a gymnasium at the police-station in every centre. I think there should be an instructor. Constable Skinner is a first-rate man.

20. You would give a man a status as instructor to the whole of the Force?—Yes; we have a first-rate man here named Tait—a pupil of Skinner's. It would also be advisable to have a room for men to dry their clothes in.

21. You are very hard up for accommodation?—Very.

22. You have six or seven sleeping in one room?—That is only one room.

23. What are the sanitary arrangements like?—They are very fair. I think the police should be relieved from the outside duties they have to perform, such as for the Education Department, Old-age Pensions, and Inspection of Machinery. The sergeants have to do that, and they cannot really do it and look after the men properly too.

24. Do all sergeants take their turn?—We are constantly doing it. There is no special man here; there is in some places. I think the Inspectorship of Weights and Measures should be held in another Department; I do not see why the police should do it; it is no policeman's work at all. A remark has been made about one of the Sub-Inspectors playing billiards in our room. I might say it does not interfere with discipline in any way. Mr. Wright is a man no one could be familiar with.

25. We shall not agree on that, and I do not want your opinion on it. Where else have you done duty besides Wellington?—Auckland, Christchurch, and Nelson. I have been here for two years.

26. How do you find the discipline in different places?—I think it is first rate here. We have a very strict disciplinarian in Mr. Ellison.

27. How long is it since you were in Christchurch?—When doing Exhibition duty.

28. Are you able to compare the condition of the Force in the different centres?—I have not been on duty in the large centres for some years.

29. Are they all fairly efficient?—I think so; the records will show that.

30. There is no occasion to set centre against centre?—No; I think we compare with any other centre.

31. At what age were you promoted?—Forty.

32. Have you any opinion as to the age at which a man should be promoted?—No man should be promoted over forty-five. The work is severe. I know of cases where sergeants have gone back to constables.

33. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think it would be a good thing if the men were sent back to the drill ground after serving a year or two: would that not be impracticable?—It would be a first-rate thing.

34. You know the men have to attend a class for twelve months after they join?—Yes.

35. Is Greene one of the men you mention as being dissatisfied?—Yes.

36. There is no general dissatisfaction in the service as far as you know?—I do not think there is another man in the station but Greene.

37. You noticed Mr. Arnold's remarks in respect to the men at the Lambton Station: did they cause considerable dissatisfaction and unrest?—Yes, the men were very much annoyed; their relatives were writing and complaining.

38. Do you know anything about a "special" man?—I think that is absurd; there is no truth in it whatever.

39. *Inspector Ellison.*] You were a good while under me, did you receive considerate treatment from me?—Yes, first-rate treatment.

40. Have you noticed me being unduly rough with any man?—No; you keep men in their place; but if a man does his duty he gets on all right.

41. A man gets a fair show if he does his work well?—Yes.

JAMES DALE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 271.)

Witness: I am stationed at Lambton Quay. I was enrolled in 1881, and have had twenty-eight years' service. I was promoted after twenty-five years' service, in 1906. I was then in charge of Alexandra South Station. I did street duty for five years, and was then sent to Lawrence. After being appointed sergeant I was brought to Lambton Quay, and have been on sectional duty here ever since. I should like to correct a slight mistake which I think the Commissioner will admit. In giving his evidence in Otago it appeared as if I was classified with Constables Taylor and another as having completed thirteen years. My reason for mentioning it is that I was classified with men who were considerably my juniors. I have done twenty-eight years' service—twenty-five before promotion. I have no complaint against any officer in the Force. I thank the Commissioner for my promotion, to which I have worked up by hard work. I ask him to produce my merit sheets.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Had you prospects of promotion before you received it?—I was in charge of the goldfields. I was transferred from Cromwell to Alexandra by the late Commissioner, I have grounds for saying, for special reasons. It was a pretty rough town, and there was a good deal of drinking there, and the only promise made to me prior to my getting promotion was by Mr. Tunbridge, who said if I managed this station as well as the former one I would receive further consideration.

2. Why do you think you did not get promotion before?—I do not know. I made application for promotion, and always understood I had the confidence and good will of Mr. O'Brien, and I was surprised at his remarks concerning myself in Dunedin—that he did not recommend me. But I think he had to admit he was wrong, and did recommend me. I have never used political influence nor made application more than the records will show. I am a married man. I pay £1 a week rent, my allowance being 10s. 6d. I do not make this as a complaint, but it is somewhat hard I should lose my seniority in the way I have.

3. How?—Because I have done solid hard work in the Force, and it seems hard that a man after doing hard service so long should find himself with twenty-five sergeants ahead of him.

4. You were so grateful for your promotion just now?—I admit it; but the fact is there are twenty-five sergeants, most of them enjoying out-stations, who are my juniors considerably.

5. I do not see how it is to be remedied. You have temporarily lost your opportunity, or it has not come to you; it is a good thing you are as grateful as you are?—I am grateful, but I think it is a little hard. I am living in hopes of further promotion. As regards the constables here, a good deal has been said about them one way and another. Since I have been here I can only say I am proud to have charge of such a class of men. I am on night duty, and have twelve men under me, and am proud of the way they do their work. I do think we, as sergeants, are asked to do rather much at night, and I think we should have another sergeant at this station.

6. That is a matter the Inspector, if he thinks necessary, would report on so strongly that in all probability there would be no difficulty in its being done?—There is a good deal of work for a sergeant. He has twelve men to look after over a wide radius, and if there is a fire or a serious offence he is the man who is looked to in the morning. I think there is rather much for him to do as it should be done. The sergeant has no time to converse with his constables as he should do. It is simply going round, "Is all right here?" and so on to the next man.

7. What else would you say?—Possibly the constable might want to ask questions, or something of that sort. I am only pointing this out to show that another sergeant is desirable for our station. In regard to recruits, I should like to see the term of probation such that there should be some practical work done in it. Suppose twelve men go into the depot, I should like to see some of them do part of their time on the street, and go back to the depot afterwards.

8. You could do that if you extend the time in the depot?—Yes; the men come down to us full of law, but without the first idea of police duty—how to work a beat, and how to walk on it; and if we check them they resent it. I should like to see them brought out to assist the men on the street, and learn some of the practical work of police duty.

9. They get a certain amount of drill and physical exercise?—Yes, but they do not know how to speak to the public; they go too harshly at it, and get into trouble.

10. You would give them more practical training?—That is my idea. In regard to the question of the "handy" man, I have never heard of anything of the sort.

11. How old were you when you were promoted?—Nearly forty-five.

12. Is forty-five old enough?—Yes.

13. Have you felt the sectional work at all hard?—No; but I say it takes a good man to stand a place like Wellington; if a man can stand Wellington he can stand any place.

14. What is there about it?—There is such a lot of walking in it; there is not so much in other places, where the beats are closer together. Our beats extend from Tinakori Road to Manners Street Station. It is all very well to talk about visiting constables, but sometimes you cannot find them for a bit; you have to go round a man's beat to find him.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you had any inquiries to make in respect of candidates for enrolment?—Yes.

16. They are carried out satisfactorily now?—Yes.

17. Could you suggest any other method of investigation?—I do not see that any more could be done. I do not know what steps are taken as regards the Australian men, but my experience is it has been the one or two Australians in the Police Force that have caused a lot of trouble, and have been dismissed.

18. Do you know of any influence obtaining?—Nothing of the sort. There is a lot of talk about it.

19. Do you believe in the present system of promotion?—I cannot see that it could be bettered; it should be left entirely to the superior officers.

20. Merit and seniority combined should be considered?—Yes. While on this question, I think the actions of a constable should be recorded in some way—in this way. I have had a good many cases which I think should have been recorded in my favour, and which should have told for my promotion, and you, as Commissioner of Police, know nothing about it, such as cases of theft, licensing cases, and general police duties.

21. When you do anything meritorious it is on your sheets?—If I am away in the country the Commissioner of Police knows nothing of what I am doing.

22. But he knows through your Inspector?—Well, there is very little entered on the record sheets, unless it is something very meritorious.

23. What do you say as regards efficiency and discipline as compared with former years?—It is very good.

24. What is your opinion on the behaviour and morality of the men?—It is very good.

25. Do you know anything about the matters referred to by Mr. Arnold in respect to the men on the station?—In my opinion, the statements were unfounded, and wrong.

26. Do you consider Greene is one of the dissatisfied men in the station?—I know very little of him; I am married, and not much about the barracks.

27. *Inspector Ellison.*] In regard to visiting constables on beat, you wait for a man sometimes. There is a given time for him to travel round about, and you sometimes have to wait nearly the whole of that time before he arrives?—Yes; a sufficient time to delay you.

28. On other beats he might pass in a given time?—Yes. If he does not turn up within a reasonable time, and has no excuse, he is brought to book for it?—Yes.

29. Constable Taylor asks that certain reports you made in regard to visiting hotels should be put in. I intend to put them in?—I should like to say the number of visits I have paid to hotels since March, 1908, is 283, within hours and after hours.

30. All the sergeants on duty visit the houses and go into the bars and see how the hotels are conducted?—Yes, and a report is put in every month or fortnight.

[Reports produced.]

31. Do you know of other cases being brought up besides these, and dismissed?—Yes.

32. You do not know about a case against the Commercial Hotel some six years ago on the same lines as these cases?—It was before my time; I heard of it.

33. Have you received fair and considerate treatment from me since I came to Wellington?—The best ever I had in the Force. You are the straightest gentleman I ever dealt with.

34. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Have you ever reported breaches of the licensing laws in Wellington and no prosecution has resulted?—The papers are in—all the reports I have ever made.

35. Do you know of any drunkenness in the Police Force? Do you know this man whose name I now show you?—I am astonished to see the name; I know nothing of it; I know the man; he is a fellow-sergeant.

36. Is Wellington properly policed?—Yes, except the point I have mentioned—I think there should be another sergeant at Lambton Quay station.

THURSDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

WILLIAM MATHIESON, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 272.)

Witness: I wish to apply to have the files searched with regard to my period at Invercargill. It was stated yesterday by Mr. Dinnie that certain letters had appeared in the Dunedin and Invercargill papers which I was supposed to have written or instigated.

The Commissioner: I do not see how that will advance matters. I presume the question was asked with a view to show that you had instigated or were the author of these letters. You have given your denial to that.

Witness: I go further, and say that no such letters existed.

The Commissioner: I do not know. The best way is when the Commissioner comes to give evidence to call upon him to produce them.

Witness: If any letters appeared reflecting upon his administration it would be the duty of the Inspector to forward them.

The Commissioner: At this stage it is impossible to go into that.

Witness: If I was accused of it it was surely due to me that I should get a chance of replying. It was a Star Chamber business.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Were there any deputations to Sir Joseph Ward?—I know nothing about them.

2. Have you never read his speeches?—I saw his reference to the matter in Dunedin. That is all I know.

The Commissioner. If you will prompt me when Mr. Dinnie is giving evidence I will go into the matter.

MICHAEL MURPHY, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 273.)

Witness. I am a sergeant stationed at Mount Cook. I joined the Police Force on the 28th December, 1889, and was promoted to the rank of sergeant on the 1st March, 1906.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Since then where have you been?—Two years in Auckland and eighteen months in Wellington.

2. Where in Wellington?—Mount Cook.

3. You are one of the junior sergeants there?—Yes.

4. What has been the conduct of the men since you have seen them in Wellington?—Very good.

5. You have no complaint whatever to find either with them or their efficiency?—No.

6. How old were you when you were promoted?—About forty-five.

7. And how did you find the sectional duty?—Pretty hard sometimes.

8. Did you find yourself physically fit?—Yes; I was kept going pretty well.

9. What is the maximum age at which a man should be promoted to be sergeant?—Forty or forty-four.

10. Do you think forty-five too old?—For some men.

11. Although you did not find it so in your case?—No.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What has the conduct of the men in Wellington been generally?—Very good, as far as I know—exceptionally good at Mount Cook.

13. And the class of men we are getting now?—Is as good as ever; you might get a few not up to the standard physically.

14. Have you had any inquiries as regards candidates?—A number of them.

15. You think they are carried out strictly?—Very strictly.

16. In the case of Constable Willetts?—I saw Mr. Richardson, and reported just what he told me. He was very busy that morning, and I had to wait some time to see him.

17. *The Commissioner.*] Did he show you any papers?—No; I showed him Willetts's testimonial.

18. Then, look at this—it is the record of service: “April 16th, 1907: Insolence to passenger; cautioned. June 26th, 1907: Insolence to Hon. Mrs. —; cautioned. October 26th, 1907: Insolence to Mr. —; severely cautioned. November 8th, 1907: Insolence to Mrs. —; informed that if further reports of a similar nature received against him he cannot be retained in the service”?—I did not see that. I did not know Willetts.

19. I want to make sure that the information was not given to you?—No.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The files were not shown to you?—No.

21. *The Commissioner.*] You saw nothing beyond the fact that you were told his conduct was good?—No.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your opinion is that Mr. Richardson ought to have shown you those things?—He ought to. I knew nothing about the crab incident.

The Commissioner. These are independent of that; the crab incident is not on that sheet.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You knew nothing about this?—Nothing.

The Commissioner. It would be well to make a note that they keep such a record in the Tramway Department, in case of any future inquiries.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] We will note that. (To witness): What do you say as to the discipline and efficiency of the men?—Very good.

25. Is there any general dissatisfaction as regards the present control?—Not that I know of.

26. You do know that there are two or three dissatisfied men?—I have heard so.

27. *Inspector Ellison.*] How have you been treated by me since you have known me?—Well.

28. Have you any complaint to make against me or my conduct?—Neither against you nor any other officer in the service.

29. *The Commissioner.*] What is his manner of addressing constables?—Very good.

30. You never saw anything to take exception to?—Never.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Did you ever know of any sergeant at Wellington having been under the influence of liquor?—No.

WILLIAM COFFEY, Journalist, examined on oath. (No. 274.)

Witness (to Inspector Ellison): I am special correspondent for several papers here. I desire to say that I come forward voluntarily, in consequence of a certain statement made by an officer of the public service as to incivility on the part of Inspector Ellison. I have had occasion to go to Inspector Ellison on many occasions, not as a Press representative, but as an officer of an association which controls the sport of boxing, and on every occasion I have been treated with the utmost courtesy and consideration, and the representations made on behalf of the association, as well as of the parent body in Christchurch, have received every consideration. While the Inspector has been very strict in seeing that the law has been complied with, he has placed no obstacles in the way of giving us a permit, and has done so promptly. I know of others who have had occasion to go to him, and they have come away with the same experience—that they have been treated with the utmost courtesy. At the same time, I have reason to thank Mr. Dinnie—

The Commissioner: Mr. Dinnie's conduct is not in question.

Mr. Dinnie: This is surprising to me.

The Commissioner: Do you want him to give you a testimonial of character?

Mr. Dinnie: I have no desire, except the question is raised.

The Commissioner: You may proceed with your evidence.

Witness: I may say there have been occasions when representations have been made to us as to the efficient control of boxing, and I have had occasion to go to Mr. Dinnie, and have always been promptly dealt with. Speaking as a newspaper representative, whenever I have had occasion to go to Inspector Ellison or Mr. Dinnie, I have been treated with courtesy and consideration, and I think I voice the feelings of other members of my profession. I do not know anything of the allegations made by Constable Taylor and Sergeant Mathieson; that is my experience of them and the Force generally. Speaking as a newspaper man, we are naturally observant, and come in contact with the Police Force more than the public generally, and my opinion is that they perform their work efficiently, with a few notable exceptions, and treat the public with a great amount of consideration. Sometimes their position is not a very pleasant one, and the behaviour of people with them is not altogether of the best, but they perform their work very well indeed.

1. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] You are connected with the newspaper Press?—Yes.

2. The authorities everywhere treat the Press with very great respect?—I do not know about that. They do, with a certain amount of respect. Pressmen have to go to the police and make certain inquiries which will tell them whether they can give the information wanted or otherwise. On several occasions we have gone away with a refusal, but if we do not get it from them we find it out in another way.

3. *The Commissioner.*] It is not so much the refusal as the manner of refusing?—Yes, sir.

4. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] If a newspaper man had been treated like that man stated he was yesterday, there would have been a strong paragraph in the paper next day?—There might or might not; it all depends on the circumstances.

5. Is not anything appearing in the Press taken notice of by the Department?—I am not in the secrets of the Department.

6. You find, as a newspaper reporter, that you will be treated with courtesy by the police?—Not always. Even politicians do not treat us very courteously sometimes.

7. You say it is your opinion that reporters are not likely to receive better treatment than anybody else?—I do not think so.

8. Have you ever approached the police for information when not connected with the Press?—Yes.

9. Did you get fair treatment then?—Very fair, indeed.

10. From Inspector Ellison?—From others before him, and from the Force generally.

11. *Inspector Ellison.*] Did you ever get inconsiderate treatment from me?—Never.

WILLIAM LYONS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 275.)

Witness: I am a sergeant, stationed at Lambton Quay, Wellington. I am on street duty—a sectional sergeant. I was enrolled on the 13th November, 1878; and promoted sergeant on the 1st June, 1885.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you been in charge of sub-districts?—Years ago I was in the Urewera country.

Inspector Ellison: He is a single man.

The Commissioner: A man is penalised for being single?

Inspector Ellison: Very often in that way.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Then, you sleep in the barracks?—Yes. I have served in all the four centres, as well as Wanganui and Invercargill.

3. And how have you found things throughout the Force?—Satisfactory.

4. How long have you been on the Quay?—About four years.

5. What has been the general conduct of the men during that time?—Good.

6. Apart from the particular cases we know of?—Yes.

7. And they have been dealt with?—Yes.

8. What is the conduct of the men in the barracks?—Good. On one occasion, some months ago, I had to speak to two of the men who were chatting at the door of their room. There were other occupants of the room—seven in all—sleeping in a room 25 ft. by 15 ft. I ordered these men to bed, as they were disturbing the others.

9. What were they doing?—Chatting.

10. What did you do?—Ordered both to bed, and reported the circumstance.

11. Were you alone?—Detective Cameron and Constable Gallagher were present.

12. Was it just a general disturbance?—They were talking a bit loud.

13. And as you thought?—Disturbing the other occupants of the room.

14. Was there any sign of injury on either of the men?—Yes, on one of them.

15. What do you deduce from that?—They told me that they had been wrestling.

16. What first drew your attention to it?—I noticed a skin abrasion on one of the men.

17. Were both afterwards dealt with?—Yes.

18. Were both under the influence of liquor, or only one?—Both slightly under it.

19. And that is the only occasion on which you noticed anything of the kind?—The only occasion.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have been in Wellington some time?—Four years and three months.

21. Have you had any inquiries in respect to candidates for the service?—Yes, several.

22. Were they strictly carried out?—Yes. In the case of the colonial-born, they had to be accounted for from the day they left school; employers had to be interviewed, and there also had to be a personal report from any person who had any knowledge of the candidate.

23. So that every part of the time is accounted for from the time of leaving school?—Exhaustive inquiries are made regarding character.

24. Do you think that candidates should have a longer period of probation than now?—I should say, about three months.

25. That is in the depot?—Yes; and three months' street experience.

26. That would mean six months altogether?—Yes.

27. Then they could be either retained or discharged?—Yes.

28. You know that we have a system of classes, and that they have to attend them for twelve months after joining the service?—Yes.

29. *The Commissioner.*] Have you been at these classes?—Yes. The station-sergeant teaches them in general police duties.

30. How often are these lectures?—Once a week sometimes.

31. Is it compulsory on the men to attend?—Yes; they are notified.

32. On what lines do these lectures proceed?—Reports, by-laws, Factories Acts, and so forth.

33. How long does the instruction last?—About an hour.

34. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know anything of political influence?—Nothing whatever.

35. I suppose you know that there are a few dissatisfied men?—Not to my own knowledge, but I have heard so.

36. Do you know of any sergeant in Wellington ever having been under the influence of liquor?—Never.

37. And you do not believe that such is the case?—No.

38. *Inspector Ellison.*] You have known me since you joined the service?—Yes.

39. What is your personal knowledge of how I treated yourself and other men in the service?—You have always been kind and civil to them.

40. What is my reputation?—As good as that of any officer I ever served under.

41. *Mr. A. Gray.*] You have lived in Wellington barracks something like four years?—Yes.

42. And slept there?—Yes.

43. Is there any justification for the suggestion made that the Wellington barracks are the scenes of disgraceful conduct every night?—None whatever.

44. Do you know that it has been said that the worst of certain scenes and things that a member of Parliament described were no worse than was to be found at the barracks in Wellington every night? Is there any justification for that?—None whatever.

45. Do you know of any instance of disorderly conduct beyond the scene you have mentioned?—Nothing whatever.

46. That is your experience of four years?—Yes.

47. What is the conduct of the men at night?—Good.

48. *The Commissioner.*] Is there any drinking going on at night?—None whatever.

49. No liquor brought in?—No. We have several prohibitionists, one of whom has left the Force, and in the event of anything of that kind going on he would mention it.

50. At what age were you promoted?—Thirty-three.

51. Do you attach any importance to physical training?—I do.

52. Do you think there is a lack felt owing to the want of a gymnasium?—Yes.

53. You think there ought to be one in every centre?—Yes, in every centre where there is a big crowd of men. The accommodation is also bad at the station; there are some men sleeping in rooms 10 ft. by 8 ft.

ROBERT DARBY, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 276.)

Witness: I am stationed at Lambton Quay. I was enrolled on the 28th July, 1876; and promoted to be sergeant on the 1st January, 1898.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Ten years later you were made station sergeant?—Yes.

2. Where did you do duty as a sergeant mainly?—In Wellington three years, then in the Westport district three years, and five years in the Thames.

3. How old were you when promoted?—Forty-nine.

4. What is your present age?—Sixty.

5. Did you have to do sectional duty?—Yes.

6. How did you find it at that age?—Not a bit of trouble in life.

7. What do you think would be a proper age at which to promote a man, having regard to the strenuous nature of the work?—I would not debar a man up to fifty. If it is to stop at forty-five, what has a man to look forward to?

8. It has been suggested all over the Dominion that forty-five should be the maximum age?—When an efficient good man comes to forty-five, what does he do? He sits down and puts in his time the best way he can; he has nothing to look forward to.

9. You think that the matter should be regulated by a physical examination?—On promotion.

10. Would not that be necessary?—There was no physical examination with me.

11. I would not have thought it necessary?—No.

12. We had a case the other day of a man who said that if he had been physically examined he would never have been promoted?—Of course, we all look forward to improving ourselves if we get the opportunity.

13. Your duties as station sergeant have never been defined?—Not properly defined.

14. Have you found any drawback owing to their not having been defined?—None whatever; I have good officers, and everything has worked smoothly.

15. Do you think that the office has been justified by results?—I do. Of course, there is no doubt it is very awkward for a man in charge of a large station to be placed in a large office. The position of station sergeant is very peculiar, and the amount of work in Wellington is enormous. I am at it from 8 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock at night. If not, the work will accumulate. Of course, I have good officers. Sometimes I am there alone. If the Sub-Inspector is ill and the Inspector away visiting country stations, I am in charge of the whole place.

16. You are Inspector and Sub-Inspector rolled into one?—Rolled into one.

17. And no friction has occurred?—Nothing of the sort; I have the best of officers.

18. How about the men? Are they up to the standard?—They are excellent; I could not say any more for them. Of course, in every community you will find one or two who are not equal to the others; you cannot avoid that.

19. What would you recommend after these men have passed through the training depot?—I would give them three months on the street with another man in charge and a sergeant to learn their duties. Previous to my service in New Zealand I was five years in the Royal Irish Constabulary. There they are not allowed out for six months, and sometimes seven months, until they have a thorough experience.

20. Have you heard of much discontent amongst the men owing to not getting Sundays or time off on account of being at Court?—Here they always get time off when at Court, when they ask for it; in fact, they are exceedingly well treated. They also get Sunday leave when they can be spared. Of course, we are sometimes short-handed, and if they cannot be spared it is made up for them on the first opportunity.

21. Have you any remarks of a general nature with regard to the Force?—With regard to my own position, I would like to have my status in the station defined with regard to myself and the Chief Detective. I am in charge of the station when the Inspector and Sub-Inspector are away, but am I in a position to give orders to the Chief Detective?

22. That has never been defined, but at the same time has never resulted in friction?—If so, I would like to be put on the same footing as regards pay.

23. Have you ever had occasion to issue instructions in the absence of the others?—I never had occasion, because you could not have a better staff of detectives; they work most amicably together. Then, with regard to this question of travelling-expenses, free pass on the railways, and house-allowance, I get £50 house allowance, and lose £10. I would ask for a rise all round in the house-allowance, and also that the travelling-allowance to sergeants and constables be the same as to the detectives, and then there could be no friction. If I travelled out with a detective from the Thames he could go first class and I had to go second. We sit down to dinner at the same hotel table, but he is allowed 2s. while I am only allowed 1s. 6d. If I am away on a week's relief duty I receive 3s. 6d. a day, but he is allowed 8s. I do not begrudge them anything they get; but we would like to be put on the same footing as regards travelling-expenses. Then, in regard to annual leave, we are allowed twelve days now; I would like to see that extended to sixteen days, to be cumulative. Then, if we had friends in Melbourne or Sydney, we would have an opportunity of visiting them.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have had inquiries about candidates for the Force?—Yes.

25. You know how strictly they are carried out?—Too strictly.

26. In what way?—There are too many inquiries, and too much time lost over them. If I might be allowed to suggest a plan, I would do so.

27. *The Commissioner.*] What would you do?—I would provide that the candidate should receive a recommendation from the Stipendiary Magistrate in the district in which he was born.

28. But he might not know him. I should be very sorry to have to give recommendations in my district?—Also from two Justices of the Peace and the minister of the church to which he belongs.

The Commissioner. I am very doubtful about that.

29. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Anyhow, you consider the inquiries sufficient?—I do.

30. Look at this form from the Sydney Police Force [produced]. You will see they are very perfunctory compared with us?—I see they ask one question here—if a man can swim.

31. As regards probation, you think there should be a longer term?—Six months at least—three months in the depot and three months on the street—before being transferred out.

32. Do you believe in the present system of promotions?—Yes.

33. You think that merit and seniority combined ought to be considered?—I think so.

34. What do you say as regards the efficiency and discipline of the Force at the present time?—As good as ever I have seen them.

35. Do all the sergeants under you perform their duties satisfactorily?—They do.

36. And you have no cause of complaint?—I have never had cause since I have been amongst them.

37. No report has ever reached you of any of the present sergeants being addicted to drink?—I never saw the sign or smell of drink on one of them. I have known Sergeant Lyons since I joined, and Sergeant Kelly for years.

38. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction at the present time?—No.

39. I suppose you know that there is a little dissatisfaction?—It is unfounded.

40. Also that a statement has been made with regard to my son—that it is generally believed he was granted six months' leave on full pay?—I never heard it mentioned until I saw it there.

41. Is it reasonable to suppose that a man of five and a half years' service should get six months' leave on full pay?—No, sir. I would like to get it on half-pay myself.

42. You know Sub-Inspector Wright, my Chief Clerk?—Yes.
43. You have heard about him playing at billiards in the station?—Yes.
44. Have you seen him playing there?—I have.
45. Generally with whom?—The Chief Detective.
46. Does he frequent the station very often?—He does not—generally for ten or fifteen minutes during lunch-hour.
47. He lives some distance out of town?—At Rona Bay, I think, across the harbour.
48. Do you know anything about his character or abilities?—I know that he is one of the cleverest men in the Force, and I do not think there could be any exception to his playing billiards.
- The Commissioner:* We do not agree, sergeant, about a superior officer playing with his subordinates.
49. *Inspector Ellison.*] Do you remember one day last month a lady being reported insane?—By Dr. Ewart.
50. You got some instructions from me: what were they?—To instruct Sergeant Mathieson, of Newtown, to get some respectable person to look after the patient until Monday, as she could not be admitted into Mount View Asylum temporarily; and Dr. Ewart would on no account allow her to be removed to the Lambton Quay Station, to be placed in the cells.
51. Do you remember that I said to Dr. Ewart that we had no place to keep her there, and that it would be most inhumane to bring her to the station?—That is so.
52. And did he agree to that?—He did.
53. Do you remember afterwards that a gentleman called with me at your office on the same subject?—Yes.
54. Did you now his name?—Watson. I did not know it then, but since.
55. What passed?—He asked what had been done with regard to the case, and you told him; also, that the station sergeant and the Sub-Inspector would attend to him.
56. In what manner did I speak to him? Was it in an uncivil, dirty, or bad-tempered manner?—Just as you are speaking to me now.
57. You have known me a good while?—Since I joined the Force, thirty-three years ago.
58. Did you ever know me to be discourteous or uncivil to people?—I never heard of it. I have served under seven Inspectors in my time, and I never served under a better one, without exception.
59. Have you ever seen any conduct of mine that would prevent any officer of the police doing his duty fearlessly and honestly?—Never.
60. I suppose you know that I have frequently to return incomplete work—reports and such-like for amendment and explanation?—Undoubtedly. We all have to do it, both with sergeants and constables, the Sub-Inspector and myself.
61. Have you ever noticed or heard of any one sergeant or officer being singled out for having his reports sent back for amendment?—No; they are all treated the same, myself included.
62. Do you think Mr. Watson had any ground for making complaint regarding my conduct, as far as you know?—Certainly not.
63. You were present all the time?—I was, and no one could take exception either to your manner or to the way you addressed him.

JOHN WILLIAM MARTIN DART, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 277.)

Witness: I am in charge of the training depot. I was enrolled on the 1st February, 1900.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Had you been in charge of a station at all? You had been doing mounted duty?—During the first four months I did street duty in Auckland. I was then offered the position of mounted man, and remained for three and a half years mounted. In January, 1904, I went to Inspector Cullen's office as clerk. In February, 1906, the position at the training depot became vacant through the promotion of Sergeant Gordon, and I was appointed temporarily. Three weeks later I was appointed permanently, and I was appointed sergeant the same year. I have been in charge of the depot ever since.

2. Have you any general remarks to make?—When promoted, I was promoted over the heads of three hundred others, which is the most extreme case of its kind. I have not got quite ten years' service, and am thirty-seven years of age. What do you care for me to deal with—the whole work in the depot?

3. Give us evidence as you think proper?—At present the men are in the depot usually for two months. During my time the period has sometimes been only six weeks, for two reasons: Increases have been authorised in the strength, and there have been numerous retirements, resignations, and dismissals; and, owing to the inadequate accommodation at Mount Cook, we have not been able to put them there. Of late they are kept in for two months.

4. Are they sent out by you on selection?—The procedure is that when they come to the depot I keep them for three weeks or a month, and I then ask for instructions as to when they are to be posted. When I receive instructions as to when they are to go out I have to cut my coat according to the cloth. I suggest that the term should be three months, which is, apparently, 50 per cent. longer than at present; but there would be, in reality, more than 50 per cent. advantage. Some have done no reading, writing, or study of any kind for fifteen years, and for the first month they are at sea. During the last month I consider the advantages would be twice as great as at present. In addition, it would be possible to send them out on practical duty in charge of constables, and take them to Court. At present I am supposed to do that during the last ten days, but I feel that if I did I would not have time to cover the necessary ground in other respects of their training.

5. What is the maximum number you keep there?—Sixteen.

6. What is the average number you have got?—About eleven. We have now a depot which accommodates sixteen men. If the term were increased to three months it would be possible sometimes to take in as many as twenty men. We could accommodate twenty men, except as regards sleeping-accommodation, which is only provided for eighteen. If we had a gymnasium we could accommodate two more, and that would meet requirements for ten years to come. The men have fatigue duty from 6 a.m. to 6.30, instruction from 9 to 11, at 11 physical drill, from 1.30 to 3.45 instruction in the class-room, at 4.15 physical exercise. In the evening some are allowed leave; four are required to remain on reserve. The leave is allowed if their conduct is good and they are not backward in their work. Sergeant Mathieson looks after the men while I am away. On Thursday evenings they have no leave, as there is a lecture on first aid by the Police Surgeon. I do not live on the premises, but generally arrive about 8.30 a.m.; and on three or four mornings each week I make a full inspection. I go home at 5 p.m., but I have to come back on Thursday evenings, and occasionally on other evenings as well. I have a good deal of work to do otherwise, correcting reports and so forth. While I am absent the men are in charge of Sergeant Mathieson, who lives on the premises. He goes around the barracks, and invariably sees that the men are all in. It is an arrangement which works satisfactorily; he and I work in harmony; and I am of opinion that he is a very suitable man for it. In the matter of instruction, we first deal with the Police Regulations. Every regulation is gone carefully over and explained. In some cases they are out of date, and I would suggest that they be amended.

Mr. Dinnie: There is a proof here.

Witness: We then deal with the Police Offences Act, which is gone through very carefully; then with the Crimes Act. We deal with the procedure under the Justices of the Peace Act, procedure in summary cases, the issue and service of summonses and warrants, indictable offences triable summarily, the Licensing Act, the Gaming Act, Second-hand Dealers Act, the Coroners Act, Juvenile Offenders Act, Industrial Schools Act, &c. Of course, in these there are only a few sections necessary for a junior constable to know. Then, towards the close of the term we deal with the law of evidence, and of course the sections in our own Evidence Act are considered in that. Dealing with the educational standard, I have considered the question not only during the past few days, but ever since I have been there. I think there is one aspect that has been lost sight of. I believe that if you are going to accept a lower standard of education you are necessarily going to accept a lower standard of intelligence. I have often been told that the Fourth Standard will make as good a policeman as the Fifth, provided he is bright and intelligent. The trouble is that the man is generally not bright and intelligent. I do not think that is very extraordinary. I believe this: that where boys have passed the Fourth Standard and no more, in nine cases out of ten it is not because they have not had the same opportunities, but because they have been too dull and stupid to take advantage of their opportunities. It is not always so, of course: there may be a case where a boy has been taken away from school, and has had no chance; but this is the exception rather than the rule; and I find that ever since I have been in the training depot it has been the almost universal rule that the man with the worst education is naturally the most dull, and not only the most dull in the class-room, but on the drill-ground. There have been exceptions to this, but very rarely. The position is this: We have a scarcity of candidates, and the object in reducing the educational standard, I take it, is to have a wider field for selection. Some time ago, with the object of ascertaining whether my views on the question were sound, I called on the Secretary for Education and the Inspector-General, who were very good in placing their experience and information at my disposal. They have not altered my opinion. The Inspector-General says that if we admitted those who had passed the Fourth Standard we should not increase the field of selection by more than from eight to ten. It is not worth it. Although it might admit one suitable man whom we are now excluding, you might get in ten or twenty unsuitable ones, whom it is our object to keep out as much as we can. My opinion is that the educational standard should not be reduced. If it is proposed to reduce it, I think it should be only on this condition: that men when coming to the depot must be further examined on essential points of education so far as the police are concerned, and if unfit should be rejected without being put into training.

7. The Commissioner.] Apparently, in New South Wales they require no standard at all: that would, I suppose, be subject to the individual requirements of the person called upon to pass them?—I do not attach much importance to arithmetic, geography, and history; I attach more to ability to express one's-self readily on paper. Dealing with the case of men who have come in during the last five years whose physical development has not been up to previous standard, I take it to be so, because it is seldom I get a squad with a height of 5 ft. 9 in. and a 38 in. normal chest. In regard to height, during three and a half years only three men have come in under 5 ft. 9 in.; one is not now in the service. I speak of men who go through the training depot; but I have no reason to believe any are under height. In regard to intellect, I am of opinion there is not much to complain of. Some of our officers and some of our sergeants expect too much from recruits who come out after two months' training. They are too apt to compare these men with themselves as they are now rather than compare them with what they were when they first joined the Force. I thought when the matter came up some time ago it would be a fair test to put to a squad to ask them to write a report on some ordinary subject. Several suitable subjects were put into a hat, and one drawn out, and they were told to at once write a report. The men had been twenty-eight days in the depot. I have them here sealed for you to look at. I think it is a fair test of whether a man has enough common-sense and intelligence to make a policeman. One report is written by a man who subsequently resigned because he thought himself not qualified to get a certificate. If you choose to compare these reports with some first reports put in by some older men who come and complain of the intellectual standard of the men they are getting I think (although I have not

read them) you will find they will not suffer by the comparison. Since I took charge three and a half years ago 269 men have come into the depot: ten of them resigned voluntarily, and eleven were discharged as unfit. Of the ten voluntary resignations, five can really be classed as unfit, because they resigned on my advice as being unable to pass the examination if they remained. It can fairly be said, then, that of 269 sixteen were discharged as unfit, and 248 have been sworn in. I have looked carefully through the list of these men, and have come to the conclusion that of these, 225 were perfectly suitable men intellectually and educationally, and twenty-three were inferior, and under ordinary circumstances we would have been better without them. I say under ordinary circumstances because you will understand there is a difficulty in keeping the Force up to the authorised strength, and we are unable to pick and choose.

8. Those men who, practically on your advice, resigned on account of proved inability to pass the examination would have come up with a Fifth Standard certificate: how do you account for that?—Sometimes they come with a certificate given recently by a schoolmaster. I do not attach any importance to that, nor consider it worth more than the paper it is written on. I do not say in all cases it is so, but in some cases it is.

9. It strikes one as peculiar that you should have to reject men who had passed an examination of this sort?—I attach no importance to examination certificates at all. My idea is to find out what class of men I have to deal with, so I get them into a room and ask them to write a short essay or letter on some subject they are all familiar with. If a man has an idea at all he can deal with a subject with which he is familiar. In most cases I get excellently written essays. I make them read, and ask them to spell a few words, and I have an idea at once what sort of men I have. I forward this to the Commissioner, and suggest whether they should be discharged or allowed to remain another fortnight, and subsequently a report is made.

10. Would it be safe to modify the first qualification, and leave it to the officer in charge of the training depot to satisfy himself?—No; it would be impracticable; it takes some time to get a squad together. If you have a squad of sixteen, and reject five or six, before you could have them replaced a fortnight would have elapsed, and it would throw the whole thing out of gear. I would leave it as it is, and still reserve the right to reject a man.

11. But it is not a Fifth Standard test according to what you say; if it were, I would say, "Let it stop"?—It has been found to work fairly well. I would not say a man who had not passed the standard should not now go and get a certificate, because sometimes it is of value. I think we ought to have a small gymnasium at the training depot, where the men could exercise in the evening and by day when unable to go on the drill-ground. It could be built at a cost of £300 or £400, and advantage could be taken at the same time, if we are to have an extra period of three months, to provide extra sleeping-accommodation.

12. Would there be any difficulty, if it were found necessary to provide facilities for physical training throughout the Force, in utilising the police ground elsewhere or here for the purpose?—So far as regards our ground, the gymnasium should be there. I am personally of opinion that a physical instructor should be appointed. His first work would be not in the training depot now, but to make a tour of the colony, and spend a month or six weeks in all the centres.

13. But there are no facilities in all the centres except in one?—I see no reason why we should not get a suitable room anywhere, the idea being eventually to supply a gymnasium at each centre. When he has done that work his work would lie with recruits entirely.

14. They are using them now as vehicles for getting rid of superfluous energy?—Yes; there is nothing against it; but if they had instruction in this sort of thing it would save them from injury, and they would be able to handle prisoners much more easily, and it would save prisoners from injury. In regard to the position the instructor occupies in the training depot, I should like to say, though I am making no complaint, when I first came the Commissioner told me I should get the rank of station sergeant, but I should take the ordinary sergeant's rank first. When I had been there three years I asked him to make his promise good. I do not regard it as an absolute promise. He said, "You will have the rank of station sergeant, but must take an ordinary sergeant first."

15. Would you regard that to mean the creation of a fifth station sergeant?—Yes; and there is good reason for having it, because I understand when the rank was made Station Sergeant Gordon was practically appointed a station sergeant to remain at the training depot, but a vacancy occurred in the ranks of Sub-Inspectors, and he got that instead. I do not think it would any more than compensate a man for what he is losing. Take my position. Men junior to me as sergeants are now getting charge of stations, and are better off than I am, and, although I get a special allowance of 1s., it does not make up for the increased house-rent I have to pay. I get 10s. 6d. house-allowance, and pay actually 15s.; the rent of the house is 17s. 6d., but for private reasons I only pay 15s.

16. You think the status of the man in charge of the depot should be advanced?—I do; not necessarily at first; but when a man has been there two or three years, or becomes entitled to a station as a sergeant, he should have the rank of station sergeant. Unless you do that, if a man is losing by staying in the depot, assuming he is capable of doing the work, you cannot expect him to stay willingly. The position, I know, although you may have been told it is an exceedingly soft one—

17. I have not been told so?—It is common to speak of these jobs as staff billets.

18. It has never been suggested as regards yours?—I should like to say the work is exceedingly trying: it is the most trying work I have ever had. I say honestly—I do not care whether I am there or not—I would just as soon go out and do practical police duty; but I believe when a man has been there three years, or is entitled to a station as a sergeant, if he is capable of doing the work, you must make it worth his while.

19. Are you aware there is a proposal to do away with station sergeants?—Yes, to create senior sergeants.

20. How does that affect what you urge on me now?—I base my recommendation on the present position. Assuming that fifteen or twenty senior sergeants were appointed, and the rank of station sergeant is done away with, I say, at least, the instructor at the training depot should be a senior sergeant. On the subject of pay, it seems to me the public are demanding a better Police Force than we have. If that is so, you will have to provide increased pay and improved positions: I have spoken of the physical standard and the intellectual standard. There is another view to take. At present, no doubt, we get a good many applications from men who are not in constant employment—not who belong to the unemployed, but who are in work to-day and out of work to-morrow. I know that is so, because I know of instances where men apply to have their names on the list, and have subsequently got a good steady billet, and apply to have their names taken off the list. We get some of these men; they are not the best men. The best are those who hold good steady billets, but with not much prospect in front of them. We have got to make it worth their while to join the Force, and we cannot do that at 7s. 6d. a day. If we are to induce this class of men, the pay must be increased to 8s. 6d. a day. A suggestion has been made of an increase of 6d.; but I think that is only tinkering with the question, and will not gain the object we want—namely, to induce the best class of men—unless we increase it by 1s.—make it from 8s. 6d. to 10s., with an increment of 6d. every three years. If that were done the 1s. house-allowance would be quite satisfactory. It would mean increasing the pay in the different ranks all round; but if this were done, it would mean an improvement in the general conditions, and additional inducement for a better class of men to join; and even then we shall have by a long way the cheapest Force in Australasia. The pay of sergeants should go from 11s. to 14s., and also of detectives, who should be put on the same footing, without prejudice, however, to any detective who at present is classed as such, and draws 15s. I would put station sergeants and Chief Detectives or senior sergeants and Chief Detectives on the same footing—from 15s. to 17s., with increments of 1s. every three years and 12s. 6d. house-allowance. Sub-Inspectors would have to go up. Every person is agreed he is the most hardly worked and worst-paid man in the service. I think it is wrong when a man has to devote from twenty to thirty of the best years of his life in order to be made a Sub-Inspector, and has got to work in some cases twelve to fourteen hours a day. I would make his pay from £320 to £340, with increments of £10 every two years, and £60 house-allowance. Inspectors in outside districts should get from £350 to £410, with increments of £10, and £60 house-allowance; and in the centres, £420 to £460, with increments of £10, and £70 house-allowance. Probationary constables coming into the depot should have 7s. 6d. a day. At present they get 6s. Perhaps an increase of 1s. 6d. seems a large one to ask for, but amongst these men we have married men, and it is a pity to stop them. The best men we get are married men. We propose to give them three months' training in the depot. You bring a man in and give him 6s. a day, and out of that you deduct 2s. 3d. for messing, and leave him with 3s. 9d. a day to keep a wife and perhaps one or two children in some other part of the colony, and three months later you expect to swear him in free of debt. It is quite impossible. There would not be a great additional cost if you gave them 7s. 6d. a day. In regard to travelling-allowance, a constable should have 6s., and travel second class on trains and steerage on a steamer; but a married constable, travelling with his wife and family, should travel saloon. Station sergeants and sergeants, Chief Detectives and detectives, should get 8s., and travel first class by rail and steamer. On the subject of promotion, of course there will always be a good deal of discontent; but I do not think so much as hitherto. There always has been a great deal of discontent on this subject, and always will be so long as the present system prevails; or, rather, as long as the present lack of system prevails. You cannot promote men by seniority alone; that is rubbish; and the only question is how far down the list you may go before you promote a man. You may be sure the further down the list you go the louder will be the protest from the men you have passed over. And there is no test; therefore there is no complete answer. Therefore, you get discontent, and allegations of political influence, which to some extent are true; and you get a Commission; and you will have them every three or four years, unless you establish some system that will work. When you have a Commission it is quite easy for these men to bring before it any number of witnesses; they can fill the Court with witnesses, all willing to testify to their ability; but when all is done, you are no further than before. The allegations of political influence are to some extent true, and I believe you will have it as long as you give the present loophole for it. And I believe also that it is the lack of system that makes in some cases the determining factor the amount of political "pull" a man has. I think the Department and the Minister are all anxious to run straight in the matter if you give them a chance; but we have got to give them a chance—to arm them against their own friends; establish a system if you can, and make it law. It is easy to do that. You can make it law by embodying it in the Police Regulations. Then, if any man is promoted improperly, in breach of the regulations, any one definitely affected would be able to go to the Supreme Court and ask for redress. That would put it above the Commissioner or the Government to permit political influence to be of any effect. In speaking of promotion, I do not only mean the promotion of constable to sergeant, or sergeant to senior sergeant: there are degrees below that, although they do not appear—such as promoting a man from the street to charge of a station, or to clerical work, or to acting-detective work, or important duties. I think, in the making of all promotions, including these, there should be four dominating factors—first, the passing of an examination; secondly, a man's record as a policeman, as shown by the defaulter's sheet and the record or his merit sheet; thirdly, any special qualifications necessary for the particular vacancy; and fourth and last, seniority. Under our regulations at present, it will be seen by referring to No. 60, seniority and good conduct—which I am afraid means lack of bad conduct—are regarded practically as the only

requirements for promotion. Merit is not mentioned at all; if implied, it comes in purely as an afterthought. Now, it is a common thing to find comparatively young men coming to the top in commercial life and professional life and even church life, for we have the instance the other day of Dr. Lang being made Archbishop of York at the age of forty-four. We should not lag behind nor become fossilised because we belong to a Police Force. An examination was started by the Commissioner three or four years ago, and the effect was excellent. In my knowledge, many constables have derived benefit through devoting themselves to a course of study, and have acquired more information in the course of a few months than they would have in as many years if they had not taken the trouble to go through it. But, unfortunately, it is rapidly developing into a farce, and it is a great pity it should. The men are given to understand, quite properly, that the passing of this examination is to have a beneficial effect upon them if applying for any position of trust. I will refer to a case that was mentioned in Dunedin merely as an illustration. There were two men, Lennon and Skinner, who applied for a position in Mr. O'Brien's office. I believe both were thoroughly competent to fill it, and I do not intend my remarks to be considered disparaging to either of them. Skinner had been under Mr. O'Brien for some years, and he recommended him as a useful man for clerk, and as suitable, being a discreet man. Their seniority was equal, both having been sworn in on the same day. Skinner had passed the examination and the other man had not. Yet the other man got the position. If you are going to do that sort of thing, you induce the belief that the examination is worthless, and the men will not go up for it. I have always strongly advised men going out of the depot to go up for the examination and pass it; but one hardly feels justified in doing so if the men point out that this sort of thing is done. Take the case of Constable Jackson, who complained of not being promoted. He said the answer was given him that he had not passed the examination. I say that ought to be a complete answer to a constable; but it was not, because, as he pointed out, he could mention twenty who had been promoted who had not passed the examination. The examination I suggest should, first of all, be a general one for competence, for which any constable of more than twelve months' service might present himself. That could be conducted as at present—papers set in the Commissioner's office, supervised by the police. No constable should be appointed as mounted man or acting-detective or to clerical work or in charge of a station unless he has passed that examination. Then, there should be a senior examination, for which any constable of six years' service or more should present himself. Papers should be set by a Stipendiary Magistrate, and the examination conducted and supervised by persons appointed by some one unconnected with the Police Force. This would commence the weeding-out process from the bottom, and eventually it would not be necessary to have any further examination. At present, however, as so many have risen without test, it would be advisable to institute a further examination, controlled like the last, for non-commissioned officers, to find out if they are eligible to rise to the position of officers. These views meet with a good deal of opposition, but one expects that. My opinion is that unless we provide some such test as this there will be no means of checking political influence, and no means of stopping the complaints of men about the promotion of their juniors. If I may use myself as an illustration, considering I was promoted over so many men, you have had comparatively few complaints about my promotion. Why? Because I submitted to a test which most other men did not. That is an illustration. If there is a test, you have an answer. This is a matter that has got to be settled for all time; it is not a matter of smoothing things over, and frightening members and others from exerting influence for twelve months. It is useless to say the Commissioner will not allow political influence. It is a matter of common knowledge that the late Commissioner fought the matter for years, and, as the result, he went Home, and now lives in retirement. The Commissioner is as much under the Minister as I am under the Commissioner, and if he will not do as the Government wish, they will tell him he need not stay in the service. It is not fair to blame the Commissioner, even if it does exist. On the subject of promotion to the rank of station sergeant, I do not think any constable should be so promoted unless beyond all doubt he is qualified to rise to higher rank. I am forced to say this because of a position that has arisen. It is extremely bad form for a comparatively young man to appear to be criticizing a man old enough to be his father, but the position makes it necessary to refer to it. Station Sergeant King has apparently been passed over for promotion. I do not know him at all; I have only spoken to him once, and I do not know whether he is a capable man or not; but the impression we have is that he was passed over because he is not qualified for a higher position. It is unfair to him and unfair to those under him. Assuming it is so, and this rank becomes filled, where are those below?

21. The proposal is to have senior sergeants, and to have more of them?—I cannot base my recommendations on proposals. I am dealing with the position as it is. Assuming it is so, and a vacancy occurs in the rank of Sub-Inspector, the Commissioner has to look somewhere—either to the station sergeants or Chief Detectives; he might have to look to the latter for two or three promotions to the rank of Sub-Inspector. I would point out that, as they comprise only fifty of the service, and the uniform branch numbers 750, this would be hardly fair. I attach some importance to this point. A man should not be appointed to the rank of station sergeant unless he is qualified to fill a higher position. On the subject of promotions as between the detective branch and the uniform branch, I should like to say, first, that I am of opinion that detectives should be eligible for the highest rank. I think, until you reached Auckland, the question had hardly been put to you from the uniform branch at all; a good deal more had been put by the detective side, especially by Mr. McGrath. He made what seems to us to be a most outrageous proposal—that the Chief Detective should be on a level with a Sub-Inspector, and eligible for promotion direct to the rank of Inspector. We expected him to be faithful to his old love, having been many years in the detective branch. He said that branch was the right arm of the service. That may be so; but the uniform branch is the backbone of the service, and it comprises 750, whereas the

detective branch numbers only fifty. At the time of Mr. McGrath's promotion as Sub-Inspector I reported on this subject fully, because I considered we ought to know what our position was. Up to then we understood the officers were uniform men, and vacancies should be filled entirely from the uniform branch. We were led to believe that first of all, because no detective had been appointed to the rank of officer since Mr. O'Brien, and secondly, because detectives are paid out of all proportion to uniform men, and thirdly, because our regulations practically say so. It says distinctly in the regulations that the police shall be divided into preventive and detective branches. It would be possible to argue that promotions from detectives to the uniform branch are improper, but we do not take up that situation. If the chance of promotion is to be lessened to us it makes a difference to us, because many have stayed in the uniform branch and foregone the higher pay of the detective branch because they believed they would get greater facility for rising to the rank of officer. I would draw attention to the Commissioner's minute to the Minister of Justice: "If the interests of the public service are to be studied, no definite regulation can be framed in respect to promotion. To have an efficient service we must have the most capable men in the higher ranks, and Chief Detectives cannot be barred from further promotion. For instance, if we have a Chief Detective fitted for promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector, and have no uniform officer senior to him fitted for that position, then the Chief Detective should be appointed, and *vice versa*. Take Sergeant Dart's own case, for instance. He was appointed a sergeant over many others when he had only six years' service because of his special qualifications, and because I had no one else senior to him suitable for the position he had to occupy; and apparently he was well satisfied with my action in selecting him. Chief Detective McGrath was a specially qualified officer for promotion, and I had no one else in the uniform branch senior to him I could recommend. Besides, he is an officer with twenty-six years' service, whereas Sub-Inspector Hendrey, promoted at the same time, was only three years his senior, and the next promotion may be a uniform officer much junior in service to either. It will therefore be seen that, although the detective branch receive a higher rate of pay, as they do in all Police Forces, to cover out-of-pocket expenses during their investigations, and because of their special qualifications, it would be unjust to bar them in any way from promotion to the higher ranks. This is the only intimation I have had of any dissatisfaction existing." I draw your attention particularly to one point in this minute, where he says, "For instance, if we have a Chief Detective fitted for promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector, and have no uniform officer senior to him fitted for that position, then the Chief Detective should be appointed, and *vice versa*." That is what he laid down, and what the Minister has approved. I doubt whether they realise what this means. It means this: In looking for your promotion, you have only two places to look—station sergeants and Chief Detectives. There are five Chief Detectives in the colony and four station sergeants. Assuming they are of equal average ability—which is a fair assumption, I think—it means you have five promotions from the detective branch to every four from the uniform branch. Now, as the latter comprises 750, and the other about fifty, if this is fair, I confess I am quite unable to see it; and especially if you remember that Chief Detectives attain the rank with few years of service, while station sergeants in most cases serve from twenty-five to thirty-three years before they get there. A detective down south told you they were disappointed at the attitude taken up by the late Minister, but if this attitude is to be taken up by the present Minister the uniform men will be equally affected, because it will destroy the efficiency of the uniform branch by removing the chief incentive to efficiency—a reasonable chance of promotion. We do not say detectives should be barred altogether, although they have privileges in the way of enormously increased pay. We believe if they have ability, as well as any one else, they should be allowed to rise to the rank of Inspector. But it is only fair that promotion should be as nearly as possible in proportion to the numerical strength of the two branches. During the course of training of men in the depot, I gave them every week a short examination, to show how they are progressing in their work; and before they pass out I set a final examination, and these papers are marked and submitted to the Commissioner, who decides whether they have passed. In the depot the men have also to pass through the St. John's ambulance course in first aid. I have passed it myself, and hold the society's efficiency certificate, and I assist them in this work towards the close of their training. I think I ought to say, in justice to myself, for the past two years and a half there has been only one failure. These examinations are not conducted by me or the Department. I want to touch on the position of the clerical staff, because it has been assumed that the uniform men are almost entirely opposed to them. I believe a period of training in one of the offices—either the Commissioner's or an Inspector's—would be an excellent training, and almost a necessity for a future Inspector; and if you are going to disassociate the clerical staff from the rest of the Force, it would mean that none of the best men would offer for it. That would be a loss. The more clerks we can get to come out of the office after years of training, and mingle with the uniform men, the better for the service. There is an impression that there has been unfair competition between the uniform men and the clerks. I am unable to see that. It will be conceded that if not one of the present district clerks had been promoted to sergeant, or if one were reduced to the rank of constable to-morrow, there would not be a single additional vacancy for a uniform constable for promotion. So I do not think there is any unfair competition so far. But it might arise. A constable as a district clerk obtains promotion to the rank of sergeant in ten years; let us say a constable from the uniform branch gets it in fourteen years; the clerical man has four years' advantage, and, as he requires the more qualifications, it is only fair he should do so; but he should not be allowed to make use of this too much. Take the case of the last man promoted—Cunningham, district clerk at Napier: If he chose to say to-morrow, "I do not want clerical work," and were to apply for a transfer to uniform, that would be unfair. And that is where there might be unfair competition between the clerical and the uniform branch. This could be got over in this way: By laying down that no clerical sergeant shall be transferred to another branch as sergeant unless he has been at least five years a sergeant,

or has at least fifteen years' service. Then there could be no unfair competition at all. One other point in connection with our clerical staff: There may be unfair competition between sergeants in uniform and those already promoted. We doubt whether it would be proper to further promote a clerical sergeant to the rank of station sergeant or higher; but it may not be advisable to lay that down as a rule. My own opinion is if we can get these men as sergeants, and let them after five years come back into uniform, so much the better for the service. But others coming in get ready to replace them. No clerk should have a higher rank than that of sergeant except the Chief Clerk in the Commissioner's Office, who should be an Inspector. I do not say who it should be, but a Chief Clerk must necessarily, in police routine matters, control the clerical portion of the service; if he does not, he has no right to be there; he would be no relief to the Commissioner, who must be frequently away on duties of inspection, and necessarily the routine work falls on the Chief Clerk. A complaint has been made that you have a Sub-Inspector dictating to an Inspector. I would not call it dictating, but it may have that appearance. I say therefore he should have the rank of Inspector.

22. Do you think it necessary he should have police rank at all?—I think so.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards a period of probation under your instruction you suggest another month. You do not know that I have made application that they should have another month?—No.

24. Would you suggest they should be trained in shooting?—I do not know anything about it. It seems an excellent thing if the police could become the nucleus of a Defence Force, but I am very ignorant on the subject.

25. *The Commissioner.*] You have given no thought to any particular way it could be carried out in connection with the training? It seems to me of great importance—not as things are, but as they might be?—I would impress upon you the fact that I am so entirely ignorant of military training that my opinion is of no value.

26. All we want is to make the men decent shots?—I would suggest that you should question a witness who you may have before you—Sergeant Gaffney—on this point; he has had some years of Artillery training.

27. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You heard Sergeant Hodgson as regards the conduct of the recruits?—I might explain. You have been shown the system in vogue at Mount Cook. On the occasion to which I understand he refers we had a suspicion of wild conduct on the part of one or two, and took steps to detect it. I came down several nights to be present with Sergeant Rutledge, and we allowed the men additional facilities, so as to have an opportunity of seeing if any were addicted to drink. We did not detect anything. I believe there was something in the suggestion that one man on one occasion took too much, but we did our very best to detect it, and failed. We did everything we could reasonably be expected to do.

28. The supervision is generally strict?—Yes.

29. You have referred to the case of Lennon and Skinner: are you aware that Lennon was scarcely fit for active duty at the time?—I have heard it.

30. And that was the reason?—I do not approve of the reason; it is a dangerous thing to put a premium on cripples.

31. It is not suggested he could not pass the examination?—But he did not; if he could, why did he not do so? If he was laid up as a cripple, there was additional opportunity for him to study. I say every consideration should be shown to a man who receives an injury, but I do not think that consideration should be by way of promotion. I have seen it occur before. I remember a case in which a sergeant was sent in charge of a central station, although junior to others, because he had received some little injury in the execution of his duty. It caused an immense amount of dissatisfaction, and always will. A position not in the way of promotion might have been found.

32. There might have been another reason for it?—I could not say.

33. You say promotion should be by examination, by records, and special qualification?—Yes, and seniority.

34. How are men promoted now?—Not by examination, I understand. So far as the other conditions are concerned, I think they would apply.

35. *The Commissioner.*] You attach considerable importance to the examination?—Yes.

36. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think every man ought to pass an examination before becoming a sergeant?—Yes.

37. You believe in the clerks all being police officers?—Yes.

38. Do you think a system might be adopted by which they could be sent out after being so long in the clerical branch?—I would say, "induced" to go out. The understanding should be, if they chose to remain, they should hold no higher rank than that of sergeant; but I would induce them to go out.

39. You do not think we should compel them to go out?—No.

40. Inspectors do not care for a change?—The change would come harder if you forced them out.

41. What do you say as regards general dissatisfaction in the service?—I do not know of any, except on the question of promotion; and I regard it as no more than normal.

42. As regards the conduct of the men, what do you think of it as a body?—It is about normal. We have practically of late years more cases of misconduct on the part of constables and of drunkenness, because the supervision by the sectional sergeants is very much more strict. The older men tell extraordinary tales of what went on, and the sergeants were in many cases as bad as the constables. There were no cases of complaints against constables, because the sergeants could not afford to make them.

43. *The Commissioner.*] The logical inference is that the *morale* of the service has improved?—I think so.

44. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It is strict supervision that shows defaulters up?—Yes.
45. You believe in the system of classes at the various centres?—Yes, if properly conducted.
46. As regards influence, you do not know of any cases?—I have no absolute evidence; I do not care to say what I have merely heard.
47. If I say no influence has obtained I am in a position to know?—I have no option but to believe you. On the subject of influence, I understand that on the West Coast Sergeant Dew, in giving evidence, stated it would take a great deal to make him believe Sergeant Dart obtained his promotion except by political influence. I was rather surprised at Sergeant Dew, who I regard as a decent fellow, going out of his way to mention me by name, when he submitted no proof of what he suggests. However, I am on my oath, and I say most emphatically that I used absolutely no influence of any kind to get the rank of sergeant, nor did I even ask for it. I took it that I would get it as a matter of course, and I did.
48. *The Commissioner.*] What do you think should be the maximum age at which men should be admitted to the Force?—Thirty, as at present.
49. Would you be in favour of compelling men, whether they had previous service or not, to go through the depot?—Yes; previous service means that the training at the depot is of additional advantage. Many of these men have been admitted without going through the depot in order to keep pace with requirements. If we made the service sufficiently attractive to induce more recruits, there would be no necessity for that.
50. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Have you had any occasion to report probationers' conduct?—Yes.
51. Do you remember the case of McGrath and Shannon? Do you think absolute justice was given effect to in that case?—I say it was. What was done I did. No one knew anything about it.
52. What are your hours of attendance during the week?—I come at 8.30; I lunch from 12 to 1.30; I leave at 5. I come back every Thursday for three hours, and occasionally other evenings. In addition to that, I work at home, correcting reports and examination papers.
53. Who looks after the depot in your absence?—Sergeant Mathieson.
54. Is he instructed to do so?—Yes. When he came to the station I told him what his duty was, and he accepted it as such. I could not instruct him, because he is senior to me.
55. Should he not have instructions from a higher authority?—There is no necessity for it.
56. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As long as it works in that way it is quite satisfactory?—Yes.
57. *The Commissioner.*] It is a kind of mutual arrangement between the two sergeants?—Yes.

HUBERT McCORRIE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 278.)

Witness: I am stationed at Mount Cook. I was enrolled in January, 1896.

1. *The Commissioner.*] And since promotion you have been stationed at Mount Cook?—Yes.
2. How old were you when promoted?—Forty-one.
3. Since then you have been doing sectional duty?—Yes.
4. How do you find the conduct of the men under your supervision generally?—The conduct of the men at Mount Cook is of the best—of the highest order. I do not know much about other stations.
5. What do you think should be the maximum age at which a sergeant should be promoted, having regard to your own experience?—Not over forty-five, and that he should be medically examined too.
6. Do you think it would be of advantage to have a period of probation for the younger constables after coming out of the depot?—I would be in favour of twelve months' probation.
7. You do not think twelve months rather long? You see, they will be three months in the depot; that will give them nine months afterwards?—I do not think it is too long; it takes some time to find a man out at times.
8. And you think it is desirable to have a long period?—Yes.
9. Have you noticed any drinking amongst any of the men?—I have not noticed the sign of drink on one man since I have been at Mount Cook.
10. And you believe that it does not exist?—Yes.
11. Have you any general remarks to make?—I attended a general meeting of the sergeants held in Wellington, and I agree with the resolutions put in yesterday, with a few alterations.
12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know anything about the inquiries made regarding candidates?—Yes.
13. Are they strictly carried out?—Yes.
14. Would you suggest any stricter method?—I could not.
15. You have heard about the conduct of the men. I suppose you do not know much about the Lambton Quay Station?—As far as I see, their conduct is good.
16. You do not know of any sergeant who is addicted to drink?—I do not.
17. What do you say regarding the efficiency of the Force at the present time?—It is equal to anything since I joined.
18. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction as to the control of the Force?—I do not.
19. Is there any drinking amongst the men as far as you know?—I have not seen a sign of it since I went to Mount Cook; their sobriety is exceptional.
20. Have Mr. Arnold's remarks caused dissatisfaction?—The men at Mount Cook resented them.
21. *Inspector Ellison.*] You served under me for a couple of years at Christchurch?—I did.
22. Had you any complaints as to the way in which I spoke to you?—No.
23. A few days ago I spoke on a matter of duty: did I speak in a proper tone?—You did.

DAVID STEWART, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 279.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You were enrolled in June, 1889?—Yes; I was transferred from the Armed Constabulary.
2. And promoted on the 1st March, 1908?—Yes.
3. Since then, where have you been stationed?—Mount Cook.
4. Doing sectional duty?—Yes.
5. How do you find the men?—Most satisfactory—smart, clean, active, and intelligent.
6. You have no trouble with drinking, or anything of that sort?—No.
7. Do you think that physical training would be an advantage?—No, sir.
8. Why not?—I think one ounce of tact in suppressing a street row is worth all the training I ever saw. I know one or two great gymnasts, and they thought nothing of making an unfortunate prisoner suffer.
9. But if you get into a street row?—You will always get the crowd to consider you if you are right; that is my experience in Wellington.
10. I am glad to hear that Wellington crowds are like that; I have seen the reverse in other parts?—It would probably depend on the character of the constable.
11. You do not see any necessity for a gymnasium?—I do not approve of it.
12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of the character of candidates' inquiries?—Yes; I have had to make them.
13. From the time they left school to their application?—Yes.
14. What about the efficiency of the Force at the present time?—I have been in close touch with it for twenty-eight years, and it is higher intelligently, physically, and morally. Why, I remember long ago, when they had whiskers down to their breast, and never arrested a drunken woman because they would get their whiskers pulled.
15. Would you suggest that they should be shaved, clean entirely?—I do not know, sir.
16. You do not know anything of the sergeants drinking?—No.
17. You never heard it suggested?—No.
18. As regards general dissatisfaction, is there any?—It is rather hard on married men here; the house-rent is so exceptionally high.
19. And the pay?—Sixpence a day more would make a big improvement.
20. Keep them quiet?—I think it would.
21. Do you know of any drinking amongst the men?—No.
22. You consider them well behaved?—Exceptionally.
23. *Inspector Ellison.*] How long have you been in Wellington?—Three years and a half.
24. And you have done a good deal of work directly under me. How have I treated you?—Exceptionally well; you rendered me very valuable assistance in quoting the Criminal Code, and in suppressing brothels, bludgers, and others of the criminal class.
25. Some people say I am very uncivil to them?—That was quite uncalled for; I read it in the papers.
26. *The Commissioner.*] From where were you promoted?—From Manners Street Station; I was in charge there for two years.
27. You had nineteen years' service when promoted?—Yes.
28. Had you ever been recommended before that?—I never troubled.

NORMAN DOW ABBOTT, Acting-Detective, further examined. (No. 280.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] I have been requested to ask you a question in connection with Dr. Sharman's discharge of his duties as Police Surgeon in Auckland?—All I can say is that he attended me very satisfactorily.
2. I never questioned his competency; all I wanted to know from you was, was there a lack of general confidence in him on the part of the police there?—I know there was some dissatisfaction, but I did not speak of its nature. I was stationed at Newton, and did not come in contact with him to any great extent.
3. Did he attend you?—Yes, and my wife and three children.
4. Was he attentive?—Extremely attentive.
5. As far as you are concerned?—He gave me every attention.

THOMAS DUNCAN, Commission Agent, examined on oath. (No. 281.)

1. *Inspector Ellison.*] You have known me a good while?—Yes.
2. You have come to me repeatedly on business matters in connection with my duty?—Yes.
3. How were you treated?—Always most courteously and civilly.
4. Did you ever see any rudeness in me, or anything but my natural manner, which may be blunt and bluff?—It has always been cordial and courteous, as far as I was concerned.

WILLIAM MCGILL, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 282.)

Witness: I am attached to the Headquarters staff. I was enrolled on the 18th May, 1882; and promoted to be sergeant on the 1st January, 1903.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Where from?—Wellington district office.
2. You had been in the district office?—I had been doing office-work for eighteen years.
3. Were you district clerk?—I was assisting at the time, but I had been district clerk before that. I first commenced duty in 1882. From 1882 to 1888 I did mounted and detective duty, principally in Napier and Gisborne. In 1888 I was transferred to the watch-house, Wellington.

In 1892 I was taken into the office as second clerk. In 1896 Colonel Hume gave me 1s. a day extra, and took me in to the Head Office to assist in the accounts. In 1897 I was transferred as district clerk to New Plymouth. While there I was recommended for promotion by Inspector McGovern. I then came down to Wellington to take charge of the district office, as the present Sub-Inspector Wright had gone to America. In 1900 Commissioner Tunbridge gave me charge of the *Police Gazette*. In 1903 I was promoted to the rank of sergeant. In 1904 Commissioner Dinnie altered the *Gazette* from being fortnightly to weekly, and made a number of alterations, and last year introduced the system of sending out the photos. of prisoners with the *Gazette*, with their finger-print classification and *Gazette* reference. This has doubled the work, and improved the *Gazette* so much that it is one of the best, if not the best, published anywhere. I approached Mr. Dinnie for some consideration for the extra work, but he did not think very favourably of it.

4. Are you getting paid as a sergeant?—Yes.

5. What is that?—Twelve shillings per day.

6. And house-rent?—Ten shillings and sixpence.

7. And what else?—Clerical allowance, 2s. per day.

8. What more did you want?—More house-allowance.

9. To make an exception of you, or was it for the whole of you?—For the whole lot. I interviewed Mr. Dinnie. I also thought if any alteration was made, or any increase of salary given, he would take my case into consideration, as my predecessor held the rank of sergeant-major, and the one previous was a detective, and afterwards became Superintendent. The lodging was costing me about £1 4s. per week.

10. Is the 2s. per day a special allowance?—Yes; the Head Office has always got a special allowance, as it is supposed to be advanced pay for special work. Of course, the Head Office always did get that.

11. I am not questioning that, I am only asking you?—It was mentioned here that the *Gazette* was only four pages. Here are some copies of it [handing in file]. A comparison would be much better with the time when I took it over in 1899.

12. Let me have an average copy at the time you took it over and at the present day?—I will bring the two years. It is a publication which runs from ten and twelve up to twenty pages.

13. What are your particular duties in connection with it?—In England, the criminal reports must be signed by the Inspector or Superintendent before being sent for publication. In my case, they come direct to me from the men in charge of stations—men perhaps with very little experience. I have to go very carefully over them, to see that the proper offence is stated. I have to see that it is correctly published in the *Gazette*, so that the offender may be arrested and brought before the Court if necessary. The index also, from being yearly, is now half-yearly.

14. Do you compile that yourself?—Entirely. Recently, of course, I have had some assistance. The work was increasing to such an extent that I applied for assistance, and I get a man when it is absolutely necessary—one or two days a week, not more. His duty is between the finger-print department, the store, and myself.

15. Take the list of police districts, how often does that appear?—Once a year.

16. The Supreme and District Court sittings?—Once a year. Of course, I make extracts from the *New Zealand Gazette*.

17. At what time have you to be ready for publication?—I take it over to the Government Printer on a Monday, and it comes out on the Wednesday. The proof comes over on Tuesday afternoon, and the reading of that takes time. I check all the returns from the Inspectors' offices.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you consider the *Gazette* as good as any other coming from the States?—I think it is more complete. Our indexes compare favourably with any others I have ever seen.

19. You have been about Lambton Quay a good many years?—Twenty-one years.

20. Have you heard of any dissatisfaction?—The men are thoroughly contented, except one or two; they are very satisfied with your administration, and they have reason to be, because you have done more for them than any former Commissioner.

JOHN PATRICK HACKETT MCGUIRE, Sergeant and District Clerk, examined on oath. (No. 283.)

Witness: I am stationed at Wellington, in the district office. I was enrolled on the 15th May, 1894; and promoted on the 1st April, 1906.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Where were you promoted from?—The district office.

2. What experience have you had in a district office?—I have been just on ten years in the district office, Wellington.

3. And are now district clerk?—Since February, 1905.

4. Previous to that you had experience as an assistant clerk?—Yes, in the same office.

5. Is your experience limited to Wellington?—I had two years in Dunedin, and also some experience at Lambton Quay and Mount Cook.

6. Then, you had twelve years' service before promotion?—Just on twelve years.

7. How do the men compare to-day as assistant clerks and the men you have come in contact with?—It is much harder to get the same class of clerks as previously.

8. Do you mean, not so well educated?—Some are better educated, but do not make such good clerks; they are not so reliable. They write a good hand, but their work is slummed; secondly, when you come to look up records, you cannot trace them. If you get a man who writes a good hand, and is fairly intelligent and reliable, you can trace it.

9. How long do they remain there?—They want to get a country station after a year or two. I had one constable there three or four months ago who was successful.

10. The Commissioner has told me that there are very few men who apply for it?—Not many.

11. We have disposed of that?—I notice that there are a lot of constables and sergeants who have a lot to say in regard to the promotion of district clerks interfering with their promotion. If there were another twenty clerks who remained in the district office it would not affect their work.

12. You have got to consider that it is at the option of every man to go out if he chooses. As long as he remains in the office there can be no objection. You would have it a rule that a man should go out after a certain time? We had it advocated this morning that five years after being promoted a man should be compelled to go out?—I do not know that that would be successful.

13. Why not?—The longer a district clerk is in an office the more assistance he is to his Inspector.

14. But the service in the district office ought to be of very great value to a man in the other branches of the service. You are simply promoting a man, locking him up, and there you are. Can you lodge any solid objection as to why he should not go out?—Not if a man desires to go out.

15. It is not a question of his desiring, but, in the interests of the service, that he should give the value of what he learned to the service?—I believe it would be of service.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Supposing they do go out, if we promote men according to seniority and merit, they would stand the same chances as other men?—Quite so.

17. So that after ten years' service they go out and are senior to other men who have not been promoted, and get the first chance of promotion?—Yes.

18. If they had special qualifications they would deserve to go out?—Yes.

19. You know the nature of the inquiries made in respect to candidates?—They are very strict and stringent. It almost becomes monotonous at times the number of times a candidate has been employed—sometimes for only ten or fifteen days; and yet you have to interview every employer.

20. So that we have every information?—That it is possible to get.

21. What have you got to say as regards the conduct of the Lambton Quay men?—My experience is that they are a very well-conducted body of men.

22. As regards general dissatisfaction?—I have not heard of any.

23. Have you heard anything of the "special" men talked about?—Not until the Commission started.

24. And it was mentioned down in Dunedin?—Yes.

25. *Inspector Ellison.*] Were you in the office about a month ago, when Constable Taylor called with some expenses?—Yes.

26. There was a gentleman with him?—Yes.

27. You heard me speak to him?—Yes.

28. Was there anything unduly rough in what I said?—You came along the passage; the constable and this man were standing at the doorway, and you said, "Why did you bring that man here? You heard what the Magistrate said. You had no right to bring him here."

29. Was the manner in which I spoke particularly offensive?—No.

30. Have you noticed anything improper in my behaviour?—No.

31. Have you been fairly treated with other officers?—Yes.

32. You know the clerical work has increased greatly in the last five years?—Doubled.

33. You know that the payment of Coroners' jurors, witnesses in indictable cases, and those others committed for trial all tend to make more work?—In five years our monthly imprest has increased by over £800.

34. And vouchers have to be made out for all these items?—Sometimes as small as 1s.

35. In our case it is different from the other; they can put all the witnesses in one sheet?—Yes.

36. You have to make a separate sheet for each witness?—Yes.

37. *The Commissioner.*] Why?—By order of the Treasury.

38. Where there are half a dozen in one case?—Yes, it is a specially printed voucher.

Inspector Ellison: It makes a great deal of extra work—more than the Supreme Court would have in similar cases.

39. *The Commissioner.*] Then, your payee has to have a separate voucher?—Yes.

40. *Inspector Ellison.*] The same thing applies to witnesses before the Coroner?—Yes.

41. And a covering voucher?—Yes.

42. *The Commissioner.*] You do not get many of these?

Inspector Ellison: About a couple of dozen a month.

43. *The Commissioner.*] There is a great deal of work done for the Machinery Department?—Yes, and Old-age Pensions. I suppose they would average about two hundred a month.

44. What?—Inquiries.

45. What about the Education Department?—They are dropping into the office every day.

46. There are only eighteen hundred in Christchurch, and they have more there than in any part of New Zealand?—I should say, approximately, about two hundred a month.

47. *Inspector Ellison.*] I should say over a hundred a month. They have frequently to go backwards and forwards?—Yes.

48. So that there is a great deal of work done?—A considerable amount. I consider you are one of the busiest Government officials in Wellington when you are in your office.

49. And it is coming in at every hour of the day?—Yes.

50. In other places it comes in mails from Wellington?—Yes.

51. *Constable Taylor.*] When I went to get the witness's expenses, did I not report to Sergeant Mathieson, who rang you up, and told you the occurrence; and did you not say it was a pity you were not there, and that it would not have happened?—I do not remember that.

52. *The Commissioner.*] What would not have happened?

Constable Taylor: The Inspector using those words.

Witness: I remember Sergeant Mathieson ringing up and quoting a circular which he said was used in Invercargill. I told him that Invercargill was an entirely different thing.

53. *Constable Taylor.*] Did you not say it was a pity you were not there at the time?—Not that I remember.

54. *Inspector Ellison.*] Were you there?—I was, of course.

55. *The Commissioner.*] You could not be there and not there?—I was not out of the office.

Constable Taylor: I ask that Sergeant Mathieson be recalled.

56. *The Commissioner.*] We will do that later on. (To witness): How many assistant clerks have you got?—Two, and there is sufficient work for three. I go on duty at 9 a.m., and it is generally 5.30 p.m. before I get away.

57. *Inspector Ellison.*] The clerks have to clean out the office, light the fires, and all that?—Yes.

58. *The Commissioner.*] What correspondence do you open?—All, with the Inspector's permission; and deal with small matters.

59. *Memos going to the police and so forth?*—Yes. I made application for a station some time back.

60. *You would expect to get that without doing any sectional work?*—I think so.

61. *You have not done any actual police work for how long?*—Ten years.

62. *You are emphasizing the point that you expect to get straight from the district office to a station?*—Yes.

63. *You think you are entitled to it by virtue of your service in the district office?*—I think the work in the office is very hard work.

64. *That is a point, of course, that will have to be considered. I am quite certain that the Commissioner would never have considered the claim of some of those men to go right away in charge of a sub-district. Some have been promoted after only ten years' service?*—That is so.

65. *How old are you?*—Forty-one. There is another matter I would like to refer to, in connection with a remark by Inspector Cullen, in regard to district clerks treating uniform sergeants patronisingly.

66. *It was not only said in Auckland but in Dunedin also—passing on the other side of the street?*—Such a thing has never obtained here.

67. *Of course, it may have obtained in very few instances?*—We have always got on very well with them here, and all the other clerks in the office.

68. *They do not put on frills?*—They do not put on airs here.

69. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You mentioned about overwork. Have you ever applied for assistance?—I think the Inspector applied.

The Commissioner: If you thought your staff was overworked it was your clear duty.

Inspector Ellison: If I had a man competent to do the work, I would put him in temporarily.

The Commissioner: Do you consider that extra assistance is necessary?

Inspector Ellison: Very often; nearly always.

ROBERT DARBY, Station Sergeant, further examined. (No. 284.)

Inspector Ellison.] Were the charge sheets from Wellington South always satisfactory?—No; many had to be returned and spoken about to the sergeant; they were sent down, and fresh ones written out.

Do you know that the watch-house keeper frequently wrote out fresh ones?—Yes, and made a report about it.

And the others were destroyed?—Yes, and others substituted.

Did I send any but one charge sheet back?—No, only one, with a memo. through the Sub-Inspector. I wish to contradict a statement in regard to Constable Beddek. He said I would not report favourably on him from vindictiveness. I want to deny that statement entirely: there was no vindictiveness on my part. I was asked to report on him, and I reported on him as I found him.

AMOS MUGGERIDGE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 285.)

Witness: I was enrolled in 1899, and was promoted sergeant in 1906. I entered the police training depot at Mount Cook Station on the 1st May, 1899; and, after two months' instruction by Sergeant (now Sub-Inspector) O'Donovan, was sworn in as a constable on the 1st July, 1899, and appointed to the Lambton Quay Station, Wellington. I was appointed junior clerk in the Wellington District Office on the 23rd February, 1900, by Inspector Pender, who was then in charge of the district, the appointment being approved by Mr. Tunbridge, then Commissioner of Police. On the 1st September, 1901, I was appointed police storekeeper by Mr. Tunbridge. In connection with this appointment, in July, 1901, Mr. Tunbridge notified the members of the Force, by circular published in the *Police Gazette*, that he had been successful in obtaining the sanction of Cabinet to the free issue of materials for making up police uniforms, also waterproof coats, shakos, and night-duty coats to all sergeants and constables. Previous to the publication of this circular all police clothing was obtained from the Defence Stores in this city, and had to be paid for by the members of the Force. Therefore, the controlling of its own stores by the Police Department was an entirely new departure, and I am the first member of the Force to hold the position of departmental storekeeper. The qualifications required for this position are: Knowledge of book-keeping and correspondence; to be quick and correct at figures; knowledge of clothing, especially cloth, waterproof materials, coatings, principles of manufacture of shakos and helmets, knowledge of

blankets, hosiery, and underclothing, boots, all kinds of shirts, brushware, saddlery, leggings, &c.; in fact, a general all-round business training is essential to successfully cope with matters that arise from time to time in this branch of the service. I was selected out of 580 members of the Force by Mr. Tunbridge as being suitable for the position. A small store was built at the back of the Lambton Quay Station, and was ready for occupation in October, 1901. I then took over the police stores from the Defence Department. Previous to doing this, in order to be in readiness for the proper working of the store, I had to devise the system of book-keeping, also all the official forms to be used in connection with the issue of clothing and stores. The necessary ledgers and forms were supplied by the Government Printer from drafts submitted by me to Mr. Tunbridge. These have been in force without alteration ever since. The first system of issuing clothing was to headquarter and suburban stations, also stations where more than one constable was stationed, material for one jumper and one pair of trousers and one shako annually, a waterproof coat, and one night-duty coat every two years. Members of the Force in the Auckland and Napier Districts and towns north of Wanganui, in the Wanganui District, were not supplied with night-duty coats. At all stations where only one man was in charge, materials for jumper and trousers, a shako, and waterproof coat were issued every two years. The night-duty coat was not supplied. Mounted men were supplied with Bedford cord for making up into riding-pants, in place of tweed for trousers; also leggings. These men were supplied with a riding-coat in place of the foot waterproof. In 1903 Mr. Dinnie was appointed Commissioner of Police. In 1904 Mr. Dinnie extended the issue of night-duty coats to the Napier and the whole of the Wanganui Districts. From 1901 to 1905 only free-issue articles of clothing and police appointments and miscellaneous stores were kept in the police store. In 1905 Commissioner Dinnie authorised the issue of boots, blankets, underwear, shirts, boot-brushes, socks, quilts, &c., to the members of the Force on payment, at practically cost price. This departure has been much appreciated by the men, and is being increasingly availed of. The work of the store was by this concession practically doubled. In 1906 the work of the store was again doubled, owing to concessions made in the free issue of uniform by Mr. Dinnie. Under this system every member of the Force, wherever stationed, receives material for trousers every nine months and material for jumper every eighteen months; shako annually; waterproof every two years. At all stations in the Dominion where there are two men or more each receives a night-duty coat every three years. White helmets are worn in Auckland and Napier, also Wanganui Districts during summer, and provision was made for these to be issued free. Recruits are provided with material for trousers and jumper, also shako; if to be stationed at Auckland, Wanganui, or Napier, a white helmet, a waterproof, and night-duty coat. After nine months they receive tweed for trousers; after twelve months' service, tweed for jumper; thenceforward they are on the same footing as the older hands in regard to free issue of clothing. It must be borne in mind that the issues of clothing to members of the Force do not become due at the same time; that is, there is not a rush of work for a few weeks in the year and then a slackening off, but a steady and continuous receipt of requisitions for clothing and stores all the year round. The number of requisitions dealt with last year was 2,350. When it is taken into consideration that some of these requisitions necessitate the tying-up and posting of two and sometimes three parcels each, it will give some idea of the work to be performed. 2,520 letters were posted during the same period. A separate ledger account is kept for each man in the service, showing the quantity of clothing issued and becoming due. Care must be taken that the allowance is not overdrawn. A summary of all clothing issued free and on payment is submitted to the Commissioner of Police monthly. Vouchers for all stores purchased are also forwarded to the Commissioner, with schedules attached showing details of expenditure. Ledger accounts are, of course, kept, showing issues and purchases of stores, also issues and purchases of clothing, free issue and on payment. I also have to check all returns of forage issued to horses used for police purposes. I have to see that every article purchased for use at all stations in the Dominion from a broom-handle to a cooking-range are duly taken on charge and accounted for in the various police districts. I have to purchase all articles stocked in the police store. The Department is not tied to any particular firm; and to obtain the best value, and having due regard to the judicious expenditure of public money, it is necessary to know where the various supplies can be obtained to the best advantage. At the present time we have dealings with twelve separate firms, besides stores that are imported from England. On the 1st October, 1906, I was promoted by Mr. Dinnie to the rank of sergeant. My claims to promotion were based on special qualifications for the work in the particular branch of the service in which I was placed. The establishing of a store in 1901 for its own requirements was an entirely new departure by the Police Department, and without solicitation on my part I was appointed storekeeper. In fact, when I was directed to attend at Mr. Tunbridge's office I declined the position unless he could see his way to increase my pay. Mr. Tunbridge immediately offered me an allowance of 1s. per day, and I at once informed him I would be glad of the position on those terms. At this time, also subsequently, Mr. Tunbridge informed me he would do something better for me later on. During Mr. Tunbridge's term of office three entirely new branches of the service were established and open to members of the Force—viz., training depot, Editor *Police Gazette*, also police store; the rank of sergeant was recognised in the first and shortly after appointment in the second. There is not the least doubt in my mind that if he had remained in charge of the Department that the "something better" would have eventuated in the same recognition being given to the storekeeper. I held the position of police storekeeper for five years as a constable (two years under Mr. Tunbridge and three years under Mr. Dinnie). I am directly responsible to the Commissioner of Police for the clothing and equipment of the Police Force of the Dominion. I have to purchase all clothing and stores, and certify to payment of vouchers. I correspond direct with the various Inspectors, and also with all suppliers of stores. During the five years I have been storekeeper not one article has had to be written off as unserviceable or unsaleable. At the annual stocktaking my books

and stock have on every occasion been found correct. Mr. Tunbridge, before leaving New Zealand, expressed his gratification at the manner in which the work of the store had been carried on, especially as regards absence of complaints or friction of any kind in carrying on this branch of the Department. I have never used influence of any kind, or even applied for any of the positions in which I have been placed by the responsible officers of the Department. I have to refer to the evidence of Inspector O'Brien, of Dunedin, given before this Commission about two months ago, in regard to my promotion to the rank of sergeant. The Inspector objected because I had only seven years' service. Now, this Inspector joined the Police Force in 1874, was promoted to rank of sergeant in 1877, after three years' service. Promoted to rank of detective in 1881—two promotions in seven years—whereas he now comes forward to publicly criticize the one promotion I have received in ten years. He said I should not have been promoted before my time, whatever that means; but, judging by this officer's rapid progress in the early stages of his career, the time system then did not enter into his calculations. This is a subsequent development, and I extremely regret that this Inspector should have thought it in keeping with the dignity of his position to publicly criticize the promotion of a man not in his district, whom he has never even seen, and of whose qualifications and duties he is admittedly ignorant. I produce various forms which have to be filled in in connection with the issue of stores. Under my system each member of the Force is practically keeping a day-book.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was your previous training?—I have had five years' experience in London as a clerk. When I was fifteen I started in a merchant's office. For a few months I was on the journal, three years in the warehouse, twelve months in the correspondence department, and a few months in the Customs department.

2. How long were you in New Zealand before you joined the Force?—I came out in 1895, and had four years' general store experience, and joined the Force in 1899.

3. What was your remuneration in connection with your duties at the time you were promoted to be sergeant?—Nine shillings a day, and 1s. a day house-allowance. I got 7s. a day on joining. When I was promoted I was getting 7s. 6d.

4. What did you receive on your promotion?—4s. a day extra.

5. Was it necessary in connection with the discharge of your duties as storekeeper that you should hold police rank?—Yes.

6. Why? Could not the difficulty have been met by giving increased remuneration without police rank?—What about the pension scheme? All these extra allowances do not count.

7. But that is a mere incident to your position in the police?—In my opinion, it is hardly fair to expect me to put in the rest of my days in the Police Force, and go out on a constable's pension.

8. You were promoted before your time, according to your position in the service. What I want to know is, you were really promoted with a view of improving your status and increasing your pay?—I think to give me a status.

9. Was it necessary to give you police rank for the work you had to perform?—I should say so.

10. Why?—Well, I have to correspond all over New Zealand.

11. Does it give you better facilities to correspond as a sergeant?—It is only reasonable to expect that a man should have some rank when he has to do so.

12. I am not disposed to find fault with the remuneration you receive, because there is a lot of work and responsibility, and you probably do it to the satisfaction of all concerned; but you know your promotion caused dissatisfaction?—I think, entirely under a misapprehension. Those men think that by Mr. Dinne giving me promotion some one in the uniform branch has been deprived of it.

13. Suppose you were sent out on sectional duty to-morrow, you would be senior to a great many men without the service?—That is so.

14. That is what they object to. If you remained in the store there would not be the same ground of complaint. But you could go out at any time?—Yes, I could, and if I had not got promotion I would have come out in any case.

15. Considerable objection has been taken to the quality of the stuff. It has been described as being no better than blue blanket, and it has been submitted to experts who have so described it: how do you account for that?—It all depends on what they mean. The coats supplied are made out of colonial melton cloth.

16. It is said that waterproofs have tumbled to pieces the first time they were used: can you explain it or deny that it is a fact?—If I went into the whole history of the matter it would not be fair to certain private firms.

17. It is your duty to see that the Government get good value for their money?—So they do. I have just got an allowance on some returned goods.

18. Let me understand the matter without mentioning the name of the firm, and I shall consider whether I shall press for the name?—I bought certain stuff from a firm according to sample, and, so far as I could ascertain, it was according to sample, and other experts failed to detect the reverse.

19. Then, what is the good of samples?—With waterproof materials it is impossible to tell the difference in quality until the coat made of it is actually worn. Two coats of different qualities will weigh the same on the scales, and it is impossible to tell the difference.

20. How long did it take you to ascertain that the stuff was of inferior quality after it was got in?—I found it out about six weeks afterwards, and I went to the firm about it. It was a colonial wholesale firm, and they wrote to London, and insisted on getting full allowance, and that every coat supplied should be taken back and a new one take its place.

21. Whether it had been used or not?—Yes; every coat was exchanged.

22. And the lot you had not served out?—I sent them all back.

23. And did the same firm supply other stuff in place of it?—Yes; they have not finished supplying them yet. We have been getting this stuff from the same firm for seven years, and it has always given the utmost satisfaction until this lot. We have to rely on the manufacturers at Home, and the supply of rubber from the Congo Free State has ceased. According to the newspapers, the British Government have remonstrated with the Belgian authorities for committing atrocities on the Natives—torturing them, and so on, in order to induce them to collect rubber, and the consequence is that rubber has largely increased in price.

24. So that offers inducement to adulterate?—Yes.

25. How did you satisfy them that your objection was sound?—I happened to have a coat I got five years previously, and compared the two qualities.

26. Is there any advantage in importing stuff direct?—Yes; there would be, only that we have no room.

27. Surely that would not be an insuperable objection?—Yes, it would.

28. You only buy it in small quantities?—Under the present system we have to keep a small number of coats. I keep a stock of about a hundred.

29. What would be the saving to the Department if they imported everything they required?—There would be about 5s. on a waterproof coat.

30. But what would be the full advantage to the Department on every line you have to deal with, aggregating the lot—that is, if you imported direct, allowing for extra quality?—The only material would be the material for night-duty coats and waterproofs. You cannot better the colonial-made underclothing, blankets, &c. I should say, about £200 a year. You would save that in actual money, and get a better class of stuff.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have had to ask for assistance lately?—Yes, I had a man, but that was not sufficient. I should like to say I think the complaints have not been put fairly.

32. *The Commissioner.*] When an Inspector comes and says a thing on oath I am not in a position to say it is not correct. I cannot ever traverse any portion of what he says?—In regard to this line of waterproof coats, I found out myself that the coats were inferior. To see if it was possible for another expert to make a mistake, I took it along to two firms in the city, and asked them to carefully examine it, and give me a quotation for supplying coats of the same material. It was carefully examined by the two firms, one keeping it for a week, and they both said that I was getting a good article for the money, and they could not supply it at the same price.

33. I believe, against this, there is sworn testimony by an Inspector, who took one to an expert in Auckland, who said it was no better than blue blanket?—Experts never agree; but I am referring to the waterproof coat.

34. I am speaking of the overcoats, which an Inspector in Auckland said were no better than blue blanket?—He meant what we term the night-duty coat. What I am speaking about as having submitted to experts is what we term the waterproof coat.

35. Well, take the Inspector's statement as regards the overcoats, how do you account for it?—Those coats were called in, and I received an allowance on them.

36. That is another line you were at fault in if that is the case?—Those are the only two cases that have happened in eight years. The night-duty coats are separate altogether.

37. But they are all under your control, and you are responsible to the Department for carrying out your duty in such a way that the Department shall get the best value for the money. Every inferior article you send out causes dissatisfaction?—All these coats were exchanged in the same way as the waterproofs.

38. But how did they get in, that is the question?—The explanation in regard to the night-duty coat is this: there were two dozen altogether. If you recollect, 1907 was a very dry season, and the firm which was supplying the coats was short of water. That was the excuse given to me.

39. Then, you have the excuse of a dry season on the one hand and a shortage of rubber on the other. I should avoid those firms in future if I were you?—I should like to say this was the best material that could be got. I had probationers sent to me to fit out, and I thought it better to give them those coats than to let them go without coats. The instructions with regard to the issue of clothing are that a night-duty coat must last three years, but it can be renewed on the recommendation of an Inspector; and I thought, rather than let those men go without, it was better to give them these coats. They were all called in, and we received allowance for them afterwards.

The Commissioner: I think you made a mistake, as it gives cause to people to find fault with the manner in which you do your work.

FRIDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

Sir EDWARD OSBORNE GIBBES, Bart., Secretary of Education, examined on oath. (No. 286.)

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Our Department does a great deal of work for your Department—the constables and sergeants?—The Police Department does a great deal of very valuable work in connection with the Education Department, and does it exceedingly well, and, on the whole, very willingly. We occasionally get an irritable remark; but that is human nature, and no importance is to be attached to it. There is an impression in the Department that the police do not take quite as seriously as is desirable the apprehension of absconders from industrial schools. It is a very important matter, because if the schools get the reputation of being unable to hold the boys

and girls sent to them, there is a fear that Magistrates may prefer to send them to gaol rather than to the schools. The Commissioner, however, has always expressed himself as very willing to check any laxity in this direction where a case can be brought under his notice. I shall be glad to give some information as to the nature of the work done by the police for the Education Department. I suppose there is no country in the world which does so much as New Zealand in compelling people to pay towards the support of children sent to industrial schools. I believe I am correct in saying that New Zealand collects absolutely a larger sum than New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia put together, although it has less than a quarter of the number of children maintained in industrial schools. This question was looked into some months ago, and, from the published returns of the States I have named, it was ascertained that they had altogether 6,763 children in industrial schools, and collected altogether £4,449; while here, with 1,545 children, we collect £5,604, an absolutely larger sum than those three States put together. It is impossible to estimate the far-reaching effect of a system that compels every person whose wickedness, or negligence, or incapacity causes the State to take the control of his child, to pay for the maintenance of that child to the utmost farthing. It must have a very great effect, for instance, as a check towards juvenile delinquency. The parents under such circumstances are bound to see that their children go straight, if it is possible at all. What I want to point out is the essential error of regarding the Education Department as more than the merest agent in this matter. The essence of the proceedings is the vindication of the authority of the Court that makes the order for payment: the Education Department is merely a book-keeper. It is quite natural that the feeling of irritation should be attached to the Education Department for worrying everybody; but that is the position. The Court makes an order that a certain person pays a certain amount, and it is not the business of the Education Department any more than the police to see that that is carried out. The employment of collectors by the Education Department would alter the whole aspect of the case, and the result would certainly be that such a system would be far more costly and very much less efficient. This total of between £5,000 and £6,000 is collected day by day in quite small sums, and it is of the utmost importance that they shall be small sums. Directly a man or woman of the class against whom such orders are usually made, who is not in a position to pay any large sum, but can pay a few shillings a week, is allowed to let it accumulate for two or three weeks, it becomes impossible to collect it. If the Education Department undertook to collect it, it would have to have an army of collectors—such an army as would be in a position to apply to those people with the frequency of the police. In its capacity as book-keeper the Department does everything it can to lighten the labours of the police. In the majority of cases it enters into direct correspondence with the person who has been ordered to pay. These are two forms made use of that are sent out directly an order is made, calling attention to the fact that an order has been made, that the party will be expected to pay, and that as long as he pays regularly he will not be worried. After a little time, if there is any disinclination to pay, a second notice is sent, and the result is that in many cases people are induced to pay into Court without the police being troubled at all. There is another consideration—that in recent years the Department has done a great deal to take away from the police work which they formerly were accustomed to do. Some years ago, before the organization of the Education Department in regard to industrial schools was as perfect as it is now, the police were required to report on all applications of inmates of industrial schools where employers were concerned, or parents seeking to get their children back. They were also required to report upon children licensed out, but that work is now done by the officers of the Education Department, and that in itself constitutes a very substantial relief. I think there is only one other point I wish to touch upon, and that is in regard to the inquiries made in respect to past inmates of the schools. In 1901, which was immediately after the system was taken up systematically, the report on industrial schools contained this paragraph: "For some years the Department has had in hand a 'Register of Past Inmates,' in which has been entered from time to time any information that could be obtained respecting the character of previous inmates of industrial schools. Inquiries made in connection with application for payments of earnings have, for instance, supplied a large proportion of the information that has been recorded. To make the record complete, a confidential circular has been sent to the police, and the Department is now able to furnish an interim report of the results. Information has been obtained with regard to 1,111 persons out of 3,529 discharged from industrial schools between the 1st January, 1883, and the 31st December, 1896. Of these 1,111 persons, 174 are accounted for as follows: 60 have left the colony, 59 are dead, 3 are in lunatic asylums, 52 cannot be traced. Of the remainder (937), 828 are of good character, 6 are of fair character, 103 of bad character. Thus, 89 per cent. have certainly done well, or fairly, and only 11 per cent. are certainly bad; and if to the former is added a proportion of the 174 above named (the 52 that cannot be traced would be known to the police if they were bad), the Department is entitled to claim that not more than 10 per cent. of industrial-school children have failed to do well. It is to be remembered that this inquiry has been made long after the persons concerned have been free from Government control—for as long as ten years in some cases." The exigencies of departmental work have prevented for some years the prosecution of that work to the extent to which it was proposed to carry it out. It has been taken up again recently, and it is hoped that such information will be obtained as will enable that Department to prepare a paper showing the results of industrial-school operations for the past quarter of a century, and it must be evident that an investigation of such a kind would be exceedingly valuable. Owing to circumstances, there has been, unfortunately, a large number of these inquiries recently sent out, and I have no doubt that the police have found the work rather difficult to tackle, on account of its size, and coming in on them at the one time; but it is a work that is now finished, and in the future it will not recur to anything like the extent to which it has lately been subject.

The Commissioner: You are probably aware that this matter was first raised when Mr. Hogben was giving evidence. I particularly stated in the clearest way that I regarded it as the bounden duty of the police to carry out orders of the Court, but I distinguish between the collection of money due under orders of the Court and the following-up of inmates who had left these schools, as well as the work under the Infant Life Protection Act; therefore your statement does not quite follow that. Nobody questions the duty of the police in collecting maintenance moneys on orders of the Court. You follow me?

Witness: Yes.

The Commissioner: The Police Department raises the point with regard to the extra work involved in connection with inquiries made in regard to ex-inmates. Personally, I regard them as of the highest possible value; but they say it has caused an unnecessary amount of work for them, for which they receive no consideration whatever; and also under the Infant Life Protection Act.

Witness: With regard to inquiries regarding ex-inmates, there is certainly no one but the police to do it, and for one reason: that in a very great majority of cases the police have the information. I happened to be in the country a month or two ago when a complaint appeared in the Wellington papers which surprised me exceedingly, because it was evident to me that the information had been given to the newspapers by some member of the Police Force, and it was in the direction of a very sarcastic comment upon this system which has been initiated by the Education Department. It appeared to me to be a most remarkable thing. I happened to be in the country, and went to see the local constable, and asked him whether he had any forms. He stated that he had one, and I asked him how he regarded it. He said it was a very ordinary thing, which did not give him any trouble. I said, "What did you do?" He said, "I did not know the man myself, but knew where he had been, and I asked one or two people who knew him what sort of fellow he was; I got the information necessary without any trouble. I ascertained at once that he was a man of decent character, and reported accordingly." That is precisely the line of inquiry the Department wishes pursued. In some cases the individual is known to the police. In that case it is a very simple matter for the police to report, "This man has been in gaol so many times." It is all in their records. There are cases in which an inquiry has been sent from place to place, but I do not think there is a great deal of work involved in that. Of course, I admit it is a work that the Education Department has no right to apply to the police to do, but we ask them to do it as one department asks another in similar cases.

2. *The Commissioner.*] What other department would you ask to do work of that kind? Departments stand on their dignity in doing work for other departments outside their own?—I am constantly asking the Lands Department to apply to their officers for information about applications for school-buildings. The applications come to the Government from Education Boards for grants for school-buildings, and I have to apply to the Lands officers in every case. It is work that I could not call upon the Lands Department to do, but they do it willingly in every case. There are many other instances. If the officers of one department are better acquainted with the circumstances of a particular matter than your own people, you have no hesitation in asking them.

3. It is used as an argument for increasing the Force in various places; they say that so many men are required for inquiries. You have not touched on the Infant Life Protection Act: what are the duties in connection with that? It is now vested in your Department?—The amount we have asked them to do in connection with that is exceedingly small. For instance, a woman may take her child to a foster-home, and leave it there. There is not much description given as to where she really leaves it. In a few weeks or months she is not to be found, and I send a memo., "Can the police find So-and-so?" We have then to start inquiries as to who she was, and where the child was taken. We have not had a great many of those—perhaps two or three dozen in the year. I think two or three dozen is rather on the outside limit.

Inspector Ellison: I mean, from here and other places; they come through my hands. For instance, I may get a memo. from the matron of the Home in Tinakori Road, and I may have to send it to Dunedin, Christchurch, Greymouth, and other places to trace the parent. In a great many cases we find the people, and get the money.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] On the whole, do the police carry out their duties satisfactorily?—Exceedingly so.

5. Would there be any objection to a charge being made on your Department for services rendered?

The Commissioner: You had better reply as Mr. Hogben did—that that is a matter for the Minister.

Witness: I hold that it is only in connection with past inmates and the administration of the Infant Life Protection Act that that would be applicable.

6. *Inspector Ellison.*] Do you think it is really desirable the police should inquire about former inmates of industrial schools who are not known to be misbehaving themselves or members of the criminal class?—It all depends on how it is done. The constable I spoke to in the country evidently did it with great tact and discretion, and the individual concerned had not the least idea of it. Unfortunately, cases occur in which the same tact and discretion are not exercised. I am sorry to say that there is a case in Christchurch at the present time in which a girl was employed, and the constable went to the girl's employer, a hotelkeeper. He called his housekeeper, and they said she was a very good girl. He told them that the inquiry was very confidential, and that they must not say a word about it. However, the girl and her mistress fell out next day, and the mistress made remarks.

The Commissioner: A man like that should be marked as unsuitable for future inquiries.

7. *Inspector Ellison.*] At any rate, the constable you mentioned carried to the man from whom he made inquiries information about his neighbour that he did not possess before—that he had been an inmate of an industrial school?—Yes.

8. And in many other cases that must occur?—Yes.

9. These inquiries pass through the hands of a great many police—from the Inspector to the sergeant, the sergeant to the constable, and one constable to another, and each one knows that the subject of the inquiry has been an inmate of an industrial school. A great many men leave the service who have this information in their possession, and it often transpires that one man's wife or relation may have gained the information from conversations that arose. Is it not a fact that a great deal of information gets divulged in casual ways about these people? I know, as a matter of fact, that it does, but I want to know is it not probable that it does occur?—Every official necessarily has a knowledge of circumstances he does not want to speak about. The police must have a vast amount of information about private members of the community that the members of the community know nothing about. The police are in possession of an enormous amount of knowledge that would certainly form a very sensational subject for discussion, but they do not talk about these things. Why should they talk about the mere incident that such a person has once been in an industrial school?

10. Would it not be very desirable to assume that in the case of those regarding whom the police have no knowledge—who have not come under their notice—that they are doing well? The slur will always be thrown up against a person who is known to have been in an industrial school. My point is that it would be better to assume that those we do not know are doing well?—How are we to find out?

11. If no unfavourable report comes against them?—No; because we do not know; the police might have an unfavourable report.

12. The only thing to be gained is to find out the percentage doing badly?—We must ask.

13. But is not that the result arrived at?—You complain of the fact of our asking.

14. I say that the fact of the police making inquiries is objectionable. It is not nice to hunt up a man in good work, or women who have become the mothers of families. I do not think it is a reasonable or nice sort of thing, and it is objectionable to the people inquired about, no matter how much decorum or tact is observed. My contention is that it would be much better to let such people drop out of sight altogether, because there is a slur cast upon them?—I think it is quite likely that the terms of the application to the police might be put in a different form. Care has been taken to indicate that we do not want elaborate inquiries. In the case of the mother of a family, there is no necessity to make inquiry.

15. We have got to find out to identify her?—If once you know she is married, and the mother of a family, it should end there.

16. But you must find out first?—You admit that it is of importance to have it?

17. *The Commissioner.*] It is of the highest importance to know?—Of course, we never had the matter brought before us until now.

Inspector Ellison: I admit what has been said in regard to orders of the Court, but a great deal more economical way could be devised.

The Commissioner: What you say is that when names are sent to you you wish it to be assumed they are leading reputable lives unless you have records against them?

Inspector Ellison: Yes; and about orders of the Court, in the Police Department a better method might be devised.

ROBERT JOSEPH COLLINS, Secretary to the Treasury and Paymaster-General, examined on oath. (No. 287.)

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What do you say with regard to the police accounts submitted to your Department? Are they in proper form?—In proper form, well kept, and, I may say, promptly rendered; they give us very little trouble in the Treasury, and, in fact, I may say the police accounts have always been well kept, back to the time of Mr. Goldfinch and Mr. Tasker, and that is saying a good deal for the present accountants; they are as well kept as any department's in the service.

2. *The Commissioner.*] I have a sort of dim and shadowy idea that the police might be made the nucleus of an addition to the defences of the Dominion. In these days of outcry for compulsory training one has to consider these matters. With regard to the use of the rifle, do you think it would be of value if every constable, as part of his training, were taught the use of the rifle?—Decidedly; but it is not a matter for me to enter into—the defence of the country.

3. But you are one who has always taken a very keen interest in these matters, and I wanted to know if you saw any difficulty?—No difficulty whatever, and it would be very useful.

4. My own idea is very dim and visionary, but if there is anything in it it might be worked out departmentally. They would not form part of the Defence Forces, but a nucleus if necessary?—It would be very valuable.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think that a little military training would do the men good—set them up?—Improve their bearing, discipline, and physique.

MICHAEL FLEMING, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 288.)

1. *Inspector Ellison.*] You are a constable, stationed at Lambton Quay, and employed in the police office at present?—Yes.

2. You heard the occurrence when I spoke to Constable Taylor about the witness's expenses last month?—Yes.

3. Did I speak in an offensive, overbearing manner?—I thought you spoke as you would speak to anybody.

4. Just as an order or instruction would be given?—Just the same.

5. I am accustomed to speak plainly and distinctly when I give instructions or orders?—Yes.

6. Did Constable Taylor come back up the passage, as asserted by Mr. Morris?—No, he went straight out, and did not come back again.

GEORGE NASH, Dairyman, examined on oath. (No. 289.)

1. *Inspector Ellison.*] You are a member of some of the Wellington local bodies?—I have been a member of the Hospital Trustees for seven years, and am still a member.
2. You have had to call upon me on some occasions?—On several occasions.
3. How were you treated?—With the utmost civility and courtesy.
4. Did you ever hear anybody say I treated people differently?—Never.

ARTHUR EDMUND ANDREWS, Acting-detective, examined on oath. (No. 290.)

Witness: I am stationed at Wellington, and am doing plain-clothes duty. I joined on the 1st June, 1902.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You applied for clerical work in February, 1905?—I do not remember the exact date, but I know that I did apply.
2. You then had three years' service?—Yes.
3. In March, 1905, there was a vacancy in Auckland, and you were sent there?—Yes.
4. On the 1st September, 1906, you applied for the usual clerical allowance, and were recommended by your Inspector, and that allowance was granted to you?—Yes.
5. On the 29th January, 1907, I fined you 10s. for submitting a disrespectful report in respect to a sergeant?—That is so.
6. In consequence of that, you applied for a transfer from the office; that was dated the 1st February, 1907, and on the 26th of the same month you were transferred to ordinary duty at Napier?—That is so.
7. Since then you have applied for detective work, and have been appointed to it?—That is so.
8. During the whole of your time in Auckland, did you communicate with any officer, Inspector, sergeant, or constable in my Department?—None whatever.
9. The suggestion is that you communicated with Sub-Inspector Wright?—I have never written to him or had any conversation with him in my life on police matters or private matters.
10. How often have you spoken?—When brought into contact with him, when stationed in Wellington.
11. Not before?—Not before, nor since.

CHARLES ROBERT BROBERG, Chief Detective, examined on oath. (No. 291.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] Give me an outline of your police service?—I joined the police in Dunedin in January, 1895, after twelve months' service in the Permanent Artillery. In December, 1899, I was promoted to the rank of detective in Wellington; and in February of this year I was promoted to the position of Chief Detective, in succession to Mr. McGrath, who had been promoted Sub-Inspector. I have a staff at present of four detectives and four acting-detectives. Detective Cassells is at present out of the Dominion, and he would make nine. I notice that in the evidence given before you at Auckland Detective McMahon referred to my case, alleging that he had been passed over by me. He stated there that he was three years my senior. In explanation of that, I would like to say that he was two years and three months my senior in the service, and two years and a few days my senior as detective; but at the time I was promoted to the position of Chief Detective I was receiving a higher rate of pay—2s. a day—than he was receiving. I also received a special advance of six years, which, I contend, really placed me in the position of being four years his senior. Probably you are aware that the position of Chief Detective is one in which it is specially laid down that it can be attained only by merit and general fitness. In that respect, it is the only position in the service in which such a condition is laid down. So far as my merit compares with Detective McMahon's, I would refer you to our merit sheets. He has one, so have I [produced]. I also notice that—at Rotorua, I think—Constable Willcocks alleged unfair treatment in connection with the apportionment of the reward in the Ellis case; that may affect me to some small extent.

The Commissioner: I do not see how it can affect you; it is a matter entirely for the Commissioner. It is impossible to stop evidence of that kind; but I did not attach any importance to it.

Witness: I do not think he was unfairly treated. I was in charge of the case for ten months, until after the man was convicted.

Mr. Dinnie: He seemed to complain more that the other constable got as much as he got.

The Commissioner: So that you are under a misapprehension.

Witness: I would like to speak with regard to the condition of the Force to-day generally as compared with fifteen years ago. I think the Force to-day compares more than favourably with its then condition. The sergeants now are much younger, much better, and more able than the sergeants of fifteen years ago to do their duty. They have a better knowledge of their work, and all seem inclined, as far as I can see, to impart what knowledge they have to the men under them. I know that fifteen years ago half of the sergeants could not tell you anything, and the other half would be annoyed if you dared to ask them. As far as the sergeants are concerned, they get on very well with the detective branch; there is no disagreement of any sort between the two branches. Various views and suggestions have been put before you regarding the two branches. It is not a personal matter, but a matter of policy. I think the constables of to-day compare very well with those in the Force when I joined. I agree with Sergeant Dart that some of the officers who have attained high positions are inclined to misjudge by comparing with those of to-day. I think that from an intellectual point of view, and from the moral standard, the men compare very favourably to-day. On the ground of physique, there are some men who, while they fulfil the requirements as far as inches are concerned, may not have the appearance of the men joining in

former years. They were men who came from the Artillery, and had gone through a very rigid course of setting-up drill, and had a much more commanding appearance than the men of to-day. There is no doubt that the men joining are greatly benefited by the course of education they receive at the training depot. I think, however, it would be beneficial if they had more physical drill, and more instruction as far as wrestling is concerned.

2. *The Commissioner.*] You have a different opinion from that given by a sergeant yesterday; he did not believe in it at all?—I will agree to differ from the sergeant.

3. Quite so. He is the only man I have heard say it?—I think the pay of a constable is altogether insufficient. I would suggest that when he becomes a permanent member of the Force his pay should be 8s. 6d. per day, and that he should get a rise of 6d. every three years.

4. You would keep him on probation?—If he is three months under the sergeant who is now instructor, and gets some physical training, I consider he is fit to do police duty in three months.

5. You would have no further period of probation?—I do not think he wants any further period, if the sergeants are as strict as the Wellington sergeants.

6. But sergeants are not alike?—I have no reason to believe they are less strict elsewhere.

7. It is not a question of what you have reason to believe: it is what we know?—Even if the pay was risen to 8s. 6d. a day, I do not think the position would be rushed. No doubt there would be many more applicants, and we could then make further improvement as far as the candidates are concerned. Not only would more come, but once they got appointed they would respect their position, and submit more readily to discipline. Now there are some who do not value their position as constables. I do not agree with Sergeant Dart so far as the standard of education is concerned. I think many good men could be selected from candidates who, having the other necessary qualifications, have only passed the Fourth Standard. I do not say they should be taken indiscriminately, but if the best candidates were picked, although they had only passed the Fourth Standard, they might be good constables. I think the first thing is to see if he is a man of brains and common-sense. I am not in favour of reducing the height, as I consider that the appearance of a constable on the beat is half the battle. Men inclined to break the law will purposely come in contact with a little man where they would avoid a big one. There has been some talk of examination before attaining the rank of sergeant or detective. I am not in favour of that; I think it should be left to the Inspector to judge whether a man is fit for the rank.

8. You differ from Sergeant Dart on that point?—I differ entirely there. If you are going to make them compete, give them something to compete for, and the salary of either sergeant or detective is insufficient to compete for by examination. A man passes an examination and he gets 10s. per day. The man who empties my dust-box gets 10s. per day, and has no responsibility compared with a policeman. On the question of house-allowance, at present the Chief Detective gets 14s.; detectives and sergeants, 10s. 6d.; acting-detectives and constables, 7s. Detectives and acting-detectives pay rent, averaging £1 1s., and I assure you they do not live in mansions. A number of them have to live at a distance from the station, rather far away, simply because they cannot get respectable houses any cheaper. I submit that the allowance in Wellington is altogether insufficient. A man is being penalised by being stationed here. There is no station at which there is more work; yet, from a pecuniary point of view, the men are worse off than in Dunedin or Christchurch.

9. Do you know that we have it on sworn evidence that the highest rents paid in New Zealand are at Napier? It came as a surprise to me, but there it is?—I am surprised to hear it. I do not know what Detective Hill pays there, but I know that there are acting-detectives in my office paying £1 per week.

10. The average in Napier is 19s. One sergeant pays £1 for five rooms; Detective Hill pays 18s.; another pays £1 5s. for six rooms, and so on. Well, that is as bad as Wellington, is it not?—Detective Hill pays 18s. in Napier, and gets a very good house for that; my men have to live in back lanes, and pay £1; that is the difference in the position. I think the house-allowance should be increased all round. I do not agree with Sergeant Dart when he said that if the men got 1s. a day rise it would meet the requirements. Sergeant Dart lives at Kilbirnie, and pays 15s. per week; he could scarcely ask for a rise, seeing that he gets 10s. 6d. My acting-detectives get 7s., and pay £1; so that they are 13s. out of pocket. So far as travelling-allowance is concerned, all ranks in the detective office, from myself to the junior acting-detective, get 8s. per day. In the uniform branch all ranks, from sergeants to constables, get 6s. I would ask you to compare that with the allowance in the Post and Telegraph Department. Some sergeants seem to think that if they get the same allowance as the detectives get they would be satisfied. Any officer in the Post and Telegraph Department, according to a circular recently advertised, having a salary under £400 a year receives 10s. per day travelling-allowance. A warder in the gaol, whose salary is practically the same as that of a junior constable, receives 12s. 6d. I think, if the Department can do that, they can afford to pay a sergeant of police more than 6s. per day and a detective more than 8s. A detective travelling is not only under the expense of paying for board and lodging, but many incidental expenses come his way; and I never met one yet who could make any money, or even keep square, on his travelling-allowance. In answer to those sergeants who found fault with the detectives getting more house-allowance, I suggest that the reason in the first instance was that the Department knew that detectives were liable to incidental expenses to which sergeants were not liable. When you were in Christchurch I noticed in the evidence that the qualifications of some acting-detectives were brought under your notice. I know two of the men—Ward and Gibson—and can only indorse the opinions expressed about them. They are very capable, hard-working men; but on account of the prominence they received, I think it possible that other men—mine in particular—might suffer through not being brought under notice.

11. Those men were referred to elsewhere as being exceptionally good men?—I admit that; but I wish to point out that I have men here who are equally as good. For instance, Constable

Hammond, who appeared before you and submitted reasons why he should get special consideration on account of long service and temporary duty in the detective office on different occasions, I really think his is a case in which some special consideration should be made. He has all the necessary qualifications for a good detective and a good officer. I have another man of less than eight years' service—Andrews—and I say, without fear of any contradiction, he is one of the best men that has entered the branch for many years. He is an exceptional man, and certainly should receive special consideration.

12. What experience have you had of Acting-detectives Ward and Gibson?—Personally, I have not come in contact with them so far as actual work is concerned.

The Commissioner: Then, we will pass from that. It does not lie in you to speak of their qualifications.

Witness: Suggestions have been made about the district clerks. I do not agree with those who hold the view that those who have received promotion through occupying very responsible positions should be in any way retarded. I think they should be allowed to qualify for higher positions with the other sergeants, who, having done ordinary duty, have been some years longer in attaining the rank. If you will permit me, I should like to mention the question of billiards, and explain the position. We have a table at the barracks, which was put in at the expense of the men themselves. Every member of the Force holding a subordinate position, and I at times, play billiards there. Very often I take my lunch in town, and Sub-Inspector Wright takes his lunch in town, and during the lunch-hour we often play fifty up together. I have also seen him play with Sergeant McGill, but I have never seen him play with constables, or mix with them. I understand that in Auckland delegates from the rank of sergeant submitted to you certain suggestions. As a delegate appointed by the Wellington detectives, I should like to submit certain suggestions in answer to theirs: I appear as a delegate on behalf of the Wellington detectives. I beg to submit the following remarks and suggestions, which have been approved by the Wellington detectives as representing their views on the respective subjects, for the information of the Royal Commissioner. The detectives recognise that the Royal Commissioner fully and thoroughly understands and appreciates the nature of the duties which devolve on the respective branches of the Police Force of this Dominion. The attention of the detectives has been called to resolutions and suggestions connected therewith which were advocated before the Royal Commission by the Auckland sergeants, and it is desired that the following particulars be furnished you in respect thereto: It is quite correct, as stated by the Auckland sergeants, that there are at present sixteen commissioned officers in the New Zealand Police Force. It is desired to direct attention to the fact that Mr. O'Brien and Mr. McGrath are the only members of the detective branch of the service promoted to commissioned rank during the past twenty-three years—that is, since the coming into operation of "The Police Force Act, 1886"; and during that period we have had thirty-one commissioned officers. It will be apparent that the uniformed branch has provided 93 per cent. of those officers. If the past seven months be excluded from the period of twenty-three years—that is, to take the period antecedent to the very recent promotion of Mr. McGrath—the number of detectives promoted to commissioned rank is reduced to one in twenty-two years and a half, which means that prior to February last 96 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of our commissioned officers were drawn from the uniformed branch, and only 3 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of them from the detective branch. Nine members of the Force who were constables when Mr. McGrath was a detective of full rank in 1885 were promoted to commissioned rank (three attaining Inspector's rank), while he still remained non-commissioned in the detective branch. The three junior Chief Detectives were promoted to detective rank when two of the present Sub-Inspectors were constables. It is submitted that this clearly demonstrates that so far the detectives have been travelling the circumference of the circle, while the members of the uniform branch have travelled the diameter, and reached the goal—quite the reverse of the suggestion made by the Auckland sergeants. The Auckland sergeants' request that a senior sergeant in the uniform branch should be held to be of superior rank to that of the Chief Detective is, in the opinion of the Wellington detectives, preposterous, untenable, and unarguable. It practically means that seniority alone should dominate the service, and that any of the sixty-eight sergeants and 116 constables now holding subordinate rank to the junior Chief Detective, but being his senior in length of service only, would, on their attaining the rank of senior sergeant in the uniform branch, forthwith become his superior in rank, with a consequent right to direct and instruct him; and, further, a priority of claim to promotion to commissioned rank, notwithstanding the fact that the position of Chief Detective is at present the only one in the Force for the filling of which the qualifications of ability and general fitness are strictly and definitely required by Police Regulations (*vide* Regulation No. 236, of the 16th June, 1904), and that the Chief Detective is directly responsible to the Inspector for the control of the detective staff, and for the proper investigation of all serious matters, and the due detection of offenders where his staff is employed. Every member of the uniform branch has had the opportunity of becoming a member of the detective branch of the service, and, consequently, of competing for the position of Chief Detective. Apparently, it is now asked that those who have worked their way to a Chief Detectiveship should "mark time" until those in the rear ranks march past them. With reference to the status of the members of the Force holding the rank of detective: In addition to the provisions contained in Regulations 224 and 228 (in which "officer" means "a commissioned officer"), departmental decisions and acts in the past have established the ruling and principle that the rank of detective is at least equivalent to, if it is not really higher than, that of the rank of sergeant in the uniform branch; in fact, for a detective to be returned to uniform with the rank of sergeant has been considered degradation and punishment for him. The following are cases in point: Second-class Detective Richard Doolan was reduced to second-class sergeant in 1889; Second-class Detective Patrick Quinn was reduced to second-class sergeant in 1890; Second-class Detective Thomas Neil was reduced to second-class sergeant in 1890; Fourth-class Detective

James W. Ede was reduced to third-class sergeant in 1894. Two of our present detectives (Livingstone and Siddells) were transferred from the rank of sergeant to that of detective on their own application, but not with seniority, or as a reduction or punishment. The Auckland sergeants now ask to be considered superior to them in rank, and that without having regard to seniority or other qualification. In the case of Detective Livingstone, who has thirty-two years' service (of which nineteen years has been spent in the detective branch), and who has served successfully in both branches of the Force, their request means that seventy-five sergeants junior to him in service (many of them very considerably so) should be held to be his superior in rank, solely because they belong to the uniform branch; in fact, under such conditions as are proposed by them, a country constable would, immediately on promotion to the rank of sergeant, become the master of a detective who may have held that rank long before the newly appointed sergeant joined the Police Force. With a view to removing any misconception or feeling which may exist respecting the relative positions of the sergeant in charge and the detective in out-stations, it is submitted that all detectives of full rank now stationed at such places should be brought in to the offices under the control of the present Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, or Chief Detectives, and be replaced by acting-detectives (to be selected from those holding such positions in the city detective offices) of proved intelligence, ability, and general fitness who are inferior in rank to the sergeant in charge. This only involves the transfer of one detective from New Plymouth, one from Gisborne, one from Hastings, one from Lyttelton, and two from the suburban station of Newton (Auckland), and the efficiency of the service would be fully maintained in consequence. Referring to the question of pay: In comparing the pay, the Auckland sergeants appear to have altogether overlooked the fact that detectives are under considerable expense in the execution of their duties, and receive no consideration for clothing, consequently their pay is reduced to practically the same as, if not actually less than, that of the sergeants. Unquestionably a successful detective is called upon to spend money freely, to mix with people of all social positions under circumstances which tend to the expenditure of money, to interview people at places where it becomes incumbent upon him to at least spend as much as those he is interviewing do while he is in their company, to frequently purchase information necessary to secure the detection of offenders, and to be on duty from 9 a.m. till at least midnight. A sergeant is under no obligation to place himself in such circumstances, has no demands on his salary, is supplied with the clothing he requires when on duty, and only works eight hours per day. In house-accommodation the sergeants have all the best of it. Many of them live rent-free, and have perquisites as well; while the detectives have to pay a rental much in advance of their allowance, and receive no perquisites. Each of the Chief Detectives in the centres receives much less consideration in house-allowance than the station sergeant. In Auckland and Christchurch the station sergeants are provided with free and up-to-date houses, while the Chief Detectives receive only 14s. per week, which only partially pays their rent. In Wellington the station sergeant receives £50 per year, and the Chief Detective £36. In Dunedin the station sergeant receives £40, and the Chief Detective £36. It is submitted that the house-allowances in both branches should be equalised. With a view to the betterment of the service, the following is submitted: (1.) The evidence given before the Royal Commission by Inspectors Gillies and O'Brien, Sub-Inspector McGrath, and Chief Detectives Herbert and Bishop, respecting the position of Chief Detectives, and their suggestions that the Chief Detectives should be appointed Sub-Inspectors in the detective branch is agreed with, strongly supported, and further urged before the Royal Commissioner by the detectives in the Wellington District. In Tasmania the Chief Detectives at Hobart and Launceston are commissioned officers holding the rank of Inspector. In Melbourne there is a Superintendent and an Inspector controlling the detectives there. In Sydney they have a Superintendent, an Inspector, and a Sub-Inspector in the detective branch. In Brisbane, Adelaide, and Perth a Sub-Inspector is in charge of the detective office. And it is submitted that the New Zealand Chief Detectives should be placed on at least the same footing as those holding similar positions in the smaller Australian States. Each of the present four junior Chief Detectives and many of the present detectives are thoroughly disciplined men, having undergone at least a year's military training under Imperial military officers in the New Zealand Permanent Militia subsequent to service in the New Zealand Volunteer Forces, in addition to having served for some time in the uniform branch of the Police Force before their appointment to the detective branch of the service. (2.) That those at present holding the rank of detective be classified according to merit and general fitness as detective senior sergeants and detective sergeants. (3.) That the acting-detectives be designated or appointed detective constables, and retain their plain-clothes allowance of 1s. per day. (4.) That all detective senior sergeants and detective sergeants be stationed under an Inspector or a Sub-Inspector of either branch. (5.) That detective constables be stationed under a member of the Force who is their superior in rank in either branch, as the requirements of the service may demand. (6.) That detective constables eligible for promotion to detective sergeants, if stationed in a country or suburban station, be brought into one of the centres under a Detective Sub-Inspector for a reasonable period of further city duty prior to being promoted. (7.) That the pay and allowances of Sub-Inspectors be the same in both branches. (8.) That in the absence of the Inspector in charge of the district, the senior Sub-Inspector be in charge of both branches of the service. (9.) That the Sub-Inspectors of both branches be eligible for promotion to the rank of an Inspector of Police. (10.) That all promotions in the service be determined by ability and general fitness. (11.) That the ranks in both branches be equal. (12.) That promotions in either branch be from subordinates in the branch concerned. (13.) That the travelling-allowance for detective senior sergeants, detective sergeants, and detective constables be 10s. per day, the minimum allowance granted to Civil servants under the Civil Service Regulations. I should now like to reply to certain suggestions and remarks made by Sergeant Dart. I would first point out that we are personal friends, and it is not a question of any personal feeling, but simply his policy against that of the detectives.

13. Did you read the memo. in connection with Sub-Inspector McGrath's promotion?—I did not, but I heard his evidence. He admitted he thought that detectives who had reached the position of Chief Detective were eligible for promotion as Sub-Inspector. I am junior Chief Detective in the Dominion, and will have to refer to my own case to further our argument, but I am really endeavouring to further the interests of the whole branch. Sergeant Dart gives the strength of the two branches as 750 in the preventive branch and fifty in the detective. He contends that detectives should only be promoted in proportion to their numerical strength. If you consider what that really means you will see the importance of the position so far as the detectives are concerned. It means that there should be only one promotion from the detective branch to the position of Sub-Inspector to every fifteen from the preventive branch. It means that whilst one man should be promoted from the detective branch, fifteen should be promoted from the preventive branch. I can quite understand his putting forward such a suggestion. It is really in his own personal interests, or those in his position, and nobody else. I submit a man in the Police Force requires every bit as much merit to reach the position of Chief Detective as a man does to be qualified as instructor in the training depot—that is, as far as practical police education is concerned. So far as practical police experience is concerned, I should like to point out I do not understand Sergeant Dart's position altogether. For the purpose of furthering the promotion of the men holding the position of instructor to the Department, he claims to belong to the preventive branch. How he got there I do not know. He was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1906. He holds a staff position. It is a very good one, and he draws 1s. a day plain-clothes allowance. He really, I submit, is as far away from the preventive branch as I am. When his promotion was gazetted it was mentioned in the *Police Gazette* that he was specially promoted to the training depot. I contend that while he wants to use this special promotion of school-teacher to the depot, he has very little practical experience of police duty. No doubt he has very full theoretical knowledge, but he has very little practical, and he wants to use this promotion as a short cut to a Sub-Inspectorship, and have a 15-to-1 chance as compared with the right of a detective to reach that position. He says he is entitled to the position of station sergeant by virtue of being in charge of the training depot. He says fifteen station sergeants should be promoted for every one detective who is promoted to the position of Sub-Inspector. Therefore I can understand his saying he belongs to the preventive branch. Ten years ago, when I was a detective, Sergeant Dart was a probationary constable. I required some men for special work, and Dart was sent to the office, and placed under me, and took instructions from me. After two years as mounted constable he was promoted to a clerkship, and after six years and a half was appointed to his present position. I admit the importance of the position, and he is probably the best man in the Force to fill it. I say that without any hesitation; but I contend that during the ten years which has elapsed since he was a probationary constable and I was a detective I have a very good record. I have been a successful detective, and yet what he says is that he should be promoted to station sergeant and have a 15-to-1 chance as compared with me. As far as my record is concerned, I refer you to my merit sheet. If Sergeant Dart's argument succeeds, and in future a man holding the position of drill-instructor and school-teacher to the Department is to be allowed to use his position as a short cut to that of Sub-Inspector, it will be a position very much sought after, and there will be a lot of discontent as to who is to get it.

14. It does not do to ask too little in these days?—I admire Sergeant Dart for asking for plenty. I am sorry he is not present; but here I am going to say I should like to point out that Sergeant Dart is not satisfied with placing obstacles in the way of Chief Detectives or detectives, but he says clerks—men who occupy responsible positions in the service—should have obstacles placed in their way—that they should be held in the office for five years, and not be allowed to go and compete with other men as sergeants. That would suit his own case to a T. It would remove a lot of superior well-educated men who have an excellent knowledge of police work as obstacles from him; they would not reach the positions of station sergeants or senior sergeants, and he would have no one to compete with. He makes provision for Chief Detectives to be kept out of the road and for district clerks to be kept out of the road—clerks selected on account of merit, just as Sergeant Dart is. Sergeant Dart suggests there would be discontent if they were promoted. I undertake to say that if Sergeant Dart were promoted to the position of Sub-Inspector, if he gets the position of station sergeant because he is drill instructor, there will be no end of discontent. I have mentioned two branches of the service he endeavours to obstruct. The next one is that of station sergeants. He says before they attain the rank of Sub-Inspector station sergeants should be submitted to a severe examination. What does this mean? It means that a lot of good men who have spent years in the service, as against theoretical experience, would have no more chance of passing this severe examination as compared with Sergeant Dart than I would have of flying to the moon. He knows very well, if the examination were of a severe character, those men would have no chance of passing it. As far as general police work is concerned, and general efficiency, those men might be all that is required, and would make as good Inspectors as we have in the service; and I do not think any one can find fault with them. But if those station sergeants or senior sergeants had to submit to an examination of that sort, they would have a very poor chance of competing with a man with a college education. Those are three branches he has endeavoured to remove from his path, so as to have a nice clean track to walk along to the position of Sub-Inspector. But he is not satisfied with that. He has the distinction of being the first man before the Commission to advocate a reduction of pay. At present detectives receive up to 15s. He says they should only receive 14s., and supports his suggestion by saying sergeants should get the same. Perhaps he thinks, if the detectives were reduced, sergeants would have a chance of getting more. He does not suggest station sergeants should be reduced. Station sergeants should go up to 17s. 6d.; because he admitted he expected the rank of station sergeant very soon; so that one could not expect him to advocate a reduction in his own pay. He asks that detectives, who have to work

hard, and keep up a reputation, and do their duty to the Department, should suffer. I am not surprised that he appeared before the Commission as a free lance, and a dissenter from the general suggestions and general opinions of the sergeants: he wanted to spring something fresh, and to push his own barrow along. In the course of his remarks on the detective branch he spoke of Mr. McGrath, and said that he, in speaking of the detective branch as the right hand of the service, no doubt had a weakness for his old love. We are all very pleased to see that Mr. McGrath, although he has reached superior rank in the uniform branch, does not forget us, and is satisfied as regards the ability of the men he left behind. I am sure it is gratifying to the detectives here to know that he has not somersaulted, and not embraced any new love to assist him to quick promotion. I submit, when men enter the police, all start off scratch. If a man has extra ability in the direction of being qualified as district clerk, detective, or for any other position, he should not, after serving years faithfully and well and working hard in his branch, be retarded in any way. I think if a district clerk serves ten years he is entitled to promotion, and should not suffer in any way because he gets promotion a few years sooner than those doing street duty. I think ten years' experience in a district office should fully qualify him for promotion as sergeant. Every man has an opportunity to work himself up when he joins the Force. If he says, "I am going to push on," he will push on, and it is no good him taking things easy, and starting to squeal when he sees other men promoted. The same thing applies to detectives. If a man has the necessary qualifications and ability to be a successful detective, he should not have to mark time while others are given the opportunity to catch up to him. One other thing I wish to say: Sergeant Dart yesterday said he thought a station sergeant should get as much pay as a Chief Detective. We are very good friends, and I would be only too pleased if he got a rise to-morrow; but, apart from the question of salary, I submit he does not hold a superior position to a Chief Detective. When the Inspector and Sub-Inspector are away he is really in charge of the station, and, so far as the routine work goes, he runs the show, but so far as the detective branch is concerned he does not hold a superior position in comparison with the officer in charge.

15. Was the appointment of Quartermain the cause of any dissatisfaction among the men doing plain-clothes duty?—No.

16. It has been voiced in other places?—It is not much voiced here. Every one recognises here that he has a very responsible position, and particularly in Wellington we know the value of it. There is no general discontent.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you a satisfactory staff of men under you?—Yes; I think they will compare with any in the Dominion.

18. Do they work amicably together with the uniform branch?—Yes.

19. There is no trouble at all?—None whatever.

20. Have you found the finger-print branch has been of great assistance to you?—Undoubtedly. If a detective goes to them, they are always ready to impart any information.

21. They have helped in the detection and identification of criminals?—Yes. The importance of the finger-print branch is not at all known to the outside public.

22. You have been some years at Lambton Quay?—Twelve years.

23. You know there is some little dissatisfaction amongst a few there?—Yes, I think there is; but I think there is less dissatisfaction now than at any period during the last fifteen years.

24. There is no general dissatisfaction as regards the present control of the service?—No.

25. Do you know anything about inquiries as regards candidates for enrolment?—Not a great deal. I have not had many through my hands. What few I had were most thorough.

26. In regard to the term of probation, do you think, in addition to three months on the drill-ground, they ought to have three months before their appointment as constables, so as to try them in practical work and ordinary police duties before their appointment, so that they may be more easily dispensed with if unsuitable?—No. I think Sergeant Dart is capable of ascertaining whether a man should be made a constable or not.

27. You know that false information reaches the Press occasionally?—Yes.

28. As regards the general conduct of the men?—It is very good indeed. You could not find a better class of men in any Force in the world.

29. Is the efficiency and discipline as good as heretofore?—Yes; we are under a very strict Inspector. Nobody could find fault with the Wellington police.

30. Have you any reason to complain about the Inspector in regard to the manner in which he treats you?—He has always treated me with the greatest courtesy.

31. Are the sergeants a good class of men?—They are better to-day than they have ever been.

32. Did Mr. Arnold's remarks in respect to the conduct of the men at Lambton Quay Station cause trouble?—The men are indignant about it, and feel that the remarks were not justifiable.

33. Is it generally believed that my son had six months' leave on full pay?—I never heard it; I saw it in print. I never heard any member of the Force suggest it afterwards.

34. Have you heard of any sergeant at Wellington being under the influence of liquor?—No.

35. What is your opinion as regards the question of promotion?—That is the bone of contention, no doubt.

36. If a district clerk gets promoted in the course of ten years, and prefers to go out and compete with ordinary sergeants, provided that seniority and service is considered, would that make any difference to his chance?—All clerks I have ever known have had what I may call "beat" experience before they went into the office. If a man goes into an office, and keeps his nose at the grindstone for ten years, he earns his promotion, and he should have the same chance of further promotion as the man who reaches the position of sergeant through ordinary channels in twelve or fourteen years.

37. Do you believe in physical drill?—I do.

38. Do you think a gymnasium and instructor would be useful?—Yes.

39. You do not believe in examinations?—I do to a certain extent; but if you are going to make men pass severe examinations, you should give them something to compete for.

40. Should they not be able to pass certain examinations before promotion to the rank of sergeant?—It depends on what you call examinations. No doubt all the men could pass some examination, but I think a constable who has been continually under the eyes of an Inspector for fourteen years has passed quite a sufficient examination.

41. The Inspector knows his qualifications?—Yes.

42. Should he not be able to pass an examination which is not too severe, such as knowing how to make a proper report?—No. I say the Inspector is competent to judge whether a man has the necessary qualifications to make a good sergeant, and there should be no further examination unless you are going to make the position something worth competing for. If you start their wages at 12s. 6d. the men would study to pass.

43. *The Commissioner.*] That would not apply to the same extent to examination before a man could get commissioned rank. Do you not think it advisable that a man should be compelled to pass some examination before promotion to commissioned rank?—It all depends on the sort of examination. If it can be easily passed by all constables it would be no examination at all. If it is an examination which could only be passed by educated men, what about your practical men?

44. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suggest a practical examination in law and police duties?—I do not think any man who is qualified as a Sub-Inspector would object to an examination of that sort.

45. *Inspector Ellison.*] As regards promotion, do you not think the qualifications of a man in regard to ability to control, advise, and direct constables under him is one of the principal points in qualifying for promotion from constable to sergeant?—Yes, certainly.

46. And that could not be set forth in any examination?—No.

47. It could not be disclosed by examination-papers, but must rest on the knowledge of his superiors?—Yes.

48. *Acting-Detective Abbott.*] You have known me for some years, when I was in charge of Levin, and had an opportunity of judging my work: what can you say in regard to my present position—it has been suggested I was unduly promoted?—I think Constable Abbott is in every way qualified to hold the position he is in. There is no doubt about that at all. He was generally recognised as a good sergeant, and I recognise him as a good acting-detective.

49. *The Commissioner.*] His actual qualifications were never called in question; but the attitude has been taken up in Auckland that, having voluntarily left the Force, and having chosen to go back, he is put into a position without subsequent service that other men with longer service would be very glad to get?—I think, if the Department think fit to reinstate a constable, and he has fifteen or sixteen years' service, and they think he is fit to go into the detective office, they have the right to put him there without question.

50. You know there is a regulation that gives the Commissioner power to select any constable and give him a position as acting-detective?—Yes.

51. *Acting-Detective Hammond.*] You knew that twelve years ago I was doing a considerable amount of work in the detective office?—Yes.

52. Do you think, owing to the discord which was then apparent between the Commissioner and Inspector Pender, that a recommendation from him would receive the consideration it deserved?—I knew there was friction, and a recommendation at that time from Inspector Pender would probably not have a good effect.

53. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You do not suggest that if the Commissioner thought this man qualified for the position he would keep him back?—The man was highly recommended by the sergeant in charge and the Inspector, and they should be better judges than Commissioner Tunbridge.

54. *Acting-Detective Hammond.*] You recognise that at that time I was doing good work?—Yes.

55. I have given satisfaction since I have been with you?—Yes; I am very well satisfied with you.

WILLIAM BERNARD McILVENEY, Chief Detective, examined on oath. (No. 292.)

Witness: I am attached to the Headquarters staff. I was enrolled on transfer from the Permanent Militia in 1893. I joined at Dunedin, and was transferred to Invercargill in 1894. I was placed in the office of the late Inspector McDonnell, and did clerical work there; also performed my share of uniform duties till 1897, when I took charge of the detective office in Southland. I was promoted to detective in 1899, and transferred to Wellington. On arrival here I was elected by Commissioner Tunbridge to perform special duties in other districts; and during the seven months I was attached to the Wellington office. I did duty on the West Coast and Nelson in connection with murder cases and other serious matters. On my own application, I exchanged stations with Detective Boddan, who was then in Dunedin, on the ground of ill health. Then I was asked to return to Invercargill, and did so in 1900. Almost immediately I was taken away on special duty to the West Coast and Nelson, and from then till the arrival of Mr. Dinnie I was travelling up and down on special work without extra remuneration or consideration of any sort. That was still followed by the present Commissioner. I was applied for from the Auckland District in 1905, and after some time there was again applied for by the late Secretary to the Post Office to take up an investigation of Post Office matters in the Auckland District. I returned to Invercargill, and was applied for by the late Inspector of Napier to investigate a murder case. I returned again to Invercargill, and was sent to get up evidence in the Tapanui murder case. From that time till I was promoted to my present rank, in 1907, I was more or less engaged on special work.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You are the first detective who has been appointed to this rank?—Yes. I am the first at Headquarters staff. My work consists in investigating matters sent to our Depart-

ment, in some instances from Cabinet, in other instances from different Ministers of the Crown; also petitions to Parliament which require investigation on account of alleged criminal acts; also investigations from the Post and Telegraph Department, of which Department I am a former member, having served three years in it. Then, I have duties in connection with the Railway and Education Departments, many of which require a knowledge of accountancy as well as departmental methods. I have also generally to assist the police in any part of the Dominion in the investigation of serious crimes of any nature, and, of course, such other duties as may from time to time arise, and in regard to which the Commissioner thinks I should make inquiries.

2. You are solely under the Commissioner's direction?—Yes; but I never entered a district of an Inspector of Police without acquainting him of my duties, and informing him of the result of my inquiries, and at times obtained some assistance from him to enable me to better and more speedily cope with my duties. I wish to say that I have received the utmost consideration and the greatest assistance from every Inspector in New Zealand, as well as from every Chief Detective.

3. There has been no friction of any sort?—No, not the slightest.

4. What is your present pay?—16s. a day.

5. Have you any special allowance?—None of any sort. I never asked for any. I am entitled to 14s. a week house-allowance.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you at Invercargill?—Thirteen years altogether.

7. Under Mr. Mitchell?—I was under him until I took up my present position in 1907—five years.

8. Do you remember not long since a number of letters appeared in the paper in respect to my position?—I remember hearing of them. I have an idea I saw one, but am not certain.

9. *The Commissioner.*] In what paper?—I rather think, the *Otago Daily Times*.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Did it come to your knowledge that there was any agitation down there in the direction of supplanting me?—Yes.

11. Might that have been the reason for the transfer of Sergeant Mathieson?—I presume the reason would be known only to you.

12. *The Commissioner.*] You have no reason to identify Sergeant Mathieson with the agitation to supplant the Commissioner?—I was absent at the time; it was only hearsay.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have had no letter from any one relating to this matter?—Not that an agitation was going on, but that there would be one.

14. Has Constable Greene ever made any statement to you as to visiting Inspector McDonnell?—They were very great friends, and he has told me he has been out to see him.

15. Has he even mentioned anything in respect to a letter for the Press?—He has mentioned to me that he conveyed some data for another member of the Force to Mr. McDonnell. Shortly after, these letters appeared in the Press.

16. *Sergeant Mathieson.*] Do you identify me with those agitators at Invercargill?—I said it was only hearsay.

17. Of course you know nothing?—I was not there.

18. How long have you known me?—Since 1893.

19. Have you known me as an agitator of any description?—No; I have known you as a very good constable and sergeant.

20. Did you ever hear me express myself antagonistic to Mr. Dinnie?—No; I think you were present when he was antagonistically referred to by others.

21. You have no reason to suppose I was antagonistic to him?—I know you had wishes that he should be supplanted.

22. You have heard others express themselves antagonistic to the Commissioner?—Yes; when I came to Wellington I came here with an opinion that I was going to have a very warm time of it. I had been spoken to of Sub-Inspector Wright. He had enemies down there, and, in consequence of what they stated, when I was leaving Invercargill I expressed myself to Inspector Mitchell in these terms: "Good-by; I am leaving paradise to go into hell." I have now been two and a half years in this office, and I say there is not the slightest vestige of foundation for the remarks that have been made against this Sub-Inspector; he never interfered with me in any way, and I cannot speak too highly of him.

23. Do you know I was passed over in regard to promotion?—Yes; and I think I might say I know why. I had spoken of you in a very favourable way from time to time to the Inspector at Invercargill, and, while he acknowledged your general ability and your fittedness for the position of sergeant, he seemed to have a doubt whether he should recommend you, and I know from himself that for a considerable time he did not. I also know from himself that Mr. Dinnie, on seeing you and speaking to you, was so struck with your general manner and appearance and of your file, that he asked Inspector Mitchell why he had not recommended you. Inspector Mitchell informed him that for some reason of his own he had not so far recommended you, but was pleased to inform the Commissioner then that he was now prepared to recommend you. I believe he did so after that, and he told me then that Mr. Dinnie went away with a favourable impression.

24. Did a conversation take place at that time between myself and Mr. Dinnie?—I was not there.

25. But you are aware of it from hearsay?—I would not like to swear to it. I may have heard something.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I do not deny the conversation. You have been on leave, I think?—Yes; I just returned this morning.

27. I have not seen you in respect to this matter?—No. I wish to say another thing that occurred to me. I have heard some remarks about a "special" man. Although I have travelled the length and breadth of New Zealand for some years, I never heard of any "special" man till it was mentioned in Dunedin. I do not believe there is any truth in it.

28. *Chief Detective Broberg.*] Do you consider an allowance of 8s. sufficient to pay a detective's board and lodging when travelling, and covering incidental expenses?—Personally I find it is not so.

29. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have not found hell quite so hot as you expected?—No. I came here with an absolutely erroneous impression.

30. *The Commissioner.*] Who was going to supplant the Commissioner?—The suggestion was that he should be replaced by Inspector Mitchell, of Invercargill.

31. That would be rather a big jump?—Well, I must say he is a very able man, but he is a junior Inspector.

32. You heard about the complaint of a man in Invercargill that proper police proceedings were not taken in reference to the marriage of his daughter?—I saw something of it.

33. I promised this man I would ask you about the matter?—I think, from my recollection, I saw Mr. Stuck, and told him to attend at my office. I took a statement from him as fully as I could, and it was read to him, and signed by him as correct. Inquiries were made from the other witnesses to the marriage, and, lest there should be any suggestion of religious feeling, I took Sergeant Mathieson with me when I went to see one of them. I made every inquiry I could into the matter.

34. And found no grounds for prosecution?—Absolutely none.

35. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What do you think as regards the clerical staff at Headquarters? Should they be Civil servants?—No. I feel very strongly on this subject. I should feel it very keenly if I were instructed by any civilian. If the present staff were to go away, you could not get a civilian to fill my place, and I would not feel disposed to accept instructions from a person not a member of the Force.

36. Is it not necessary for an Accountant or Chief Clerk to have a knowledge of police business?—Yes.

37. *Chief Detective Broberg.*] You are familiar with the resolutions passed by the Wellington detectives, as submitted by me, in reply to the suggestion of the Auckland sergeants: do you approve of our suggestions, and support them?—I do.

WILLIAM MCNEELY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 293.)

Witness: I am at present stationed at Headquarters. I look after the accounts.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Would it be correct to term you "accountant in the Commissioner's office"?—No; Sub-Inspector Wright holds the position of Chief Clerk and Accountant.

2. How long have you been there?—On two occasions; the last time about five and a half years.

3. When were you promoted?—On the 1st April, 1906.

4. You have been over three years sergeant?—Yes.

5. And entered the Force in 1897?—Yes.

6. Therefore you had nine years' service when promoted?—Yes.

7. What are your particular duties?—Generally in connection with the accounts—checking them and preparing them for payment by the Treasury, or for passing by the Audit Department.

8. What is your remuneration?—11s. per day, and 2s. special allowance.

9. In addition, I suppose you have house-allowance?—Yes, 1s. 6d. per day sergeant's allowance.

10. What house-rent do you pay?—I live in a house of my own, but it is equal to £1 per week.

11. Is there anything of a general nature you wish to mention?—No; only to voice the general opinion of the Force, that the pay is too low. I think 6d. a day rise should be given to the constables.

12. You are better off than some?—It is not for myself I am speaking, but married constables joining at 7s. 6d. per day are very badly off.

13. What is the average rent a married man would have to pay?—At least, £1 per week.

14. What sort of house do you value at £1? Your own house?—It is only a four-roomed house, between one and two miles from the office, on one-eighth of an acre section on the top of a hill.

15. How long have you been getting this 2s. per day extra?—I got 1s. in 1899, the usual allowance granted to district clerks; and an extra 1s. on the 1st November, 1904.

16. How long have you been in the Headquarters office?—Five and a half years on this occasion, and eighteen months on the former occasion. It is eleven years ago since I came into Commissioner Tunbridge's office.

17. Is your time fully occupied?—More than fully.

18. Are you short-handed?—Yes; I think the office could very well do with one man extra.

19. Who are in the office besides yourself?—Sub-Inspector Wright, Sergeant Gaffney, and Constable Nelson.

20. Of course, the other sergeant's work is confined strictly to the *Gazette*?—I think about twenty-five years ago there were four men doing the work, and the police vote has increased about £70,000 since then.

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The Force has increased about 160 in the last six years?—Yes.

22. Any one coming to see me must come through your office?—Yes. If they are to see you, the Chief Clerk takes them in.

MICHAEL GAFFNEY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 294.)

Witness: I am at present stationed at Headquarters. I was enrolled in December, 1897. I had served twelve months in the Artillery. I was promoted in 1907.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How long have you been in the Commissioner's office?—I will be attached to the present staff five years in October next.

2. What were you doing previously?—I joined and served in Auckland, and entered the clerical staff about December, 1898. I served as assistant clerk until June, 1904. I was then promoted district clerk, and transferred to Napier, and from there transferred to Wellington in October, 1904.

3. Then, your police experience has been mainly clerical?—I did twelve months as watch-house keeper, mounted and plain-clothes constable.

4. What remuneration do you receive at the present time?—10s. 6d. as sergeant, and 2s. clerical allowance.

5. And the ordinary house-allowance?—I am a single man.

6. What are your duties in the office?—Principally with the records—typing and any general work that may be required, such as looking up files—record clerk.

7. Were you a typist before you went there?—I learned it before I went there.

8. How do you find the work?—Much heavier than in the district office, especially within the last six months.

9. Then, you are short-handed. What hours do you work?—About nine hours a day on an average, because I work two or three nights a week.

10. What hours do you work?—From 9 to 5, then go back two or three evenings a week from one and a half to two hours. I have been doing that especially for the past two months.

11. You have been mentioned to me as a man having some experience of a rifle?—Yes; I had two years in the Permanent Force, and during that time I passed the examination for a non-commissioned officer. I had three years' Volunteer service before that.

12. I mean for shooting purposes, not merely an ornamental appendage to drill. I am speaking of the police as possibly forming the nucleus of an addition to our Defence Forces, and for that purpose it would be essential that every constable should have a reasonable knowledge of the rifle—such a knowledge which, without making a man an expert shot, would enable him to hit a haystack?—No doubt the training would be very beneficial to them.

13. And you see no difficulty about it?—It could not be done without a three months' course under the most elementary conditions.

14. Three months of what?—Two hours' instruction a day.

15. At the butts?—The rifle practice at the butts might take years to make a man a good shot.

16. You do not want to make every man a good shot?—Three months' instruction would be necessary in the care and use of the rifle.

17. And a great deal of the drill that a man does now could be done with the rifle?—Yes.

18. So that could be got over?—He would first require foot drill before the rifle would be issued to him, and then he would require a longer time with the rifle.

19. Irregular corps do not require very much actual drill-work, and yet they are very useful with the rifle. I want to evolve some scheme by which a man, without adding too much to the drudgery of his ordinary course, may become fairly proficient with the rifle?—It would not be too much. The ordinary rifle course of rifle clubs might be encouraged.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have to do with inquiries respecting candidates in the service?—Yes.

21. Give an idea of how they are conducted?—The applicant applies for a form, which is received and noted. The form is sent to the man. When he sends in the application, a further form is attached as to the nature and mode of the inquiries to be made. The form is first examined to see that all questions are carefully answered, so that the whole time from leaving school is accounted for, and the name and address of the employer given, so that the officer making the inquiries may see and know who he is to call upon. It involves a lot of work. I remember one man had twenty-one previous occupations, and we had to inquire as to whether his time was correctly accounted for. Forms have to be sent all over the Dominion, and if the man has been employed outside New Zealand, the facts as stated in his form are printed in the form of a letter and sent to the local police, so that his whole time is accounted for.

22. You know there are a few who come with certificates from other forces?—Previous-service men.

23. The regulation provides that we can take them up to forty without going through the probation class?—Yes. There was evidence given here by Constable Gallagher with reference to the question of late leave. It was misunderstood. I think what was intended was the Imperial Army regulation dealing with late leave, which provides that all good-conduct men with over twelve months' service, and who have been six months clear of the defaulter list, should get permanent late leave. That encourages men to be of good conduct.

JOHN WILLETTTS, Constable, further examined. (No. 295.)

1. *Sergeant Mathieson.*] Do you recollect a conversation regarding your transfer to Wellington South? Tell the Commissioner how you came there?—I was stationed at Lambton Quay, and I lived in a house of my own at Berhampore, four miles away. I think I did duty for seven or eight months at the Quay, and found it very hard to get down there in time, because I had to be there at a quarter to 5 in the morning when on day duty. That meant leaving home at 3.30 a.m., which was very difficult on a wet winter's morning. After six months there I asked for a transfer to Wellington South, not that I did not like Lambton Quay, but I could not get a house down at this end of the town.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Who did you ask?—I put in an application in writing to the Inspector, and I saw the Inspector personally about it. He told me that I might as well let the matter drop, that I would not get it; anyhow, that there were senior men waiting for those places, and that I did not have a chance. Some time later on I heard that there was a vacancy likely to occur within a few days—that there was a man being transferred from Wellington South—so, to the best of my knowledge, I applied again; I believe I put in two applications, but would not swear to it. Talking to the other men about it, I mentioned that I would never get there if I relied upon Inspector Ellison to send me there, and they advised me to see Sub-Inspector Wright personally. I saw him, and stated my case, telling him plainly how I was situated, and asked him to use his influence with Mr. Dinnie to get me there. He said, Yes, and as soon as the vacancy occurred I got it. In extenuation, I might state that when I mentioned this matter to the sergeant I had no idea that it would be brought up, but seeing that it is I had no option but to tell the exact truth.

3. Did you bind him in confidence when you made it?—No.

4. Do you know what was done with your application?—It would be minuted in the ordinary way, and sent back to me.

5. Was it minuted?—As far as I recollect, it was.

6. In what way?—I could not say now.

7. But you ought to be able to say?—The application would be in existence. Surely I can refresh my memory by seeing it? Might I ask for the papers to be here?

8. *The Commissioner.*] Whom did you see in reference to the transfer?—Mr. Wright personally.

Mr. Dinnie: Inspector Ellison will prove that he recommended the application.

The Commissioner: Why are not these things done through the Inspector? He says he went to see your Chief Clerk?

Mr. Dinnie: That did not affect his transfer. I cannot prevent him from seeing anybody he likes. I am going to prove otherwise.

ARTHUR HOBBS WRIGHT, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 296.)

Witness: I am Sub-Inspector of Police, employed as Chief Clerk and Accountant on the Headquarters staff. I joined the police on the 2nd August, 1882, and after three months' duty at the depot was transferred as constable to Invercargill for office and other work. What I am going to state now is not with the view of blowing my own trumpet, but to show that my service and experience entitles me to the rank I hold, and that I did not receive it simply because I was a clerk. During the time I was stationed at Invercargill I frequently had to perform ordinary uniform duty in addition to clerical work, also detective work, for which I was specially rewarded, and promised promotion. Shortly after I went there I was placed in charge of the station during the absence of the sergeant, although much junior to other men on the station, and on all occasions subsequently for eight years was similarly placed in charge; the reason for this is set forth in record A.C. 90/293, which I put in. I was recommended for promotion by Inspector Buckley in 1884, again by the same officer in 1887, then by Inspector Moore in 1889, and again in 1890. In that year I passed the police examination controlled by Mr. Stratford, S.M., obtaining 179 marks out of a possible 200, was granted the only first-class certificate ever issued, and was specially promoted. In 1891, when the Invercargill District was abolished, I was transferred to Dunedin as second clerk, where I remained until 1893, when I was appointed district clerk at Wellington, and again promoted by Colonel Hume. While in the office at Wellington, before the appointment of Sub-Inspectors (in 1899), I always acted for the Inspector when absent—on one occasion for six months—ane generally gave directions on police matters. On the 1st January, 1898, I was promoted to the rank of sergeant by Commissioner Tunbridge. In 1897 and 1898 I was rewarded by both Commissioners Hume and Tunbridge for special ability in connection with two important murder cases, and produce my record sheet. In the same year I was selected to proceed to South America to effect the extradition of an offender, whom I brought back to New Zealand *via* London. At that time I was offered the position of Chief Detective at Wellington by Commissioner Tunbridge, with the view to speedy promotion to rank of Sub-Inspector; the offer was confirmed by the Minister, but on my return from South America it was decided that my appointment might cause jealousy, and it was dropped. Subsequently I was offered charge of Invercargill District, but for family reasons did not accept. In 1905 I was transferred to the Commissioner's staff, still holding the rank of sergeant, as second to Mr. Tasker, who was Chief Clerk. The latter dying in November, 1905, I took over his duties, and on the 1st January, 1906, was promoted to my present rank. Had I been in the uniform branch I was next on the list for promotion in any case, being next to Sub-Inspector O'Donovan, who was promoted to sergeant on the same day as myself, but reached the rank of Sub-Inspector three years and a half before I did. There has been no short cut to promotion for me; it took me sixteen years to reach the rank of sergeant, and twenty-three and a half years that of Sub-Inspector. As the question of the Headquarters staff being members of the Civil service has been referred to during the Commission, I should like to give evidence on the point. One reason has been assigned that their promotion with less service than others who only perform ordinary police duty creates a feeling of dissatisfaction in the Force. If such a feeling exists—and I question whether it does to any extent—it is entirely unwarranted; the promotion of members of the staff does not retard that of others in the slightest degree; in fact, it increases their chance of promotion, by removing from the ranks intelligent men who would undoubtedly compete strongly with them for promotion if they continued ordinary duty. There are many reasons why members of the staff should be selected from the Force; one is that they are invariably selected from the district offices, where they have attained a practical acquaintance with police returns, accounts, correspondence, and methods generally, and so are in a better position to check

the work that is sent in to the Head Office. Their character, conduct, and ability have been proved for years before being appointed to the staff; consequently, their work is satisfactory, and they are not likely to be removed from office for misconduct, which in itself is a matter of importance in a department where the records are of an essentially confidential nature; they are men who, having been tried, can be implicitly trusted. It is an inducement to members of the Force in district offices to perform their duties satisfactorily so that they may hope to be selected for the Commissioner's office, and an inducement generally to candidates for the Force of superior education to seek appointment with the view of ultimately getting on the staff. If the best positions in the clerical portion of the service be taken away from the Department and given to the Civil service it naturally follows that the attractiveness of the service to good men is lessened. The experience of this and other Forces has proved that the work of the Department can be as well, if not better, performed by police officers than by Civil servants. In this Force prior to 1888 Civil servants were employed as district clerks at Dunedin and Christchurch, when they were replaced by sergeants. One of the strongest reasons is that of discipline; it cannot be expected that a Commissioner can exercise the same control over Civil servants as he can over his own men. When Civil servants were employed in the Head Office a few years ago it was a standing source of dissatisfaction to members of the clerical staff in the Force, who maintained that they had a right for consideration for such positions. The previous Commissioner, Mr. Tunbridge, had already initiated the system of employing police on his staff, and the change was completed as opportunity offered, and the system has worked well. It has been stated by two Inspectors that a Sub-Inspector should not be in a position to instruct them, but no remedy has been suggested. When the Commissioner is away it naturally follows that some one must act for him. One Inspector suggested that a Chief Inspector should act for him; but what would happen when he also was absent? Suppose the Inspector at Wellington was authorised to act for the Commissioner, he is not the senior Inspector in the Dominion; and the same objection would arise—viz., that a junior would be instructing a senior. It must be remembered that any instructions issued are issued under the name and authority of the Commissioner, who accepts the responsibility therefor. The practice of a clerk signing for the head of a department obtains in all branches of the Government service, and I have never heard of any objection except in the Police Force. I think one Inspector said he should not object to a Civil servant acting for the Commissioner, but it is well known in the Force that when the late Chief Clerk used to so act his action was strongly resented in some quarters, so much so that in one instance the Inspector declined to allow him to speak to him on police matters, and practically ordered him out of his office. As regards the Sub-Inspector in the Commissioner's office competing with other Sub-Inspectors, I cannot see on what grounds such a course would be unfair; he has his place in the seniority list, and it would be time enough to complain if it was attempted to put him over the heads of his seniors. I have spent the best part of my life in the service, have devoted my best efforts to its welfare, and should look upon it as grossly unfair if I could not compete for promotion with others. I cannot better illustrate the importance of a trained police officer holding the position of Chief Clerk than by quoting an actual occurrence a short time ago: A warrant was received for execution in Australia; the warrant had been drawn up by a solicitor, was signed by a Magistrate, and had passed through the hands of a Chief Detective and an Inspector; on examining it I found that it did not disclose any offence, and sent it back to the district, pointing out the omission; a fresh warrant was issued, sent to Australia, and executed. Had a clerk without any police training been in charge of the office the warrant would have gone on as it was, and the extradition proceedings would have failed, and the Department would have been put to considerable expense and discredit. I could quote similar instances, but one is sufficient to illustrate my point. Again, cablegrams are constantly arriving in connection with extradition cases where it is absolutely necessary that the officer dealing with them should have had an extensive police training, or trouble would follow. In connection with accounts, it is equally important that the Chief Clerk should know exactly what is police duty and what is not, so as to check the expenditure, and see that it is properly charged. For the past two years I have, under instructions from the Commissioner, prepared a redraft of the regulations, which are necessarily full of technical matters that could not have been dealt with without a thorough knowledge of police duty. They should have been redrafted years ago, but there was no one to do it with the exception of the Commissioner, who could not devote the necessary time to it. As regards district clerks and their assistants, I should like to say that they are selected owing to their superior education and ability, and were they not so selected it would be to their benefit financially. There are only nine district clerks in the Dominion, and they cannot get their promotion in less than ten years, which is only about three years before they would expect to get it if confined to uniform duty. But as against this small advantage, what do the uniform men get? In five or six years they get charge of stations where they get free houses and other emoluments amounting to £100 a year and upwards; they remain quietly there saving money, until, by length of service, their turn for promotion comes, by which time many of them are in good circumstances; whilst the clerk has had to live in town and pay rent at a salary that does little more than keep him out of debt. I have no hesitation in saying that there is not a clerk in the Force who is as well off as a constable in charge of a country station. The promotion of clerks is not so rapid now as it was thirty years ago, as the following instances will show: Inspector Ellison was promoted to sergeant in seven years, Inspector Wilson was promoted to sergeant in eight years, Sergeant Bulford was promoted to sergeant in four years, and Sergeant Fraser was promoted to sergeant in seven years. The Police Commission of 1898 were unanimously of the opinion that the clerks were underpaid for their responsible duties, and recommended a special allowance of 1s. per day in addition to the pay of their rank. There were then two of the district clerks sergeants. It is a difficult matter to keep good clerks in the office. Quite recently one clerk with about six years' service applied for charge of a station, and got it; and another application is now under consideration.

The evidence of Inspector Mitchell that the position of a district clerk is absolutely a clerical one is hardly fair; he has to act for the Inspector continually; he may get the sergeant in charge to sign the memos. that he puts on correspondence, but he has to know what to put on, as the sergeant has enough work of his own to do without doing district work. The clerks are selected just the same as detectives, owing to their education and ability; but while the clerk has to wait ten years for promotion the detective gets his in seven or eight years. I only mention this to show that the clerks are not exceptionally well treated. A suggestion has been made that a special grade should be established for clerks, but I do not see where they would come in when they reached the top of their grade. Would they be expected to go back to uniform duty as constables, or what, if they wanted promotion? As regards the work done by clerks, they certainly get Sundays and some public holidays off, but have to make up a lot of time by working overtime, and seldom take annual leave. I have only had four weeks in twenty-seven years. In addition, their work is of trying nature, with no diversion such as relieving duty, escorts, attending Courts, &c. As regards the "useful" man, Inspector Cullen apparently insinuated that there was some connection between the supposed "useful" man, Acting-detective Abbott, and myself. I absolutely deny any such insinuation, and there were no grounds whatever for making the suggestion. I knew Constable Abbott when he was in Wellington as mounted man, but only as such; he was never in any way intimate with me, and I never had one word from him, either directly or indirectly, from the time he left Wellington until he returned here some six months after he had left the service in Auckland. I ask that he be called. While on this subject I may state at once that I know my position too well to allow any member of the Force to influence me in any way. I was never a tale-bearer, and the insinuation is entirely unwarranted. Respecting the present condition of the service, I have no hesitation in stating that it was never in a more efficient state. The men are well conducted, sober, and energetic, as proved by the orderly state of the country and the improved criminal statistics. The best men are selected from the candidates offering; a large number who would have been selected without question a few years ago are now rejected owing to the stringent inquiries made. Political, Masonic, social, or any other influence has no effect so far as I know, the best men for the positions vacant being invariably selected. Raising the standard to the Fifth has tapped a different class of the community, and I am not sure that the Fourth Standard is not sufficient, with a preference to those holding higher certificates; but before trying this I think an all-round increase of 6d. per day and a reduction in the time of increments to three years should be tried. Owing to the large number rejected of late years, the selection has been somewhat restricted, and almost every batch of probationers taken on has exhausted the list. The conditions outside have been so good that it has made the recruits less amenable to discipline; hence the large number of resignations. The Force has been so largely augmented of late that the utmost difficulty has been experienced in getting sufficient men through the depot to fill vacancies and provide for the increases; the term of probation had therefore to be reduced, and a number of previous-service men had to be tried, some of whom turned out well and others indifferently. A mistaken idea has arisen among some of the uniform men in respect to detectives being allowed to travel first-class by rail. This privilege was not granted with the view of raising the status of a detective above that of a uniform man. First-class passes were simply issued to enable detectives to travel in any part of a train when engaged on special duty. It arose from a railway guard objecting to a detective travelling first class when he was shepherding a criminal who was travelling first class. Dissatisfaction with promotions always has and will exist; the trouble is largely caused by men who should have been promoted years ago, but, being in charge of good stations, they did not accept or seek promotion when they could have got it; but now, since the Provident Fund Act is in force, they realise that their pensions would be so much larger if they got the rank. I know that the Commissioner takes great pains to select the best men for promotion, and every representation receives his careful consideration. The ups and downs in the seniority roll have been there from the commencement of the Force, and more regard to seniority has been paid during recent years than ever before. One difficulty is that a senior constable may be in a district where the Inspector will not recommend him, and is consequently passed over, and is transferred to another district, where he is recommended and promoted. This, of course, puts him below those who were previously recommended and promoted. I have served under six Commissioners, and am satisfied that at no time has the Force been better administered than it is now. He has done more to improve the condition of pay of the men than any previous Commissioner. Constable Green's evidence the other day was so manifestly vindictive towards myself, and, not being given in the interest of the service, it would be better that I should treat it with the contempt it deserves; the only thing I will say, for your Worship's information, is, that there was just enough truth in it to save the constable from a charge of perjury. It is true that I have occasionally had a game of billiards with the Chief Detective or a senior sergeant on the staff, but to insinuate that I in any way associate with the uniform men is a wilful falsehood. It must be remembered that I have been connected with the Wellington Station for sixteen years, and have always taken a keen interest in encouraging any scheme for the amusement or improvement of the men. I started the first library there in 1893, and was treasurer for twelve years. I know who to speak to, and can do so without in any way lowering my position. The evidence was simply put forward for want of something of any consequence that could be brought forward.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Why cannot the Commissioner be expected to exercise the same control over Civil servants as over his own men?—Because they are not in the Department.

2. What has that got to do with it?—I have seen it.

3. So have I. I am a very old Civil servant, and I know all about it. In regard to a late Chief Clerk being ordered by an Inspector out of his office, where was that?—Not in Wellington.

4. Is the man still in the service?—Do you want me to mention it?

5. Certainly I do, because I consider it a very gross breach of discipline?—Inspector Cullen.

6. In regard to what you say about this extradition warrant, what you point out is that a clerk should have a knowledge of law, not police duty?—The two run together.

7. Not necessarily?—Then you will have to have a lawyer as Chief Clerk.

8. Possibly. In reference to this matter of promotion, what are all the Inspectors for if they do not see that the claims of the best men are recognised?—It used to be the rule to ask these men if they would take promotion.

9. You do not think that that is in the best interests of the service?—I do not know. If a man has no go in him, it might be as well.

10. The advancement perhaps is neutralised by losing £100 a year or so. That is all the more reason why they should not be allowed to do as they like. I take strong exception to that?—And there was no pension; that is the cause of the alteration.

11. In regard to a senior constable being passed over in one district and recommended for promotion in the next, that is, of course, due to the inequality of view of the Inspectors?—We had a case quite recently of a constable of long service in a district; the Inspector would not recommend him—had no time for him; he was transferred to another district, and strongly recommended.

12. Was he a good man?—He was, as far as I know.

13. Was he promoted?—It was the case of Constable Hodgson. Inspector Cullen would not recommend him, but Inspector Ellison did.

14. I was going to ask Inspector Ellison why he recommended him?—I only illustrate what I have stated.

15. That is through the personal view of the Inspector in charge, which is unavoidable?—It is unavoidable.

16. Is there anything in your statement you wish to supplement? How long do you consider it has been necessary to revise these regulations?—The regulations were never any good when first made.

17. For how long has it been necessary to adopt new regulations?—Ever since they were made, in 1886.

18. Do you know why it has not been done?—Of course, there was no one to tackle them.

19. Who has tackled them recently?—I have.

20. Why not before?—I was not in the office.

21. How long have you been there?—Only three years. It has taken me two years' overtime.

22. Do you not represent that it is necessary to get further assistance?—The work has to be done, and I have to do it.

23. It seems to me that this is such an important matter that it should not be delayed?—It has remained in abeyance for twenty years, and it is a very difficult matter that will take a great deal of time.

24. If it were not so important, I should find more excuse for it?—The Force has been a long time without it, but it will be an improvement, I believe. The regulations will be up to date. At any rate, some of the old regulations are ridiculous and unwarrantable.

The Commissioner: That is so.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.* They have been amended from time to time?—In respect to candidates, leave of absence, and so forth.

26. *The Commissioner.* Is your staff overworked?—Well, they are well worked; I would not say overworked. I think Sergeant Gaffney does more overtime than anybody else. Of course, there are times when the work does not come in so strong. We all have to work overtime at times, especially when Commissions are sitting.

27. Do you think it is consistent with your position as a commissioned officer to be frequenting the barracks? You have not to regard yourself merely as Chief Clerk. Do you think it consistent with the fullest demands of discipline that it should be so?—I have never seen anything wrong in it, because I never associated with any one but a senior sergeant. I see more objection now than I ever did before, because it is made use of.

28. Exactly?—I maintain that there has been no harm done whatever.

29. It is only as a matter of discipline—as to whether it is the right thing to do?—I understand that in the army, officers encourage their men in all kinds of sports.

30. With regard to Constable Willetts, is it a typical case? Are men in the habit of interviewing you?—They come to the office to see the Commissioner, and I take them in.

31. Ordinarily, do constables interview the Commissioner?—It refers more particularly to country constables. I have no recollection of Constable Willetts.

32. He clearly wishes me to understand that he went there, interviewed you, discussed his transfer, and asked your good offices. That, to my mind, would be objectionable. I do not say it is true, but if it were true, it would be objectionable. I am inclined to think that it would not be the right thing to discuss it?—If the constable came to me I would say, "Put in an application."

33. You have no recollection of it?—I have no recollection. I am certain I never made him any promises. He is of a peculiar disposition, and comes up to you and speaks to you. He was up in the office repeatedly, and used to make representations.

JOHN WILLETTS, Constable, further examined. (No. 297.)

1. *The Commissioner.* What did you actually say to Sub-Inspector Wright?—I could not say exactly; I was on duty when I spoke to him.

2. Did you ask for the Commissioner?—No; it occurred when I was on duty on the Glasgow Wharf, on the arrival of the Day's Bay boat.

3. What business had you to stick him up?—I wanted to further my own ends, and thought it was the right thing to do.

The Commissioner (to Sub-Inspector Wright): You see what it comes to. He sticks you up, and talks of the matter afterwards.

Sub-Inspector Wright: I have no recollection of where it occurred.

The Commissioner: Where did it occur?

Sub-Inspector Wright: I do not deny that he spoke to me, but I do deny that it had the slightest effect.

4. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] What did the Sub-Inspector say?—He said, "Very well." I said, "I hope you will excuse me. I want to get away from Lambton Quay. I would thank you to use your influence to get me away from Lambton Quay to Wellington South, or out of Wellington altogether."

Sub-Inspector Wright: I did not use my influence.

ARTHUR HOBBS WRIGHT, Sub-Inspector, further examined. (No. 298.)

1. *The Commissioner*.] You actually deny the truth of what he said?—I do not deny it.

2. To my mind, it is a matter of discipline—that a junior constable should stick you up. Apparently you had no influence to use, or did not use it?—I took no notice of it.

3. May I take it that you are not in the habit of allowing constables to discuss matters with you?—He had no right to do it. As a matter of fact, Inspector Ellison will tell you that he recommended the transfer. I do not like to insult a man if he comes and asks me.

4. Surely it would not be an insult if you said, "This is no time to discuss these matters. Put your application in"?—I did not discuss the matter with him; he told me what he wanted.

5. I would rather it had not come up, but there you are?—It seems to me that you have got to be very careful in this country as to what you do.

6. In regard to the papers about Dr. Sharman in Auckland, what is your knowledge of them? I have been promising witnesses all through the Auckland sittings that when I got here I would examine the papers?—They went to Cabinet. Cabinet referred them to the Premier, and there they are.

7. The present prospect of getting hold of them is remote?—You cannot get them until the Premier comes back.

8. I have stopped several witnesses in the belief that I could get hold of them?—I tried to get them.

9. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] What position did you hold under Mr. Tunbridge?—He promoted me to the rank of sergeant. Am I compelled to answer questions by Mr. Wright?

The Commissioner: I have already stated that I would give members of Parliament the status to examine witnesses within certain limits, taking their position as trustees of the public interest into account. All matters affecting the Police Force in my report are bound to be brought before Parliament, and if any member of Parliament takes sufficient interest in the proceedings to help me by asking questions, so long as they are not of a personal nature, he is at liberty to do so.

Witness: The other day it appeared as if he were holding a brief for a particular party.

The Commissioner: I have spoken to Mr. Wright, who assures me that he is seeking information for the public.

10. *Mr. Wright, M.P.* (to witness).] Were you ordered to be transferred to Wanganui as district clerk to the local office?—There was an order issued to that effect, which was cancelled.

11. *The Commissioner*.] How long ago is that?—Ten years ago.

Mr. Wright, M.P.: It is since the last Commission.

The Commissioner: It would not have any bearing upon my mind at all. Everybody admits that the Force to-day is in a good position so far as general discipline is concerned, and it would be impossible to bring little matters of that sort against the Force at the present time.

Mr. Wright, M.P.: It has nothing to do with the present Commissioner, but apparently there was influence outside.

The Commissioner: The man who allowed himself to be exercised by that is no longer in New Zealand. There is not the slightest doubt about influence being used; the only thing is the extent to which it is effectual. I have had constables stand up and admit that they have used it. One admitted that he went to three members of Parliament, but there was sufficient shown on the papers to satisfy me that they had no effect, and the man is worse off to-day than before he used that influence. If members of Parliament would hold themselves aloof from constables I think they would get on much better.

12. *Mr. Wright, M.P.* (to witness).] During Mr. Dinnie's absence, have you to instruct men of superior rank to yourself?—In a sense, I have.

The Commissioner: He is practically Acting-Commissioner. The Commissioner, when absent, delegates his authority to him for what it is worth, in the same way as the Under-Secretary of a Department is represented by his Chief Clerk.

13. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*: Is it true that a hogshead of beer was presented to the Force at Christmas-time?—I could not tell you; I never saw it; I do not know anything about the station at all.

14. Do you know anything about the recent burglary at the Carterton Railway-station?—I saw there was such a case.

15. Was a detective sent there to investigate?—I have nothing to do with that.

16. Was the Commissioner's office, during Mr. Tunbridge's time, run with three men only—two civilians and a constable?—No, never.

17. How many were in it?—There were four men in the office twenty-five years ago, and there are four now; and the work has doubled.

SAMUEL PERCIVAL NORWOOD, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 299.)

Witness: I am stationed at Wellington. I was enrolled in 1882, and promoted sergeant in 1900; and made station sergeant six years later, and Sub-Inspector in 1907.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general statement to make?—There is one matter I should like to mention—the difference in pay of the Sub-Inspector and the Chief Detective. As it stands at present the Chief Detective's maximum pay is £300, and the minimum pay of the Sub-Inspector is £260, and the result is if a Chief Detective is promoted to the rank of Sub-Inspector he drops down £40. It seems a peculiar position for a superior officer to get £40 less than his subordinate.

2. What is your position?—I get £280, and £60 a year house-allowance. At present I am trying to get a house, and have not yet been successful.

3. What do you expect to have to pay?—At least £1 10s.

4. What is the quality of the men under you at present?—When I came to Wellington I expected to see a very disorderly lot of men—I heard a lot about them—but, to my surprise, they compare very favourably with any I have served with. I have been in each centre, and Wellington compares very favourably with any of them.

5. Is discipline well maintained?—Yes, fairly so. There is this fact: the men here are all very young men; in Dunedin they are men with two or three years' service; but, taking them all round, they are a very good class of men here. They want teaching their duties; they are taught theory in the depot, and want practical work.

6. There is nothing that would prevent an active sergeant and a qualified Sub-Inspector keeping adequate control?—No.

7. Is there any drinking in the barracks?—No.

8. You have seen what was said in Auckland: there is nothing of that sort here?—No; only on one occasion have I seen a bottle with liquor in it—a very small bottle that had whisky in it; but there were three or four suffering from influenza.

9. You saw in Auckland one witness said he had to resort to searching the men?—There is nothing of that sort here.

10. Would you be in favour of making all the men undergo probation after the training depot?—It would be a very good idea. I have been in the training depot myself. After two months there I think they should have at least ten months on the street before they are finally taken on. Some men after they are taken on think they are all right for life, and do not put the energy into the work they should.

11. What do you think of the proposal to extend the training period in the depot to three months?—My experience is that two should be sufficient.

12. Would you give them physical training?—It is a good idea. I have found it useful myself in several instances.

13. Would it be an advantage to the Force to have a man specially appointed as physical instructor?—He would have plenty of work for a year or two.

14. Do the men complain to you at all about not getting time off on Sundays, &c.?—No.

15. You are well satisfied with your position as compared with Dunedin?—There is more work to do here.

16. You have no trouble with the station sergeant owing to the work not being defined?—No; I always work in harmony with them; we have divided the work fairly; I have never heard Sergeants King or Darby complain on that score.

17. Do you think they are necessary officers?—Yes, without doubt. Take to-day, for instance. I have been in Court since 10 o'clock till nearly 4, and there must be some one in the station to attend to complaints, &c.

18. It is not the practice here, is it, to require the men to go home from the station in uniform?—Latterly they have been leaving it off, since I have been here.

19. You know it is the practice in Dunedin?—Yes; it is a hard-and-fast rule there; here it is not carried out so severely.

Inspector Ellison: There never was a rule to that effect here.

20. *The Commissioner.*] From your Dunedin experience, do you still consider it necessary that that rule should be observed?—No, I think it is a farce.

21. You know the men resent it?—Yes; I think a man should be allowed to go in what clothes he likes.

22. You know the circumstances that led to it?—Yes; I do not think there is any fear of that sort of thing.

23. Are you present at disciplinary inquiries made by the Inspector?—I have been at one or two.

24. Would there be any advantage if the law were altered to allow Inspectors to take evidence on oath?—No, I do not think so; the present system seems satisfactory; I never heard of any complaints.

25. Do you think any value attaches to the power of administering the oath?—I think a constable would speak the truth without being sworn.

26. You know very often you have complete contradiction in evidence. Every man does not speak the truth. Would it be of any value from that point of view?—It would have to be tried; I do not see any cause for it.

27. Is there any trouble here with the night-duty lamps?—I have not heard of any complaints; I have heard it mentioned in Dunedin. No doubt they are cumbersome, and very heating in summer, and make the uniform in a mess.

28. Do you think it would be desirable to have a gymnasium in each centre?—Yes.

29. You attach value to it for training purposes, and as an outlet for spirits, &c.?—Yes; I have often thought it was desirable in Dunedin, as the men used to get at it in the bedrooms, and break things.

30. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards inquiries into the character of candidates for employment, you have correspondence through your hands?—A great number of files.

31. Can you speak as regards the strictness?—Sometimes I have thought they are rather too strict. If a man has been employed as a rabbitier on a run, a man has been sent out to see how he conducted himself during the short period he was employed as such. I have always thought the inquiries most exacting.

32. Would you suggest three months' probation after the depot?—I would suggest that a man should be up to twelve months on probation.

33. When would you have them sworn in?—As probationers. If they do not suit at the end of twelve months, let them go.

34. Do you know anything of influence?—It is talked of.

35. You do not know of any instance in which it has obtained?—No.

36. Do you approve of the present system of promotion—recommendation by the Inspector?—I think he is the proper person to know the qualifications of the men.

37. *The Commissioner.*] You have a concrete case mentioned by Sub-Inspector Wright, in which an Inspector refuses to recommend a man: the man comes into another district, and another Inspector recommends him. He has not altered in two months?—Yes; that wants some explaining.

38. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The Commissioner of Police, who has been over him for some years, should have some knowledge of a man?—Yes, certainly.

39. Are the sergeants under you performing their duties satisfactorily?—Yes.

40. They are a good class of men?—Yes.

41. Is there any general dissatisfaction in the service as to the control?—I never heard of any. A few dissatisfied men will always have grievances.

42. And they cause a deal of trouble?—They do, indeed.

43. Is the conduct of the men generally fair here?—Yes; they are a very good class of men.

44. *The Commissioner.*] At what age should you cease to promote men as sergeants to do sectional duty?—I was promoted at thirty-eight, after eighteen years in the district office. I found the sectional duty very hard. I think a man should be promoted up to forty-five; after that it becomes too hard work. It takes an active young man to look after the men on beat duty.

45. You believe in putting a sergeant in a city first?—Yes.

46. *Chief Detective Broberg.*] In regard to the pay of Chief Detectives and Sub-Inspectors, do you think the Chief Detective is overpaid?—No.

47. *Sergeant Mathieson.*] My station was immediately under your supervision: had you any fault to find with me during your time?—No.

48. Have you had many cases from my district?—Yes; the South Wellington police are pretty active.

49. Have you found my charge sheets all right?—Yes.

50. Have any been returned since you have been here?—No.

51. Will you examine this charge sheet [produced]: is it properly made out?—I see no defect in it.

The Commissioner. It was returned by the Court orderly, through the station sergeant, as being not properly made out, because in place of giving the charge in specific detail they wanted the whole lot of boxes of pills grouped together.

52. *Inspector Ellison.*] Do you think I ever saw that charge sheet?—No, I am sure you did not.

53. *Sergeant Mathieson.*] Did you ever hear the Clerk of the Court refer to the charge sheets coming from Wellington South?—No.

SATURDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

MICHAEL GREENE, Constable, further examined. (No. 300.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] You wish to say something?—It has been stated by Chief Detective McIlveney that I have been in the habit of carrying letters to ex-Inspector McDonnell for publication in the Press. I say I never did. Another matter, regarding Sergeant Kelly. He stated I was in the habit of writing letters to the Press relative to the police, and also informing the reporters about matters relative to the police for publication. I say I never did so, and would be pleased to have any of them called to say if I did.

JOHN WILLIAM MARTIN DART, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 301.)

Witness. In reply to what the Chief Detective stated yesterday, I should like to say a word or two, principally to explain why I suggested a detective's pay should be from 11s. to 14s. I was not looking at any particular rank; I was trying to formulate a scheme for the whole of the ranks. I agreed that sergeants and detectives should be equal, and was unable to come to the conclusion that either should go above 14s. I said that, however, without prejudice to any already appointed. If I had said it should go above 14s. it would have been bringing the pay of the higher ranks too far up. That is the reason I did it, and I had to remember when the pay of the detective

is laid down at from 10s. to 15s. it was on the distinct understanding that it was because the higher uniform ranks were not open to them. We were led to this conclusion in this way. You will not find any other rank in the service where the difference between the minimum and the maximum pay is no less than 50 per cent., as in the case of the detective. The Chief Detective has spoken about me trying to get a short cut to a Sub-Inspectorship. I submit that is unfair. Almost in the same breath he suggests that Chief Detectives should be made Sub-Inspectors. He is asking for himself something more than I am asking—a short cut to no less than the rank of Inspector. He has said I am a free lance, and have an axe to grind. He appears to be disinterested, but I prefer to be honest in the matter rather than claim a merit I do not possess. All the arguments I brought forward except the suggestion that the instructor should get the rank of station sergeant are as much in the interest of the uniform branch as in my own. He comes forward in the interests of every one but himself, in a spirit of disinterested philanthropy. It is all very well to ask us to believe that. His own suggestion to be put on the list to compete for the next Inspectorship proves that. Although in one part of his evidence Sergeant Dart appears in every other line, there is not a single word of refutation of the arguments I brought forward on behalf of the uniform branch in connection with the proportion of promotions. He adopted the tactics an unscrupulous lawyer always adopts before an inexperienced Justice of the Peace, and attempted to cloud the issue by making no reference to the real issue, but besmirching the opposite party from head to foot. He is a very good fellow, a capable officer, and we are very good friends. I am quite contented if you take the arguments brought forward all over New Zealand, especially at Auckland, on behalf of the uniform branch, and put against them the arguments of the detective branch. If that is done, I have no fear of justice not being done.

SAMUEL PERCIVAL NORWOOD, Sub-Inspector, further examined. (No. 302.)

Witness: I wish to revert to a matter Sergeant Mathieson brought up. He complained that Station Sergeant Darby returned a charge sheet, and he put in what he told me was the original sheet. I thought it strange that Sergeant Darby should take on himself to return a charge sheet when he had nothing to do with Wellington South. I find the sheet Sergeant Mathieson put in is not the original sheet, as he stated. I produce the original here. The one he put in is dated the 11th. This is the original one, in the sergeant's own handwriting, dated the 6th. After this sheet was put in the Clerk of the Court complained that all the boxes of pills could be lumped together, instead of enumerating all the variety of pills. I think that is reasonable. Mr. Holmes requested the Court orderly to tell Constable Taylor to put in the total number of boxes, and not to mind enumerating the different kinds. That was done. The station sergeant had nothing to do with it, nor returned it to Sergeant Mathieson.

The Commissioner: How did it get into your possession, Sergeant Mathieson?

Sergeant Mathieson: It was sent by myself through Constable Taylor to the station sergeant. He informed me the station sergeant and the Court orderly returned it, asking that the boxes be lumped together. I was going on the statement of the constable.

Witness: There is the same mistake in each sheet, the year 1909 being omitted from each charge sheet.

Sergeant Mathieson: The charge sheet I put in dated the 11th is the one on remand; it is an original; it is a matter of system.

JOHN WYBRANT ELLISON, Inspector, further examined. (No. 303.)

Witness: I am Inspector, in charge of the Wellington District. I was enrolled in 1872. I was promoted sergeant in 1879. There was a reduction in the Police Force, and several sergeants, including myself, had to take reduced rank for about two years, owing to the finances of the country and the 10-per-cent. reduction. It was about two years before I was restored to my original rank. I was appointed Inspector in 1899, in charge of the Grey and Westland. I am now second in seniority. I wish to say I quite acknowledge the great benefit the Government has conferred on the Police Force during the past ten or eleven years. It has been gradually improving since Mr. Tunbridge came out to take charge of it. When he took charge his strength of hand was at once apparent. He raised the service from a dissatisfied and disorganized condition to what it has been since. Through the mistakes and mismanagement arising out of experiments as regards the appointment of previous Commissioners who lacked the knowledge for their position disorganization was caused. The pay of constables had been cut down to £10 per month, and out of that they were compelled to have a life insurance of £200, provide all uniform, and had no house-allowance. Vacancies in the rank of sergeant were left unfilled for years, and constables were without hope. Gradually the position improved so as to keep pace with the conditions of the country and the increased cost of living (for which the older members of the service must feel some satisfaction). The young ones did not know the old conditions. Still, although the pay has been raised a little and house-allowance provided, I do not think the Police Force can be made an attractive service for young men of education, ability, and energy. It is true we get such men occasionally for a time, and others in the service improve themselves up to such a standard. The reasons for the Police Force not being attractive are, amongst others: Unpleasant duties to be done, handling and dealing with dead bodies, handling dirty and diseased men and women, night duty in all weathers, Sunday work, being nearly always on duty on public holidays when others are out on pleasure, and no overtime for this sort of work as other men working on holidays get. No matter how decent and respectable a police officer may live, there are numbers of people who look on him as an inferior on account of being a "bobby." He is also debarred from many forms of improving his position which men in civil life may avail themselves of.

There are people belonging to a section of the community who are continually insinuating that because a man is a policeman every action that does not coincide with their own narrow view is actuated by corrupt motives. One form of this is the innuendoes and daily sneers constantly heard about sly-grog selling. Some people think the police should be able to get every sly-grog seller in the country into gaol by instinct without trouble, and do not hesitate to suggest that the reason why such does not occur is that the police do not try, do not care, or are corrupt. Nothing is too bad for such people to suggest, and the meanest of such people are capable of making very degraded remarks. As a matter of fact, it is well known that sly-grog selling is often difficult to prove and seldom very easy. The detection of it is liable sometimes to make a man feel mean in his own estimation. He must frequently tell lies, or wilfully mislead and deceive as to his calling, business, and reasons for being in a certain place; and, although a police constable may refrain from using any mean or false pretext to induce a person who is an unlicensed vendor to sell him drink as evidence, still the officer must often tell lies. In ordinary criminal cases a man can by conversation, observation, and tact obtain the information he is in search of without having recourse to low subterfuge and falsehood, but evidence of actual sale of liquor must be produced in these cases to be successful. Sly-grog sellers sometimes question the would-be purchaser, "Are you acting straight, upon your honour? Are you connected with the police? Are you going to give me away?" If you are really straightforward you fail in your object, and if he tells a falsehood a man must feel a certain amount of meanness. As to the present condition of the Force, there is at present a very fine lot of constables in Wellington. There are a few who could be well done without, but the number is at present small. A great many indifferent men have left the Force after short service within the past few years. The last lot of recruits were very promising young men. We have had occasionally some very indifferent men, and on some occasions there seemed to be more carelessness and neglect as to their work than there is at present. The improvement is probably due to the difficulty there has been of late of getting work, there having been less work in the country; but when times improve again men will soon tire of irksome duties, and want a change. I never heard of any such disorder as Mr. Arnold suggests, and I can only assume that his information was obtained from some perverted, evil-minded mischief-maker. In regard to recruits, candidates should be personally interviewed by a competent officer, who should test them as to writing a plain, simple report, showing legible, plain writing, and after conversation he would be able to form an opinion on their intelligence and manner. I also recognise that some men who are good-looking, well recommended, active, and respectable in demeanour occasionally turn out to be indolent or intemperate, and the best judge may be disappointed. But occasionally men have come into the service who I do not think would have been passed if interviewed by a reasonably good judge, and tested as to intelligence, &c. I think a qualified officer should see each recruit, and test him. This would take time, and could not be done by the Inspectors in the centres, who are already overworked with clerical duties. The present Inspector in a centre has not a moment to spare. As to recruits in the depot, I think a great deal more drill should be given, and not quite so much cram. A great deal of the legal instruction is soon forgotten, but at first some of the recruits come with overexalted ideas of their own knowledge, and feel surprised when sergeants instruct them. They should be only instructed in filling in a report, filling a public service voucher, and stating under what statute small offences which daily occur come. That would be quite enough groundwork to start on. A gymnasium would be a decided advantage, and instructions in how to catch hold of a resisting man and handcuff him. Many of the recruits have no idea of how to do so. As regards wrestling and physical drill, they are all right in their place. There was one young man here who got instructions in wrestling, with the result that he practised rough treatment on more than one prisoner, one elderly weak man having been badly bruised, for which the constable was punished, and he ultimately left the service. Although the service is greatly improved, the practice of keeping the recruits always in Wellington and transferring men from town as soon as they are useful has been a mistake. We very seldom have men of matured service available for duty here. The city is usually manned by recruits and short-service men, except when men are sent here who have given dissatisfaction in other places.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What would you do with the recruits?—I believe in a fair proportion being here, but not the whole of them.

1A. I was assured they were never left in one centre?—I think recruits could be trained by sending them in small proportion to such places as Napier, Palmerston, Wanganui, and other towns of that description. I know some of the best men have got their first training in such towns.

1B. They would get more individual oversight?—Yes, and instruction in details. I do not say it would be any better or worse than going on beat in a city, but it would be equally good. They have to do a variety of work in such places, and have the means of becoming acquainted with many phases of police work that do not arise to a man walking up and down on a beat. The recruits when they begin to learn a bit go away, and there is often trouble through their ignorance in regard to regulating traffic on the streets and speaking abruptly to people in shifting them from corners or when stopping to talk in the street. Sometimes when I come on the street myself a young constable will see me, and gets very energetic perhaps over some two or three ladies who are talking together. He comes on duty with a certain amount of nervousness, and I have had a great many complaints of trivial unpleasantness of this kind.

1C. Have you any papers showing the service of the men you have had for the last two or three years?—I can produce them quite easily. On some occasions the preponderance of recruits has been so great that I have been apprehensive of some serious trouble arising, as we were short-handed also. Had it not been for the energy and ability of the detective staff on such occasions serious trouble might have arisen. Men who have completed their course

in the training school could finish it in the large boroughs just as well as in the city. The practice has been to send men for the smaller districts from those in Wellington, leaving nothing except short-service men here. Besides this, such frequent changes are not in the public interest. Men seldom get to know the citizens or the places, and if spoken to by a stranger are lost. I consider it requires two years for a man to become fairly useful, having a knowledge of traffic and other by-laws. In regard to transfers, they cause an immense lot of work, and a general feeling of unrest, and an Inspector has the greatest difficulty in knowing all about the men. There is a really good detective staff in Wellington, and it has been most successful since I came here. The late Chief Detective was an excellent man, and has fully justified his appointment. As regards promotions, ability, integrity, and general attention to duty should be the principal factors, coupled as far as possible with seniority. In regard to district clerks, a good clerk who has filled that position satisfactorily is one of the best men in the service, and is qualified for any position.

2. Touching promotion, it would be convenient for you to express some opinion as to Sergeant Dart's suggestion that an examination should be an important test?—As was mentioned yesterday, it depends upon the examination. I think an examination for the rank of sergeant beyond ability to write a concise and intelligent report, and to explain the nature of putting evidence before the Court, is quite unnecessary. I do not think anything is required beyond that.

3. But in regard to promotion beyond that rank?—I do not think an examination would prove any more. In the Irish Constabulary I know many were studying for examinations, but they were outside the service, and the examinations blocked all promotion in the service. All appointments to the rank of Sub-Inspector were made from persons outside the service. It was done through the Civil Service only. It was a grievous bone of contention in the service. I think a man should not be promoted unless he can write a concise and plain report that can be easily read. A great deal of time is wasted when mistakes are liable to arise through men writing reports in an unintelligible manner. A mistake of one or two words often alters the sense of the whole thing. Some sergeants write in such a manner that it is very hard to decipher. As to pay: after having heard all the opinions, my opinion is that a rise of pay is most advisable if men are to be encouraged. I think there should be a rise of 6d., as well as an equivalent amount to the contribution now being paid to the Provident Fund, and that the Provident Fund should be amended so that any contributions from such increase should be devoted to pensions alone, and not be repayable to any officer except as pension, in order that a strong Pension Fund may be built up giving every man the right to retire on pension after twenty-five years, the rise to be given for the benefit of the service, and specially earmarked. My reason for this is that the Pension Fund is not financial. I know there are heavy strains on it.

The Commissioner: I do not want to touch too much on that point.

Witness: There are many men who arrive at twenty-five years' service who should be out of the Force, on account of their physical inefficiency and otherwise. It is against reasonable humanity to expect officers to force men to have to resign or retire and leave twenty-five years of accumulations when they are within a few years of a pension. There are many cases I have known where a certain amount of delay has occurred before men were able to retire after they had ceased to be physically fit. Men do not care to go before a doctor and say, "I am not fit to do anything." They are fairly healthy, but still have not sufficient energy for the service. After twenty-five years' service I would compel them to go out on pension. Or a man might be twenty-five years in the service, and commit some trifling indiscretion that would not warrant his dismissal, but it might give trouble; he should have the opportunity of going out on pension, or of being otherwise dealt with. As to clerks, a good deal has been said. A good district clerk, who has filled that position in one of the centres for a few years satisfactorily, is one of the best men in the service, and the hardest worked in some places. I was one, and if I were young again I would not take it for any one, if the pay were double what it now is. I think it would be a good thing to make a trial of taking lads of sixteen or seventeen as typewriters and clerks, and give them the option of being appointed to the service when sufficiently developed. We have few men competent to go into the office as a clerk; there are not many who are educated enough to write a good plain hand and do ordinary clerical work, form work, &c. There are very few who could reply to a letter if told to, who could be classed as simple correspondents.

4. Your idea is to be gradually training a class of clerks?—It would be worth a trial in one or two district offices as typewriters. I had one man in the office on trial for three months, and he was getting on, but he got full up of the work, and applied for another job.

5. You do not use a typewriter at all?—Occasionally, but we have not an expert typewriter. I have a sergeant and two constables in the office. There is a difficulty in getting competent clerical men. I had two sent me as clerks who were not clerks at all. One was a man named Shirley.

6. You did not accept him?—No; he was sent from Auckland; he was an able man in his way, but he was not a clerk.

7. Do you not recommend men for clerical positions?—I have, but not those two. I saw a letter from some one in Queensland about him, and soon afterwards he was put into the office.

8. Without regard to his qualifications?—Yes; he was a good writer, but absolutely careless, useless, and unreliable in clerical work.

9. Were there other men in your opinion more efficient for the purpose for which you required him?—Yes; one at least. In regard to the cost of the work done for the Education Department, that may be a departmental matter, but it would require some strong recommendation to get it done.

10. If you were called upon to do a great deal of work which could be otherwise dealt with, it must affect your efficiency as being short of so many constables?—In each centre one man of ability and tact and a good writer should be told off to attend to all the work in connection with industrial schools.

11. Why should it not be done through the Education Department?—That is purely police work, making inquiries about persons who desire to have children committed; that is fairly police duty. They come to me, and I personally interview most of them, and get the details of the relatives or any person who is liable for the maintenance of the children before I make any move. I have authority from the Charitable Aid Board to act in every case I hold to be *bonâ fide*, and bring it before the Board. That is different from any other place. In all cases I hold it better to have the children where you find they are likely to be brought up under unfavourable conditions sent to a receiving home; it is better to step in and let the State provide for them.

12. The difficulty is the State charges the local rates for the cost, and the guardians of the local rates object to be charged with this unless they have a voice in the control of the children?—As long as the Charitable Aid Board provides for the children in a reasonable manner we could raise no objection. But the Board here does not take on work of this kind. In every case inquiries are made, and the children committed. In five or six cases recently here children have been committed because the parent left them in the foster home and then disappeared. A constable or sergeant, I would suggest, should make all such inquiries, and bring cases before the Court, and look after the persons liable for maintenance, and generally enforce the orders. He should receive communications as to arrears, &c., direct from the Education Department; there is no necessity for it to come through the Inspector, causing an amount of extra work; at present they go through five or six hands before they reach their destination. This should be done by a constable or a sergeant, whichever is decided upon by the Department; but it would save a great amount of time.

13. He would be an inquiry officer—not necessarily for industrial schools alone?—He would be fully occupied with that alone. If he were able to do any more, he could make inquiries under old-age pensions or the machinery business. We have an enormous number of railway inquiries which are clerical work, but I do not see how else they could be attended to. I understand the Railway Department will not pay for any lost goods until the matter has been reported to the police and a police report has been supplied as being unable to find them. These are frequently formal. There are numerous communications about lost luggage, &c.; nobody is able to tell when it was seen, or whether it was put on a truck; we can only go to the Railway servants, who have already inquired.

14. What about the boilers?—The boilers are inspected by an officer of the Machinery Department. Certificates are issued and sent to the post-offices, and a form is sent to the police notifying us that the certificates are issued. The police have to go and see the person, and see if they are covered, and watch the machine working, and take proceedings if necessary. It has been done by the police for many years. We get a good many of them, and it all helps to swell the clerical work; but it is scarcely police work. It makes a good deal of writing; each form has to go sometimes two or three times, and all have to go through the hands of the Inspector. The railway work could only otherwise be done by the Railway having a special constable. Most of the cases occur through negligence or mistakes in transmission. Of course, where there has been a theft, it is proper to come to the police. Another thing would be an advantage to the police: to take detectives or other smart men from other places and put them into the finger-print department for a month or two. The finger-print department is an important branch of the service, and I think instruction and knowledge on this point cannot be too widely disseminated amongst the police. They should have opportunity of learning the classification, and so on. The finger-printing and examining is very easy, but there is a good deal to learn in the classification. In regard to Constable Taylor's statement, I positively declare it to be a fabrication in many points. I did not receive him when he first came in in the manner he states; I had no reason to do so. I knew nothing about him. He did not come straight to me as he states; he was brought in either by the then Sub-Inspector or station sergeant—probably the latter—I do not remember which. He came at 9.45 on the 30th April. He stated that he did not report to the Sub-Inspector or station sergeant, but walked direct to me. I produce his route-sheet. His route shows that he reported himself to Sub-Inspector O'Donovan, and spoke to the latter. I told him, as I have told many other men who come here on transfer, that if he did his work all right and honestly he would get on well enough, but that I expected him to be steady, truthful, and attentive, or words to that effect. I am confident that Constable Taylor is only the figurehead of another person or two. He is, as it were, the monkey on the stick, and the string is pulled by another. Referring to Sergeant Mathieson's allegations, I may say that I never heard why he was sent here; I was absent on leave when the notification of his transfer arrived. I had expected that a single sergeant was to be sent to Newtown, as there was accommodation provided for one in the training depot, and three constables were required for duty at Newtown, instead of taking one away and replacing him by a sergeant. I may state that I have never had any communication, directly or indirectly, with the Commissioner beyond the notification that he was sent here. As far as I knew, Sergeant Mathieson had come at his own request, and I never had a thought of giving him any worry or inconvenience, and had no reason to do so. He sent me some long reports, covering numerous sheets, in straggling writing, rather difficult to decipher. I had to send some of them back for amendment, as they were not up to the standard I was accustomed to receive from sergeants in charge of stations. The sergeant apparently expected that he was not to do any active duty, but to refer matters to the two constables under him. Because I thought differently he appears to have become annoyed, and treasured up his animosity. From what I knew of him years ago, I am not at all surprised at this.

15. Do you leave it at that?—I knew him years ago.

16. I do not want to force your hand, you know?—I knew years ago, when he was in Auckland, that he was looked upon by the Inspector, sergeant-major, and another sergeant there—Gamble, Pratt, and Inspector Brougham—as a mischief-maker. That was the reputation I had

heard of him generally. Inspector Brougham was a competent officer—as straight a man as ever was in the Police Force, and a good judge of character. In regard to Mr. Watson's evidence, I desire to say that he gave a distorted and erroneous account of the two conversations I had with him. Before going on to that, I might say that I understood from the remarks and the gossip of the place that Sergeant Mathieson was a man who was always running after persons who were supposed to have some influence, and could be got at. That was the reputation I knew of him. I was in hopes that when he came here there would be none of that; but I am afraid I am disappointed. He seems to have sought consolation from some supposed influential new acquaintances. In regard to Mr. Watson's evidence, the facts are that on Saturday, the 14th August, he came to my office and said he wanted me to do something about a lady who was insane or mentally troubled. I said I had not heard anything of it, but would inquire. "But," he said, "I want you personally to do it, because I am a Mason." He evidently had heard or assumed that I was a Mason. I said, "There is no necessity to mention that; you can trust me to do a straight duty without any influence or pressure. I will go and attend to it." I had heard nothing of it, and I went at once to the station sergeant to inquire about the case. As soon as I reached the station sergeant's office Dr. Ewart came behind me, and told me the condition of the lady. He said he thought it would be dangerous to leave her where she was—that she should be examined forthwith. I said, "I understand her husband is away. I would not bring her to the station; it would not be a humane thing to do." He said he would not advise me to; that it was not a fit place for her; and that it would be well if we could get somebody to look after her until she was examined. I told the station sergeant to ring up Sergeant Mathieson, and try if he could get some one to look after her. He turned to do so. I went to my office, and Dr. Ewart left. There was a report furnished afterwards in the usual manner, which I produce. [Report handed in.] I did not get the report, nor hear any more of the case. I knew it was in hands for attention. I was leaving the station, and was in the middle of Lambton Quay, about to get on a tram-car, at a little after 1 o'clock on the same day, when Mr. Watson came along, and called aloud, "Hey!" I turned around, and he said, "What has been done with that lady's case?" I said, "I do not know; the station sergeant is there, and he will tell you; but come with me, and we will see." I was going to dinner at the time, and as we walked to the station, less than fifty yards away, I said, "You know the police require to eat as well as other people," in a sort of joking way. I did not mean to give any offence, nor was it possible. The station sergeant explained what had been done. I saw no more of Mr. Watson, and thought no more of him until last Saturday night, when he came to my office. I did not recognise him, as I had never seen him until he came to me about the lady. He came in in a very excited manner, as I was sitting at work, a little after 9 o'clock. I said, "Will you take a seat?" He said, "No; I am not going to sit down. I have come to let you know that I am going to the Commission about that case of Mrs. So-and-so." I let him go on for a good while, because I did not recognise him as the same person. As soon as he made some more remarks I said, "You are talking about a lady who was insane, and who wanted to be committed to the asylum while her husband was away?" "Yes," he said, "I am not satisfied, and I may go on Monday to the Police Commission." I wrote this down at the time. After he gave his name he got more excited, and said he would settle me, and make me sit up. He spoke about the "square." I do not know whether he thought I wanted to square him or another meaning. He said that he came as a brother, and that it all depended. I could not recollect why he should talk that way to me, and asked him what he wanted. Again he repeated, "I'll go to the Commission. I will make you sit up. I am higher in the service than you. You would not take the responsibility. I will take this case to the highest in the land; in fact, it is gone to the highest now, and I do not know what it will end in. I have not quite made up my mind. I think I will go to the Commission. Your dinner! I will go to the Commission." I replied, "You can go before the Commission if you desire. I do not desire to prevent you. You are not required to come here bullying if you want to go to the Commission." He was very excited, and went out, and I bade him good-night. That is a true statement of what took place. I took it down, because his demeanour made me think he was either crotchety, or prompted by some bad motive. I could not understand what it was, or why. His conduct was disgraceful in comparison with what I have received from any other person in Wellington. I do not wish to say any more.

17. You said something just now about certain constables—that the general body were very satisfactory, but that there were one or two that the service would be very much better without. Have you made any recommendation with regard to these?—I could not make a recommendation. I mentioned that there was one man transferred recently, but it would be hardly possible to "shoot" him out of the service.

18. Is it only one or two?—There is another man who was transferred to Wellington also at my request, because I did not consider his conduct satisfactory at Blenheim; but I could not formulate any charge on which he could be dismissed.

19. You are only speaking in a general way?—Yes. I could not formulate any charge; but I have got that opinion of a few of them—not many. If I was able to formulate a charge to deal with them, I would not be backward two minutes in doing it.

20. I misunderstood you?—I never screened or covered any man who would not do his work. I tell them, "You take the responsibility of what you do. Do not expect me to save you."

21. In inquiries made by you, do you think you should have power to administer an oath—that it would be an advantage?—I do. I got a draft copy of the new regulations, and that is one of the things I wrote on the margin.

22. I expect it would require statutory authority?—Well, the regulations would be statutory if made under the Act.

23. I am rather doubtful about that?—I think it decidedly should be given.

24. About the standard of education of recruits?—I am not bound exactly to say that a man, because he has not passed a certain standard, should be rejected, but there are many who have passed that standard and forget all about it. It is a certain benefit to have a test, but if a man is able to write a plain hand that is easily deciphered, although it might not be correct spelling, still, if he was able to convey his ideas in a fairly concise manner, I do not think he should be rejected. Some of the best men in the service could barely spell their own names when they joined. Some are not good writers, but have a form of plain writing which wants development.

25. Do you know what Inspector Cullen suggested with regard to applications being first made to local Inspectors with regard to men?—No; but I think somebody should see them.

26. He suggested that that should be done, and inquiries made afterwards?—I think there should be an officer of some rank appointed in the service—one or two as Superintendents to look after matters of that kind—and then there would be always one available to take the Commissioner's place if he were away.

27. Are you in favour of a lengthened period of probation after leaving the depot, assuming that the time in the depot is to be extended to three months?—I think it would be a decided advantage to have the right to turn a man away after twelve or six months if he did not give satisfaction.

28. Let him be reported on and dealt with according to his probable efficiency in the future?—Of course, a man would have to be sworn in, and go for twelve months, but they can be discharged at any time; the Act gives that power, whether they are sworn in or not; it does not make them one bit harder to discharge.

29. With regard to time off for attending Court, it seems to me that it might be a matter of considerable hardship in many cases that a man should have his night's rest destroyed, and might affect his efficiency as a constable both before and after the event. Would it not be possible to make some provision whereby he should not be required to attend except specially called upon? In the great majority of cases the person charged pleads guilty?—That is so.

30. And I understand the constable has to attend on any charge, whether it is going to be proceeded with or not?—If it is known that the charge is not to be proceeded with, he is not. In some cases, where he has a lot of witnesses to look after, he would have to attend, if the witnesses were summoned and we could not notify them in time; but if we knew a case was to be remanded, I am surprised to know that he would have to attend.

31. Supposing a constable arrested a man on some serious charge, would he have to attend?—On the following morning he would; the Magistrate might wish to ask him a question.

32. Would it not be possible and better perhaps, in all cases where men have pleaded "Not guilty" to minor charges, to ask for a remand; and in a case of drunkenness, when a man is really on bail, to estreat his recognizances?—I have never known that to be done.

33. But it could be done; it would save a lot of worry to the constable. Of course, it could only be done by laying down certain procedure in the Courts. I have had a long experience, and there seems to me no difficulty. It seems to get over the difficulty of men overlooking offences and neglecting their work, because some require more sleep than others?—In the case of drunks in custody?

34. Get them remanded?—On bail, until the following day.

35. They would have the pleasure of taking out another twenty-four hours in the lock-up or of getting bail. I think that could be done?—Yes.

36. In regard to station sergeants, have they justified their appointment?—Yes. The station sergeant does a great deal of work; in fact, it is surprising where all the work comes from—all the correspondence; it has increased in the last eight or ten years.

37. There is a tremendous lot of circumlocution?—I cut it down in this way: all formal things that have to go to Newtown, Mount Cook, Island Bay—such as old-age pensions, formal reports, memos about fires, and suchlike—go direct from my office in most instances; anything it is necessary the Sub-Inspector should know I send to him. I frequently send them out, "Note this, and send to the Sub-Inspector." I know he is overworked frequently with regard to correspondence, and that is the method I take to try and reduce it.

38. With regard to drinking, has your attention been drawn to any drinking in barracks, or the introduction of any liquor?—It was never brought under my notice. The Sub-Inspector told me there was somebody on the sick list, and there was an empty bottle of soda found.

39. That is easily accounted for?—Yes.

39A. You saw what Inspector Cullen said in Auckland?—I did, and was surprised. I knew of one or two men being slightly under the influence coming off duty. Many policemen have been punished for being under the influence whom witnesses would swear were absolutely sober. The position is that a man is considered not reliable for doing his duty if he shows symptoms of drinking.

40. You said you thought the system adopted in the depot is too much cramming and too little practical knowledge?—Too much instruction in law—getting sections off by heart. I think it was Sergeant Dale who mentioned that some of them come out with the idea that they know more than the sergeant, and are surprised when told to do something. It is surprising how soon they forget these lessons. I believe in physical drill, and teaching the rifle is a very good idea, but we would require at least 20 per cent. more men to relieve for that purpose.

41. You could only get these by recognising that the system would be of such advantage in forming the nucleus of a Defence Force as to justify the extra expense?—It would be necessary to have it compulsory.

42. Has your attention been drawn to inferior material for uniforms?—Only a few coats, which we returned to the storekeeper. I examine the coats when I go to an out-station. There is no complaint made here.

43. There are a number of men in the Force with very long service and good records as constables, but who, for reasons, have not been selected for promotion: some have been overlooked, and others have been considered as not suitable for promotion. These men labour under a sense of grievance?—I know two or three as well qualified as any in the country.

44. Probably the opportunity for promoting them has passed. You would not be an advocate of promoting men up in years, and probably not able to perform the arduous duties of sectional sergeant?—There are two or three—I do not know their ages—who are physically strong, and could do the duties. If they were healthy and strong, I would promote them, and give them an out-station.

45. I have in my mind's eye a man fifty-three years of age—Constable Leahy, at Oxford—who has been recommended on two or three occasions?—He is an excellent man.

46. What would you do with a man like that—who has a claim, but for some reason appears to have been overlooked? He is only typical of a certain class, not with the same exact claims, but who might have been treated otherwise. What would you do with men like that?—I would promote him, and if he did his sectional duty for six months, I would give him the same opportunity of getting a station as another sergeant. Two wrongs do not make a right.

47. You know he has a claim?—Yes. There is another man in the Auckland District, Constable Donovan, a most deserving man.

48. There are two or three who have been suggested to me, not as good as Constable Leahy, but who might be treated as senior constables, with some additions to their pay, and probably a chevron?—The object is to be able to draw their retiring-allowance at a sergeant's rate.

49. But against that you have to consider the efficiency of the Force?—But I believe they would be as efficient as any other sergeant. I know men ten years junior to the men you have mentioned who would not be able to do their duty any better. I think it is a question of the individual. At the same time, many have grumbled whom no officer could promote conscientiously.

50. But there are exceptions, and the difficulty is to deal with them?—That is true.

51. You do not think much of the senior-constable business?—No. I think if a man was worthy of promotion I would give it to him, no matter at what age, if he was competent for it. At the same time, I refer that to these exceptions—that it should be the rule not to promote a man after he has passed a certain age.

52. It must be applied to get rid of anomalies of that sort, which you must guard against occurring in the future?—Quite so.

53. What about this man recommended by you for promotion to be sergeant whom Inspector Cullen would not recommend?—I will show you my recommendation. I may say at the same time that there are sergeants in the Auckland District whom I would not recommend.

54. I am not raising any personal question between you and Inspector Cullen. I see you state in your report, "This man has only been four months in the district. He is doing his work very well so far, and appears to be above the average of most of the men in this city"?—There is the other report some months afterwards.

55. This is dated the 1st April, 1909: "Constable Hodgson has discharged his duties in a really satisfactory manner since he came to this district twelve months ago. There is no constable in this district better suited for the position of sergeant. I consider him a reliable, hardworking, capable man"?—The reports he submitted here, and his work so far, were above the average.

56. The Commissioner says, "Noted for consideration. I note that Constable Hodgson has not passed the annual police examination. Energetic constables should show their qualifications in this direction. The twenty-three men junior to Hodgson were better qualified for promotion." Did he pass the examination, or what?—That is the end, as far as I know, until he was promoted.

57. Your recommendation is dated the 1st April, 1909, and the Commissioner's minute the 2nd April, and he was promoted on the 1st July, three months later?—There are very few men in the Wellington District who come within the category of having over ten years' service and fifty years of age.

58. Do you limit your recommendations to those?—To men over ten years' service, and not exceeding fifty years of age.

59. You do not want me to infer that that was an element in your recommendation of this man?—He was one of those I could recommend.

60. That is not the point. You recommended him on his merits, not because you had not anybody else?—On his merits and the competence he showed, and because I was satisfied he was fully equal to other men who have been promoted. I furnished notes regarding each man who came within the requirements.

61. Would you give a man, considering the true interests of the service, the right of refusing promotion?—If there were no detriment to the service, I would.

62. You qualify it by saying, "If there was no detriment to the service." Surely if you select a man as being specially qualified—and you have no right to select him unless he is—and you give him the right to refuse, is not that a loss to the service?—It might not, because the next man might be a better man.

63. I quite admit that, but it is the exception to the rule?—He should go to where he is promoted.

64. It is right enough if the service does not suffer?—I do not remember having heard of a case of a man refusing promotion in which the service has suffered.

65. I am only dealing with principles?—I think a man should go where he is sent on transfer or promotion. I know that many men object to go, and I would prefer to let them leave, or not relax the rule except where there was some actual hardship, where it was not desirable to send a man; but I would want more than some of the reasons that are given now. I think there are too many transfers given to men who want to serve in particular places; I think they have no right;

they joined to serve in any part of the country. Some, with only two or three months' service, want to go to where they will be near relatives or sweethearts.

66. We cordially agree on that point. Are the overcoats at night compulsory?—The men parade with them, but in warm weather they are allowed to take them off.

67. It was complained that they were compulsory?—I never made them compulsory. I think it would be a hardship to make a man in a state of perspiration carry a heavy overcoat.

68. Have you considered the merits of helmets as against shakos?—The samples of helmets I have seen were not very good. I think they are about equal to the shakos. I have no decided preference.

69. About clerks in the district office, if a vacancy occurs, what do you do?—I have a man on trial. The Commissioner asked me to select a man; he is giving satisfaction so far. I like to have a clerk whom I know, and a man who is willing.

70. You know the position is not sought after?—I know that. I have two good men in the office. I think it is very hard to get a good clerk in the Police Force.

71. Would your proposal to have civilian clerks for a commencement get over that difficulty?—I think it should be given a trial.

72. What would you pay them?—Say, a young fellow of seventeen, I would pay him at the same rate as in the Civil Service.

73. You would have to give him a Civil Service status, and the option of coming into the police?—I would; and make him clean out the office the same as the others. A Civil servant will not do it; but he would have to clean out the office and light the fires the same as the present clerks have to do.

74. There might be difficulty in getting a boy to do that?—No; you would get plenty of them outside the Civil Service; but I would give the same wages as in the Civil Service. I think it would be worth trying.

75. You know that in some instances there has been an objection—whether sufficiently based or not I am not prepared to say—with regard to the Headquarters staff. Have you any opinion about it?—Until this Commission arose the thing was never brought under my notice specially, but I have heard a great deal about it since. I think it would be desirable that the Headquarters staff should not be in amongst the constables at mess, and be living in the barracks. Constables are liable to be asking questions, although I have no reason to believe that the men in the office now would abuse it; still, on principle, I think they should not be there.

76. We speak entirely on principle, without regard to individuals. Do you think it is an advantage to have the Headquarters staff members of the Force?—There are advantages, and I do not know of any disadvantage, unless, as we see now, it causes some jealousy in the service. I know it used to be under Mr. Fox, who was a competent man, had been in the service himself, and I never heard any grumbling in his time. Of course, there are anomalies, as you can see in the way it has been brought up before the Commission in one or two places. I have never had any friction, but the anomalies are there.

77. Do you approve of commissioned officers mixing with their subordinates in the barracks?—I think, from what has arisen here, harm can be made of it. When that billiard-table was put there I went in with the Chief Detective, and played two or three games. I did so for the purpose of seeing how the men conducted themselves. I played a game of billiards, I think, about six months ago with the Magistrate, and, I think, two or three other games with the Chief Detective and one of the clerks in the Commissioner's office; but I never spoke to a constable in the room; listened to what was going on, to hear if there was any slang. I had to go in once over a noise made in it by two men who are out of the service, and who appeared to be wrestling; my office is underneath. I told them that if they did not refrain from making a noise they would not be allowed into the billiard-room; they had only been trying body-holds. It was at the time that wrestling instruction was being given by Constable Skinner, and they were all gripping and holding.

78. Have you represented the state of the barracks strongly to the Commissioner?—I have written several times about the want of accommodation—being overcrowded. The Commissioner has mentioned to me several times that he was very anxious, and doing his utmost to get increased accommodation provided.

79. What is the difficulty—money or site?—There is a site, but there is a great deal of expense for foundations; they have to go down 14 ft. or 15 ft.

80. But you consider that increased accommodation is absolutely essential?—I do consider it essential, and that nothing could be done with the cells, except to pull the whole lot down and get them renewed.

81. If I am satisfied, I should strengthen your hands very much?—The cell-accommodation is very bad there. There was a garret built on the top of the present station some five or six years ago. I never knew what it was to be, and I do not know what architect ordered it, but the garret is such a place as you would not like to put people to sleep in. I do not care to say anything hard about it.

82. It was suggested that all detectives in small localities should be called in to Headquarters, and acting-detectives sent out?—Some of the acting-detectives are quite qualified to do the work. Acting-detectives have good opportunities of improving themselves under the Chief Detective.

83. That struck me—that it would be better to leave them in the centres?—There is one out in a small station, and I do not think he would be an acquisition to Wellington; he is a man getting up in years. Detective Boddam, of New Plymouth, is a very good man.

84. Something was said about changing the batons. I was referred to a man who was supposed to have a very good sample of a new one. Speaking for myself, I would prefer to get a knock on the head from the old one. Have you seen it [producing sample]?—No, sir. Of course, batons

are more used for a "push" or for defending a man, than for knocking a man out. I think this is a dangerous one; it is loaded.

85. Yet men came before me and said they would like to use that?—I would not like to get a knock on the head from it.

86. What is your opinion of this baton [produced]?—I would not like to hit a man with it; the batons in use are more used for pushing; it is very seldom a man has to be struck.

87. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As to the necessity for additional accommodation, we have talked it over several times?—Repeatedly, and you always admitted it.

88. We have gone to expenditure in erecting barracks at Newtown recently?—Yes, the training school barracks, and a small expenditure on the station.

89. As regards the dissatisfaction about the clerical staff at Headquarters, do you know there was dissatisfaction when the Civil servants were there—Evans and Tasker?—There was dissatisfaction with Tasker on account of his manner in writing memos and of doing his work.

90. *The Commissioner.*] On account of his personal demeanour?—Yes.

91. Not with the fact of his being a civilian?—Not at all.

92. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Had you not occasion to keep observation on one of the men who was addicted to drink?—There was a man in the office who was on the drink several times.

93. As regards promotions, this is the circular sent out, is it not: "Please furnish as soon as possible recommendations respecting members of the Force in your district as under: (1.) Constables under fifty years of age with over ten years' service fit for rank of sergeant. (2.) Married constables fit for charge of stations, showing whether fit to act as Clerks of Court, and whether fit for stations where mounted work has to be performed. (3.) Constables with over four years' service fit for plain-clothes work. (4.) Constables fit for clerical work. (5.) Constables fit for mounted duties in cities. Please make separate returns under each heading, and express your views freely as to the qualifications of each constable recommended"?—That is the circular.

94. When you recommended Constable Hodgson you recommended at the same time twelve others, did you not?—Here is a copy of my letter. I did not recommend them all. I mentioned the names of all who came within the category.

95. What is the good of putting the names in when a memo. like that is sent out?—It is my duty, when asked for the fullest remarks on the men.

Mr. Dinnie.] But the memo. asks for recommendation.

96. *The Commissioner.*] You really dealt with every man who came within ten years' service?—Yes. I was asked to express my views in the fullest manner.

97. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to Constable Shirley, who was placed in your office, do you know he was a bank clerk before he joined the service?—He must have been a failure, then.

98. Was he not an excellent writer?—He wrote a good hand.

99. He joined the service in 1902, and in 1905 applied for clerical work?—Yes; he did fairly well for a few months; then he got lazy and indolent; he did very well till he got the clerical work.

100. You say you saw a letter that was the cause of his coming in: is this the letter, addressed to Mr. Seddon, to the effect that the writer's son was in the Police Force in Wellington, that he was an ex-grammar-school boy, and that he was a good lad, with an adventurous spirit, and suggesting Mr. Seddon's influence on his behalf? That was referred to the Minister of Justice without any remark by R. J. Seddon. On this I put a minute that I had already noted this constable's qualifications, and had him assisting in my office—that he was well qualified for office-work, and would not be lost sight of. A reply was sent to the effect that his welfare would be duly considered, and his qualifications had been already noted. That is what you refer to?—Yes.

101. He was three years in the service before he was dismissed?—He may have been.

102. As regards Constable Willetts, it is alleged by Sergeant Mathieson that he saw Sub-Inspector Wright, and through him got his transfer to Newtown?—I heard him say so. I recommended Constable Willetts for Wellington South without any one speaking to me. He had spoken to me two or three times, and I said there were one or two other men to be provided for in front of him. When a chance came I gave it him near where he was living. He came to me in a talkative sort of manner, and I told him I could not give him a show then because other men were in front of him, but when the opportunity arose there was no reason against giving him a chance. Nobody spoke to me about it.

103. It was entirely on your recommendation I promoted him?—Yes.

104. I think Constable McKay, at Auckland, said that he was dealt with and punished on a charge that he had no opportunity of defending?—Yes, I heard that he did so, and I have seen the matter explained since, and according to the memo. in that it was a clerical error, the way the clerk entered the charge in the defaulter sheet. The man was charged with committing a breach of the peace, and I suggested to prosecute him and the other man in Court. The evidence was rather conflicting. You requested the complainant to lay the information, and he refused to do so; and your note, which I have seen, shows that you fined him 5s. for failing to report the occurrence; the clerk entered it for breach of the peace.

105. *The Commissioner.*] Of course, that explanation is satisfactory as far as it goes, but it seems to raise a rather important question, as to the correctness of the entries. Who wrote it in?—It was my clerk who wrote it in, and no doubt I looked over it.

106. How about checking it, because, however small it may be, this man has a grievance?—He saw it himself; I showed it to him, and read it to him, and explained it. The error was probably in reading the Commissioner's memo.

107. What check is there on these? That is what I want to know, because the Commissioner's memo. should not be a sufficient excuse for a wrong entry?—It is a technical clerical error. There is no doubt that the charge against him first was for committing a breach of the peace.

108. But he was not dealt with on that, and yet he is shown as having been dealt with. Do you check these entries yourself?—I have no doubt that I looked at it; I usually do, but my memory does not serve me.

109. But this serves as a permanent record against the man. It may be only a very small matter?—I could not speak from my recollection of it.

110. However, the matter has been cleared up now, and I will ask the Secretary to the Commission to notify the constable that it has been set right?—It was for failing to report a breach of the peace in which he was concerned himself.

111. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In speaking of Sergeant Mathieson, you said you knew he was a man who was generally dissatisfied?—I knew he was reputed to be a man who made mischief amongst the younger constables in Auckland.

112. It appears from the evidence in 1898 that he had a grievance against Inspector Brougham. He says, "I felt I was not getting justice under Inspector Brougham"?—I knew Inspector Brougham, who was a very just man.

113. Then, as regards seeking influence, there is another paragraph—a question put by the Chairman to Mr. David Pinkerton, who was then a member of Parliament:—

"Have you ever known a case in which a member of the Force has written out a telegram and asked you to sign it?—Yes.

"What is the name?—Constable Mathieson. I noticed that one Constable Mathieson gave evidence at Balclutha, but whether it is the same man or not I do not know.

"Has that been on more than one occasion?—Only on one occasion, I think. I may say I refused to sign a telegram laid before me.

"To whom was the telegram addressed?—If my memory serves me right, it was addressed either to the Minister or to Colonel Hume.

"What was the object of the telegram?—To get clerical employment in the office, instead of doing street duty. As far as my memory carries me, there were two telegrams presented to me by Constable Mathieson, and I signed one, but refused to sign the other."

At that time there was only one Mathieson in the service; and that happened on more than one occasion. As regards inquiries about candidates, are they strictly carried out?—Yes. Every person who has been an employer is asked about the candidate. In the backblocks a constable or sergeant may have to ride miles to an employer to get the required information. I do not attach much importance to what some say, and if some did say anything I would not pay much attention to it; but every possible inquiry is made.

114. As regards the classes in the various cities, are they useful?—They are useful, but we have suffered great inconvenience for want of a room in which to hold them. We had a room upstairs. When the building was erected we had a great many married men, but they have gone, and the staff has been increased by nine or ten.

115. Are the sergeants giving satisfaction?—I have very good sergeants.

116. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction with the present control?—No; I have not had any complaints made to me.

117. You know there are some men dissatisfied?—I know that, and people exaggerate things.

118. You say the conduct of the men generally has been good?—Fairly good. We have had a good many men. I have had to check and punish occasionally, and caution. I have had to caution some of them repeatedly. We have "shot" out a great many during the last three months. I admit that no matter what inquiry is made, we may get men in who give fair promise of being likely, and turn out quite the reverse. We have had a few who should have been refused on their first application.

119. *The Commissioner.*] On what?—Appearance, intelligence, and manner, if it had been a personal interview with them. Some had been in service before, and came with discharges.

120. They have since justified that opinion?—Strongly, in two or three cases I could mention.

121. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know the system in the probation class?—Yes.

122. Do you know that they are examined as soon as they go into the class?—I know that Sergeant Dart is very careful and very enthusiastic.

123. Is he not qualified to say whether they are suitable after having them for two or three months?—Probably he is. At the same time, he might think it better to give some a trial than stand them aside after instruction. I have in my mind two men who were there and two more who were never through the depot.

124. *The Commissioner.*] Who should never have been accepted?—I do not think they should have been passed.

125. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In transferring men, you say some of the recruits ought to be sent out. You know they are nearly all single men. What accommodation have we?—I know one or two who turned out first-class men; one is chief Bailiff in Auckland, and the other is a detective in Dunedin.

126. *The Commissioner.*] Detective Ward?—Yes. I know a great many men in the service who started as recruits in other parts than the cities.

127. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But I am speaking about the practicability of sending them out when we have not accommodation?—I do not know about these places, but Wellington has suffered from that.

128. You do not believe in men having to pass an examination when being promoted to the rank of sergeant?—If the man did not show he was actually fitted for it, he should be tested.

129. *The Commissioner.*] But you are the man who is asked?—I never recommended a man I did not think could have passed an examination—that is, only in plain writing, putting a report concisely, and quoting the procedure when the law is broken, and in regard to witnesses, without a lot of useless packing.

130. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Could not an examination be arranged accordingly?—If on these lines, there could be no possible objection to it. A man like Hodgson could have passed such an examination flying. His qualifications were far better than those of most of the men serving in Wellington in that direction; in fact, it was a pleasure to me to receive his reports and work as compared with others I had to struggle through and repair defects in.

131. You think it is desirable that the men should have a knowledge of the finger-prints?—I think it is advisable that as many as possible should be instructed in it, and that men from other places should be brought in and instructed in the classification.

132. You know some men over fifty who should have been promoted to the rank of sergeant perhaps ten years ago or longer. Would you promote them now, if fitted for street duty?—Yes, rather than perpetuate the continuance of an injustice.

133. You would make them do the ordinary term of street duty?—Yes. If a man is competent and deserving, his past services should be taken into account, and if an opportunity arose of placing him in a small station he should get an early opportunity.

134. Would not that cause trouble amongst the others?—It would not be deserved. I would take the chance.

135. But it would cause trouble. We have had a system of letting senior men get out of the city, and if we bring these men in, would there not be trouble?—I would consult the convenience and welfare of the service, and let them grumble.

136. But it is grumbling that causes these Commissions?—That may be so.

137. *The Commissioner.*] You believe in rectifying a wrong?—Yes.

138. *Sergeant Dart.*] You stated that you thought Constable Taylor was a "monkey on a stick" for one person. Am I one of the persons you referred to?—I do not think you posted or instructed him in any way. The relations between the instructor and myself have always been most cordial.

139. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] You say there is great difficulty in getting convictions in sly-grog selling?—No; I said in getting evidence.

140. I do not know that there is much difference between the two. Was there any difficulty in getting evidence when five hotels in Newtown were selling without a license in 1903 and you did not prosecute?—I had evidence they were selling. At that time there was an appeal pending, and I had instructions not to prosecute.

141. You ultimately did so?—I cannot speak from memory at this lapse of time. I know there was an appeal to the Privy Council, and I think the hotelkeepers got their licenses back.

142. *The Commissioner.*] Do you accept personal responsibility?—None whatever.

143. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Have the papers gone in to the Commissioner in connection with the McGrath and Shannon case?—I do not know anything about it. Sergeant Dart said nobody knew about it except himself.

144. *The Commissioner.*] What is it?—Two probationers Sergeant Dart cautioned for some skylarking in barracks.

145. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Do you know this constable whose name I hand you?—Yes.

146. Why was he transferred from Carterton?—Because he did not give me satisfaction in the discharge of his duties. I had a suspicion he was taking more liquor than was good for him.

147. Not more than a suspicion?—No.

148. Did you not go up and make inquiries about it?—Yes.

149. Were you not told by his wife that he was in bed drunk?—No.

150. Do you know why this constable whose name I hand you was transferred?—For much the same reason. A complaint was made by his relatives that he was not getting on well with his wife, who thought he was drinking. I went to see the man, and there was not a sign of drink on him. Another time a sergeant went and found no sign of drink.

151. Was he transferred from Auckland for drunkenness?—I cannot say.

152. Why was this third man removed from Picton?—Family reasons.

153. Why was this fourth one transferred from Wellington to the South Island?—I believe he applied to go; I would not be certain.

154. Was there any charge against him of being in company with a loose woman?—I do not remember anything of the kind.

155. Do you know this gentleman whose name I hand you? Is he a sober man?—He is a man that takes liquor. I never saw him drunk.

156. Is it not a fact that he has been drunk?—It may be.

157. You have never had any complaints about it?—Never had any evidence of it.

158. Did this other man get a presentation in Wellington before he left?—I do not know.

159. He might have?—Possibly; I never heard of it.

160. Was a detective sent to make a report on the burglary at Carterton Railway-station?—Yes.

161. Was there a suspicion against any one?—I am not going to speak of suspicions; there was no evidence against any one.

162. In justice to the police, I think this matter ought to be cleared up, because there are remarks to the effect that suspicion fell upon some one who is related to a police official high up in the service?—I can produce the papers.

163. Is there any truth in the suggestion that beer was sent to the police at Christmas as a present?—I never heard of it. I once saw a small barrel of beer going into the station at Christmas—the mess caterer was receiving delivery of it—a five- or ten-gallon keg for Christmas dinner. I do not think there is any objection to a policeman having a glass of beer on Christmas Day.

164. It was not sent as a present?—I never heard of such a thing.

165. If a civilian makes that statement, would you say it is untrue?—No, I cannot say that.

166. You are Inspector of Licensed Houses in Wellington?—Yes. I inspect the hotels once or twice a year; sometimes more.

167. Most are owned or controlled by one firm?—No; there are several.

168. One firm has a great number?—Yes; a lot belong to the brewers.

169. Where does your son work?—He works for Staples and Co. I know what you are getting at, and who your prompter is.

170. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to say anything about it?—No; my son is working as a labourer, and he earns his money honestly. It is only a coarse mind that would suggest anything wrong in it. He earns his money honestly, and does his work well.

171. *Sergeant Mathieson.*] You heard my evidence. Was there any portion of it you would say was untrue?—It was coloured in respect to the innuendo that I had made offensive remarks in writing to you.

172. That is all you can say against it?—I do not object to what you said.

173. You have applied the searchlight pretty strongly to my character since 1890?—I never knew you except in Auckland.

174. You have said the worst you could say?—Yes.

175. All you can say is that you heard I was a mischief-maker, and ran after people with influence?—That was your reputation in Auckland.

176. *Constable Taylor.*] Did you ever have a complaint about me when I was under Constable Kerr?—The only complaint I had was an uneasy feeling that you were too excitable, and giving evidence in a way I did not approve of, and I asked the officer to keep an eye on you.

WILLIAM MATHIESON, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 304.)

Witness: It is suggested that I prompted Constable Taylor to give evidence. I give that an emphatic denial. It has been suggested that I prompted Mr. Wright; I give that an emphatic denial. I have only had one conversation with him in my life. The prompter of Mr. Wright may be found in an unexpected quarter.

MONDAY, 4TH OCTOBER, 1909.

Mr. Dinnie: I have applied for permission for counsel to represent me on this occasion, principally in connection with any cross-examination, so as to have his advice.

The Commissioner: Cross-examination of yourself?

Mr. Dinnie: Yes.

The Commissioner: Is there anything special you anticipate in cross-examination?

Mr. Dinnie: No; I merely thought it better to be represented; I do not know who might cross-examine me.

The Commissioner: You, Mr. Skerrett, are the counsel referred to?

Mr. Skerrett, K.C.: That is so.

The Commissioner: It is usual for the counsel to make the application.

Mr. Dinnie: I understood from Mr. Gray—

The Commissioner: I know of no understanding.

Mr. Skerrett, K.C.: If necessary, I formally make the application.

The Commissioner: It is not necessary under ordinary circumstances. The only thing is, we have arrived at the very last stage of the sittings of the Commission, and I adjourned the sittings on the application of the Commissioner, to enable him to prepare a written statement, on such lines as he thought proper, for the purpose of placing any matters affecting his administration before the Commission and the public. The value, I take it, of counsel is in the cross-examination of witnesses throughout the course of an inquiry.

Mr. Skerrett, K.C.: What I apprehend is felt by Mr. Dinnie is this: He will be here to-day in the capacity of a witness, and in case any objectionable question is put to him he thinks he ought to have some one to represent him who would be in a position to submit the objection to your Worship.

The Commissioner: When you say "objectionable," what do you mean?

Mr. Skerrett, K.C.: I mean irrelevant.

The Commissioner: That is a totally different thing. If you say "objectionable" it is assuming I am not competent to distinguish between what is proper and what is objectionable.

Mr. Skerrett, K.C.: I only used the word "objectionable" in its most general sense—in the sense of irrelevance or other questions to which your attention ought to be drawn.

The Commissioner: So far as you yourself are concerned, it would have given me the greatest satisfaction if you had been connected with the Commission throughout its course; it would have been of great assistance to me. I have had all the work to do myself, and I would have been pleased to have had you throughout.

Mr. Skerrett, K.C.: I can assure your Worship my presence here is not intended as a reflection on your capability to detect irrelevant questions. Where a person sits in a judicial capacity it is sometimes convenient to him to have objection raised to a question,

WALTER DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, further examined. (No. 305.)

Witness: My name is Walter Dinnie. I am Commissioner of the New Zealand Police Force. It is necessary on an occasion of the present exceptional nature and importance that I should give a slight sketch of my previous police experience and qualifications, which it seems apparent have not, in view of recent circumstances here, received the consideration which, in my opinion, should have been accorded them, but which I am pleased to say were fully recognised and appreciated by the highest authorities in England. I first joined the West Riding of Yorkshire Constabulary in February, 1873, and, after passing the probation class and a police examination, I was posted to the Bradford District, where I was appointed assistant clerk in the district office under an Inspector who acted as district clerk. I may say that the West Riding Constabulary was considered one of the best disciplined and most efficient Forces in Great Britain; and the fact that the district clerk held the rank of Inspector shows how the clerical staff were appreciated in that Force. The headquarters staff were all police officers of various ranks, the chief clerk being a Superintendent, but junior to the majority of District Superintendents. I served two years as assistant clerk, when I was transferred to Goole, as district clerk, with the rank of acting-sergeant. I remained there for twelve months, when, much against the desire of my Superintendent, who had recommended me for further promotion, I resigned my position, and proceeded to London, where I immediately afterwards joined the Metropolitan Police Force, in March, 1876. I again passed through the probation class, and was appointed to the "A," or most important, division, in which I served for twelve months. During this time I had to deal with numerous charges of a varied character. I was then selected by competitive examination for clerical duties in the headquarters staff at New Scotland Yard, where I passed through all the branches of that department, and was promoted to the rank of sergeant when I had completed three and a half years' service. I may say that the headquarters staff was composed of one Superintendent, six Inspectors, about fifteen sergeants, and the remainder constables. Whilst employed as sergeant I was frequently placed in charge of squads of uniform men attending race-meetings, and maintaining order on special occasions at large gatherings of the public, so that I thus obtained a varied experience, which was most serviceable to me afterwards. When I completed four and a half years' service I was selected as chief clerk to the Chief Constable of the Criminal Investigation Department, New Scotland Yard, which position I held for a period of two years, at a higher rate of pay. On my own application I was then appointed a detective sergeant, and commenced my career as a detective. I will not enter into detail in respect to the many important cases I handled successfully, or the numerous commendations and awards from Magistrates, Judges, Commissioners of Police, and Treasury Solicitors which were recorded in my favour. Suffice it to say that my services and qualifications were fully appreciated and recognised, and I gradually rose to the highest rank attainable in that department—namely, that of Chief Inspector to the Criminal Investigation Department, New Scotland Yard. Whilst serving in that branch, and in the execution of my duties, I was continually travelling and in touch with other Police Forces, principally in Great Britain and the Continent. I proceeded to America on two occasions, and also twice to Africa; and from my observations, and the interest I took in the administration of Police Forces generally, I can speak with some authority on the subject. From the experience I had gained, I made recommendations for certain reforms in the Police Force to which I was attached. The then Commissioner expressed his high appreciation of all my recommendations, a number of which were at once put into practice. It was on my return from Africa in April, 1903, after completing twenty-seven years' service, that I was asked to accept my present appointment. My Commissioner said he would deeply regret my retirement, but would not stand in the way of my future advancement, which, he was good enough to add, I richly merited. After consideration, I decided to accept the position offered, and accordingly retired from the Metropolitan Police Force, and proceeded to this Dominion, arriving here on the 8th June, 1903, since which date I have devoted my whole time to the interests of the Police Force of New Zealand. To show how my services were appreciated by the heads of the London Police Force, I venture to quote two of the numerous commendations I received as the result of my work. On submitting a report in respect to my successful efforts in bringing four notorious criminals to justice for ingenious frauds on noblemen, Sir Robert Anderson, Assistant Commissioner, wrote the following minute on the official file: "A case like this, and such an admirable statement of it as this report contains, are very gratifying to me. The matter has been handled with great zeal as well as judgment." Sir Edward Bradford, Commissioner of Police, wrote the following minute on the same file: "This is indeed a most excellent and clear report, and I indorse your opinion as to the way the matter has been dealt with. It does credit to the Department and to the Force." Some three years ago, the Tasmanian Government decided to reorganize its Police Force, and they asked the New Zealand Government to allow me to act as a member of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the condition of the service, and make recommendations with a view to improving its efficiency. The request of the Tasmanian Government was complied with, and I accordingly proceeded to Tasmania. At the conclusion of the labours of the Royal Commission, and after the report had been forwarded to His Excellency the Governor of that State, the Premier of Tasmania, in a letter to the New Zealand Government, expressed its thanks for the valuable advice and assistance I had given.

Preliminary.

In consequence of certain allegations made in the House last session, I applied for an inquiry into the specific charges made against the Police Force of this Dominion and its administration. The result was the appointment of the present Commission. At the conclusion of such a searching inquiry as this has been, it is very gratifying to me to be able to say that the evidence and records show that the Force is highly efficient and well disciplined; and the general conduct, sobriety,

and morality of the men is very good. Speaking with over thirty-six years' experience of Police Forces of Europe and the United States, as well as of Australasia—and here I may say that the knowledge necessary to properly administer a Police Force is not to be acquired in a few months, or even a few years—it is a pleasure to me to be in a position to say that the New Zealand Police Force, taken as a body, compares most favourably with the Police Forces of other countries. A large proportion of our Force consists of young New-Zealanders. It speaks well for our young men that the New-Zealand-born recruits display such a high standard of good conduct. The absence of complaints by private individuals is most noticeable, and speaks volumes in favour of the manner in which the work of the Department is carried out. I am satisfied that no Police Force of similar dimensions, or Government department, would undergo such a searching inquiry and emerge therefrom so stainless as the New Zealand Police Force has done. I do not attempt to answer the mass of irrelevant or baseless hearsay evidence which has been so prominent during this inquiry, nor the innuendos it has been thought fit to cast at the Force. Any definite charge, however, I am prepared to deal with, and I think in a manner which will give general satisfaction.

Mr. Arnold's Charges.

Before touching on the general questions set out in His Excellency's Commission, I shall briefly dispose of the charges made by Messrs. Arnold and T. E. Taylor in the House of Representatives, and by the former also in his evidence at Dunedin. I distinctly affirm that every allegation made by Messrs. Arnold and Taylor is either grotesquely exaggerated or absolutely baseless. I shall now prove this by a simple statement of the actual facts.

(1.) Mr. Arnold said, "Sufficient inquiry is not made into the character and antecedents of the men who recently have joined the Force." *Reply:* The evidence given before the Commission is overwhelming that inquiries were never so strict and complete as they are now, and the official files abundantly confirm this. (See copy of application form appended to my statement, showing particulars required as to character of candidates—Exhibit No. 1.)

(2.) Mr. Arnold said, "It is an open secret that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction and unrest amongst the general public in connection with the Police Force, brought about by revelations that have been made during the last few months." *Reply:* No dissatisfaction and unrest whatsoever amongst the general public has been shown by the evidence submitted to the Commission. If the "revelations" refer to an assault case in which three members of the Force were concerned, I may say that the offenders were promptly dealt with, and dismissed from the service. The conduct of the men referred to prior to enrolment was very satisfactory, as proved by the official records showing the nature and result of the exhaustive inquiries made in respect to their antecedents.

(3.) Mr. Arnold said, "There is such an amount of unrest, such an undercurrent of dissatisfaction, in the Police Force itself that if something is not done, and done almost immediately, results may be serious." *Reply:* The evidence clearly shows that there is no general dissatisfaction in the Police Force. In every service there is always a certain amount of discontent in respect to promotion, which cannot be avoided if the interests of the public service is the sole consideration of the administration. If there is any undercurrent of dissatisfaction, it only exists amongst a few "agitators," whose identity is apparent from the evidence adduced before the Commission.

(4.) Mr. Arnold said, "Here is a man who arrived in the Dominion, and within a short time, and without inquiry, is admitted into the Police Force, and very soon afterwards he is taking part in that assault in the streets of Wellington." *Reply:* Three members of the Force were concerned in the assault referred to. Strict inquiries were made into their antecedents prior to their admission to the Force, and their characters up to that time were shown to be most satisfactory. It is therefore untrue to say that they were admitted without inquiries. As already stated, the constables concerned were promptly dismissed.

(5.) Mr. Arnold said, "A man leaves Great Britain, and he has with him his wife's sister. He comes into this country, and within a very few weeks he is engaged in the Police Force." *Reply:* This man was four years in New Zealand before he joined the Force. He arrived in New Zealand in March, 1904; was employed by the Wellington and Manawatu Railway Company from the 7th March, 1904, to the 10th October, 1904; was in the New Zealand Government Railway service from the 12th October, 1904, to the 11th June, 1908. Prior to his arrival here he had been employed in the Government Railway service of Cape Colony, and also in the Police Force there. His parchment certificates were marked "Character very good." There was no reason to believe that the woman and two children in his household were other than his own wife and children. When information reached the Department of this man's immoral conduct his services were promptly dispensed with.

(6.) Mr. Arnold said, "Another case. A person comes from another part of the Empire and joins the Police Force. Within a very few months he is found to be living with the wife of the person with whom he has been lodging, and with whom he came out to this Dominion." *Reply:* This is incorrect. Prior to joining the Police Force this man had served ten years in the army, and three years in the Birmingham Police Force. He produced excellent discharges. On being enrolled here on the 18th June, 1907, he was stationed at Auckland, and, being a single man, resided in the police barracks. He resigned from the Police Force in February, 1909. It was after he left the Force and the Dominion that information was received by the police that a married woman had left with him. There was no suspicion of immoral conduct on his part while he was in the service.

(7.) Mr. Arnold said, "A person is dismissed because he assaults his sergeant in Glasgow. He was in the Glasgow Police Force. He comes to this Dominion and enters the Force without inquiry." *Reply:* This statement is erroneous. Inquiries were made. The person referred to,

on applying for admission into the New Zealand Police Force, produced a parchment discharge from the Lanarkshire Constabulary marked "Conduct good." Two constables in the New Zealand Police Force who had previous service in the Glasgow Police Force reported that they knew the applicant to be a very respectable and sober young man. Inquiries proved that his conduct since his arrival in the Dominion twelve months previously had been highly satisfactory. He was enrolled on probation pending inquiries in Scotland, from the result of which it transpired that he had served a short period in the Glasgow Police Force, and had been dismissed for misconduct. He suppressed this fact when applying for enrolment here. When this was discovered, by communicating with the Lanarkshire police, he was promptly dismissed; and the services also of the two constables who had withheld their knowledge of the fact that he had been dismissed from the Glasgow Police Force were dispensed with.

(8.) Mr. Arnold said, "A notorious criminal came to New Zealand. Communications had been received by the Police Department here, together with the man's photograph, and also his finger-prints. But one day in the upper office of the barracks in Wellington, when some officers were looking at the photograph of this criminal, they recognised the constable doing duty opposite the barracks, and wearing the King's uniform, as the man required." *Reply*: The files show that this man applied for enrolment in March, 1908. At that time we were particularly short of candidates. Out of seventeen candidates called up in February only seven accepted, and they were warned to report on the 9th March. On that date three of them did not turn up, so that there were only four to start the batch with. Seven more were then called up on the 9th March, which exhausted the list of available candidates. Out of the seven called up we got six, which made the batch up to ten. On the 13th March one of the ten resigned, which left only nine. It therefore became necessary to select a few candidates who had not been placed on the list owing to the inquiry into their antecedents not having been completed, but who could be got at once, as the work of the batch was being delayed. This candidate came with the best of recommendations, showing that he had been employed as wardman in the Gundagai Hospital from January, 1899, to March, 1900; as overseer of the Lunny Sisters Estate at Darlinghurst from March, 1900, to February, 1905; as a dredge hand at Port Stephens from March, 1905, to December, 1906; and again by the Lunny Sisters from January to December, 1907. His relatives reside at Petone, and are considered highly respectable. As it was necessary to make up the batch in the depot to at least a dozen, this applicant and two others who were in Wellington at the time were medically examined, passed, and sent to the depot at once on probation, being told that inquiries would be made as to their antecedents, and should they turn out unsatisfactory they would be discharged. A letter was accordingly written to the New South Wales police on the 3rd April, 1908, giving details of the applicant's employment, and asking for inquiry and a report as to his character. No reply having been received before the batch was sworn in on the 14th May, 1908, he was appointed, still subject, of course, to the inquiries being satisfactory. Shortly after his being sworn in, a testimonial in his favour was received from a member of the Australian Federal Parliament. I may mention that while in the depot his finger-prints were taken, and no similar finger-prints could be found in the finger-print bureau, as up to that time they had not been recorded there. The following month his photograph was accidentally noticed in a volume of New South Wales criminals. Inquiries were made, and it was put beyond doubt that he had been convicted of forgery in Australia, and he was promptly discharged. The result of inquiries from New South Wales did not come to hand until after his photograph had been recognised here, and he had been dismissed. Through some unaccountable reason my letter to the Sydney police—a copy of which is attached to the file—apparently did not reach its destination in due course. Hence the delay in obtaining information as to the constable's character, which information, if received in due time, would have resulted in his discharge from the probation class, and prior to enrolment.

(9.) Mr. Arnold said, "Another man came into New Zealand, and was received into the Police Force. A short time afterwards, when there was a brawl in one of the streets of Wellington, he was found in plain clothes amongst the crowd urging them on in the assault that was being committed against the constables who were striving to do their duty." *Reply*: This is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. The constable referred to joined the New Zealand Police Force on the 30th March, 1908, he having previously served in the South Australian Police Force for a period of two years ending January, 1908. His parchment discharge from that Force was marked "Conduct very good." In reference to the street brawl referred to, there was no evidence forthcoming to show that he urged the crowd on in any way to assault the arresting constables. As it was evident, however, that he seriously neglected his duty by not rendering prompt and active assistance to quell the disturbance, and as his previous conduct had not been satisfactory, I dispensed with his services.

(10.) Mr. Arnold said, "Now, I note that one of the constables in this city was found drunk on beat, and that he was sent back to barracks last week." *Reply*: The constable referred to joined the Police Force on the 1st November, 1908. The files show that prior to his enrolment he had only been in two situations—nine years in one, and four months in the other. The police reports as to his character prior to entering the Force were uniformly good. He was reported on as being "a very steady, sober, and trustworthy young man, and respected by the residents of the locality in which he lived." On the 6th June last, at 9.10 p.m., his sergeant noticed that he was slightly under the influence of liquor. It appears that the sergeant did not notice anything amiss with the constable when posted on his beat at 8.45 p.m. As the constable had not been giving satisfaction in the performance of his duties, and was adversely reported on by his superiors, he was at once dismissed from the service.

(11.) Mr. Arnold said, "I am not sure whether the Minister is aware of the condition of things in some of the barracks, particularly in the barracks in Wellington. When I was considerably younger than I am now I had to work where the very great majority of the men were of a

very mixed character, and I can assure the Minister that the worst of the scenes, and the things I could speak of as occurring between pay-day and Saturday and the time for starting again on Monday morning in those days, were no worse than are to be found in the police barracks almost every night of the week." *Reply*: This is a gross exaggeration, and is a libel on a well-conducted, hardworking, and fine body of men—public servants of whom the Dominion may well be proud. The evidence of the Inspector and other responsible officers clearly disproves the unjust aspersions cast on the men. The only "scenes," to use Mr. Arnold's word, which have occurred in the Wellington barracks for years past were a quarrel between two married men, who were not living in the barracks, and who have since left the service, and a disturbance caused at midnight by two single men (one of whom has since been dismissed), who were reprimanded for their conduct. Otherwise, the conduct of the men in the barracks has been exemplary.

(12.) Mr. Arnold said, "I should like also the condition of the sanitary arrangements in connection with those barracks (Wellington barracks) looked into." *Reply*: There is nothing really amiss with the sanitary conditions of the Wellington barracks. The accommodation is certainly not so good as it might be, but as the Force is from time to time being augmented it is intended to provide further accommodation by erecting an addition to the present station.

(13.) With reference to the names of constables handed in to the Commission at Dunedin by Mr. Arnold, with the suggestion that proper inquiries had not been made prior to their appointment, I may state that the constables referred to were all men of previous police experience, and produced good discharges. One of them has since resigned. The conduct of the others since enrolment has been excellent. They have absolutely clean defaulters' sheets. For particulars of their previous service, see tables accompanying my statement (Exhibit No. 2).

(14.) Mr. Arnold said, "Here is a constable, whose name I will hand in to the Commission, who was stationed up north. He was charged with robbing a drunken man. The charge was made by another constable, and an inquiry was held. Whatever the Commissioner thought of it, the constable believed the case was proved right up to the hilt. The person who was supposed to have committed the robbery was promoted, and transferred to a more important position down south. As, however, he preferred not to go south, he was sent further north. The person who made the charge was sent into the backblocks on the Main Trunk line, and when he protested against his treatment he was severely fined." *Reply*: In August, 1907, one constable brought a charge against another of stealing money from a prisoner. About five months had elapsed from the date of the alleged offence before the charge was brought. Considerable friction existed between the two constables. The matter was investigated, but the evidence forthcoming was unsatisfactory, and did not substantiate the charge. The two constables were transferred to the charge of other stations. The constable who brought the charge was subsequently punished for insubordination. The constable against whom the charge was brought has since resigned. The Inspector of the district held the inquiry.

(15.) Mr. Arnold said, "Sir, it is in consequence of this state of things that men are leaving the Force. It is in consequence of this that men will not join. It is in consequence of this state of things—and it does not exist in one part of the Dominion only—that there is such a feeling of unrest in the minds of the general public." *Reply*: No evidence has been adduced before the Commission to show that there exists any unrest whatsoever amongst the public. If the men referred to in the foregoing replies had been retained in the Force after misconducting themselves there would have been good grounds for public unrest, but the fact of their having been promptly dismissed should satisfy—and no doubt has satisfied—the public that such conduct is not tolerated in the service.

(16.) Mr. Arnold said, "A private employer would make sufficient inquiry before he employs a person to know what his character is. Even in the case of people coming from one of the States of Australia or from another part of the Empire, they will require certain credentials; and I say it would be almost impossible for men such as I have spoken of this afternoon to get employment in a position of trust with private people." *Reply*: We not only require satisfactory credentials as to character, and verify them, but we cause additional exhaustive inquiries to be made, and I say without hesitation that the inquiries which are carried out in respect to the previous character of applicants for employment in the New Zealand Police Force are more stringent and thorough than those at present obtaining in respect to any other Police Force. In saying this, I speak with an intimate knowledge of the systems adopted in regard to Police Forces in Great Britain, the Continent, the United States, Africa, and Australia.

(17.) Mr. Arnold said, "A member of the Force requiring to go to Great Britain received six months' leave of absence on full pay." *Reply*: The official file and the evidence show conclusively that this statement is absolutely without foundation. (See copy of Ministerial authorisation—Exhibit No. 3—evidence of Hon. J. McGowan, who, as Minister of Justice, dealt with the case; also, my own sworn testimony.)

(18.) Mr. Arnold said in his evidence at Dunedin, "The belief now is that six months' leave was granted on full pay, but that in consequence of certain criticisms by a paper previous to my speech, and which I had not seen, the authority had been altered from six months' full pay to one month's full pay, the leave of absence being still six months." *Reply*: I have declared on oath, and now repeat it, that the file produced before the Commission is the original one, and was never altered. As this is a matter that touches my honour, I feel it necessary to add this: The suggestion is an utterly unworthy one. On my producing the original file, one naturally looked for a frank and manly admission by Mr. Arnold that he had been misled, and for an apology to me for the injury he had done.

Appended to my statement are tables giving particulars of results of inquiries made prior to enrolment in respect to the characters of the constables mentioned by Mr. Arnold (Exhibit No. 2).

Mr. T. E. Taylor's Charge.

Mr. Taylor said, "The police officer against whose presence in Christchurch I protested, and told the Commissioner that if he remained there I should call a meeting of citizens to protest against his remaining in the Force—it is not in connection with a matter of an offence committed in 1897, but in connection with a serious crime charged against him during the last two or three years; and the Commissioner must know, if he knows the facts, that what I say is absolutely true, and the files in his office will prove every word of my statement this evening." *Reply:* This is an untrue statement, and is a cruel reflection on a man who is doing splendid work in Auckland. He has been well reported on by all his superior officers. The evidence of Mr. C. C. Kettle, S.M., Auckland, who knows the officer and his work well, distinctly bears high testimony to his character. Mr. Taylor has evidently been misled. I know nothing of any serious crime having been committed by the police officer referred to within the last two or three years, or, in fact, at any time, and there is nothing on the file that bears out Mr. Taylor's statement.

It will be noticed that Mr. Taylor has not appeared before the Commission to substantiate the charge he made in the House, although he has indirectly intervened by supplying information to the Commission in respect to the conduct of certain constables. The statements made by Mr. Taylor in regard to myself assume some importance when made in the House; but public men occupying important positions have before now had experience of the reckless nature of Mr. Taylor's statements.

Conduct and Efficiency.

From my long police experience I can safely say that the efficiency, conduct, sobriety, and morality of the members of the service as a whole has been very satisfactory, and compares most favourably with the efficiency and conduct of other Police Forces.

Political and other Improper Interference.

It cannot be denied—in fact, there is ample proof from the departmental files—that influence, political and otherwise, is frequently sought by members of the service; and the mere fact that members of Parliament and influential persons apparently do not discourage members of the Force from seeking influence has a bad effect on discipline. It is clear from the evidence that many members of the service believe that influence obtains in the Department, and this fact alone causes dissatisfaction; and it is difficult to convince them otherwise. I emphatically declare that in no case do I know that influence has obtained or had an effect in either securing appointments to the police service, transfers, advancement of any kind, or promotion. The fact that influence has been successfully resisted has no doubt irritated those few dissatisfied members of the service, or "agitators," and caused them to seek other means of ventilating their imaginary grievances.

In his evidence at Dunedin, the district Inspector said there was a general impression amongst members of the Force that the Commissioner had a "useful" man posted in each district, whose chief function was to convey to the Commissioner special information in regard to the actions of members of the Force. The most searching inquiry made in every district in which the Commission sat failed to discover this imaginary individual—a "useful" man. This is an instance in which the reckless and ill-considered statement of one man may cause much unnecessary trouble. The matter is unworthy any further attention.

The member for Auckland West, Mr. C. H. Poole, in his evidence before the Commission, stated that he knew of an instance in which influence had obtained in the Police Department, and he subsequently supplied information to the Commission alleging that a sergeant at Waihi had been transferred to Auckland at the instance of the late Premier in 1905 because he prosecuted a certain hotelkeeper. I have called for a report on the subject, from which it is evident that Mr. Poole has been entirely misled, and which proves that no grounds whatever exist for his assertion. The following is a copy of the report:—

"District Office, Auckland, 17th September, 1909.—Memorandum from the Inspector of Police at Auckland to the Commissioner of Police, Wellington.—Sergeant Sheehan's transfer from Waihi: The only conversation I had with the late Mr. Seddon relating to police matters at Waihi was some time in the early part of 1905, when I met him in the street, and he stopped to speak to me. While in conversation, he referred to a prosecution under the Licensing Act that Sergeant Sheehan had brought against Thomas Gardiner for being on the premises of Kelly's 'Rob Roy' Hotel at Waihi during prohibited hours, and asked me whether Sheehan instituted the prosecution on his own account. I told him 'No,' that Sheehan had informed me of the facts, and I had instructed him to prosecute. Mr. Seddon said he had been informed that Sheehan had prosecuted on his own responsibility, and was glad to know that that was not so. We had some further conversation about the recently passed amendments to the Licensing Act, and Mr. Seddon remarked that the Government was being worried by the Prohibitionists on one side and the liquor party on the other, and that it was hard to satisfy either party. There were some parties with Mr. Seddon at the time, but I cannot now remember who they were. Our meeting on the street was purely a chance one. Mr. Seddon has never been to my office, and never suggested that Sergeant Sheehan should be removed from Waihi. If he wanted to remove the sergeant he would have carried it out without referring the matter to me. Considerable fuss about Gardiner's prosecution was made by the publicans at Waihi, through the local Press, and an agitation, which was engineered by two prominent publicans, was set on foot there, which later on culminated in an attack on the police in the street there, and which was particularly directed against Sheehan. At the time Sub-Inspector Hendrey was transferred from Newton to the city, on appointment to the rank of station sergeant, I recommended Sergeant Sheehan's transfer from Waihi to Newton, to replace Hendrey there. This was over a year after the Gardiner incident, which had nothing to do with Sheehan's transfer from Waihi.—J. CULLEN, Inspector."

ORGANIZATION, CONTROL, AND ENROLMENT.

I shall now proceed to deal with the questions referred to in His Excellency's Commission :
 "No. 1. The general organization, control, and enrolment of the Police Force of the Dominion as it now exists in its several branches, and the discipline and efficiency thereof; and in what respect the said Force, or any part thereof, could be better recruited, organized, controlled, or made more efficient."

Strength of Force.

On the 31st March last the strength of the Force was 771 of all ranks, being an increase of thirty-seven during the year. The total is made up as follows: 9 Inspectors, 7 Sub-Inspectors, 4 station sergeants, 1 sergeant-major, 82 sergeants, 619 constables, 5 Chief Detectives, 30 detectives, 14 acting-detectives. In addition to the above there were 4 police surgeons, 4 matrons, 20 district constables, 10 Native constables, 43 troop horses.

Enrolment.

The system of recruiting the Police Force of the Dominion can scarcely be improved upon; and, as I have already stated, is more thorough and complete than that obtaining in any other Police Department. All candidates have to apply in the first instance to the Commissioner of Police for enrolment. An application form is forwarded to them (see copy attached to my statement—Exhibit No. 1), from which it will be seen that candidates have to account for the whole of their time since leaving school, giving the name and address of each employer, position held, time from and to, the cause of leaving. If there has been any interval between one situation and another, applicant must state where he was and what he was doing during that interval. When the form is properly filled in and signed by the candidate it is then forwarded to the various districts in which he was employed, or resided, with the following memorandum:—

NEW ZEALAND POLICE.

Application of *for Enrolment forwarded herewith.*

Memorandum for the Officer in Charge, District.

PLEASE submit a confidential report stating the period candidate has been known to the police, the period he has resided in your district, and his character during the whole of that period; also verify as far as possible the attached testimonials and statement of previous occupation, the report to show the names of persons interviewed. Should the candidate be unknown, or not well known to the police, then let careful and discreet inquiry be made, and the result submitted, giving period covered by such inquiry. The candidate should also be carefully measured, and the result given below by the officer taking the measurements.

Wellington, , 190 .

, Commissioner of Police.

Height (without shoes):	ft.	in.	
Chest-measurement (bare)	{	Full inspiration:	in.
		Full expiration:	in.

By whom taken (Signature):
 Rank:

Station: Date: , 190 .

When the inquiries have been satisfactorily completed, the file is submitted to me for consideration, and I either pass or reject the candidate, in accordance with the information contained in the various reports. In each case, it will be observed, candidates are interviewed and measured by the sergeant or constable of the district in which he resides. The candidate is then informed of my decision—namely, either that his name has been placed on the list of eligible candidates, or that his application has been rejected as he is not considered suitable for police work. When a batch of men is required in the probation class I select from the list of eligible candidates those I consider most suitable for appointment; but recently we have had a very limited number to select from, although little can be said prejudicial to their physique or intelligence. Applicants are then warned to attend before the Police Surgeon of the district in which they reside for medical examination, and if they pass they come on to Headquarters, and are at once placed in the probation class. Suggestions have been made that application forms should be supplied to district Inspectors, and that candidates should appear before them or their deputy for preliminary inspection, and to be medically examined before inquiry is made into their character. I have carefully considered this suggestion, and have come to the conclusion that the present system is preferable, for the following reasons: Communications are frequently received at Headquarters, and personal inquiries are made by members of Parliament and others in respect to candidates, which could not be satisfactorily answered if they made application locally, as nothing would be known at Headquarters of such applicants until after the local inquiries were completed, which might be some considerable time subsequent to the date of application. Further, candidates would have to make two journeys instead of one if they had first to attend the district headquarters, and later on be called on for appointment to the probation class. The inquiries would be precisely the same as at present, and no better results would obtain. The sergeant in charge of the probation class, who is a most capable officer, is quite competent to judge as to the fitness for police work of any candidate passing through his hands; and there is, in addition, the fact that the inquiring sergeant or constable, who has previously seen and measured the candidate, can testify as to his suitability for police work. Some Inspectors expect too much from young constables. They apparently think they should be model policemen when first appointed. It must be borne in mind that in no case has the present system of inquiry failed. True, one case has been brought to light in which the employer did not disclose as he ought to have done the true conduct of a candidate to the inquiring

sergeant, but that did not reflect on the sergeant but on the employer. An occurrence of this kind may sometimes take place, and cannot well be prevented. Had the sergeant known that a defaulter's sheet was kept by the employer concerned, he would have obtained and submitted a copy of it. It has also been suggested that applicants should be called upon to make a sworn declaration as to their previous character prior to selection. I am averse to this, and consider we already go quite far enough in testing the conduct of applicants, believing there are many of the would-be candidates who refrain from forwarding applications owing to the minute details already required. It is impracticable to always employ sergeants to carry out such inquiries, but I am confident that full reliance can be placed in the reports of experienced constables who are detailed for this work. Under all circumstances, I cannot recommend any change in the system now obtaining. As regards the standard of education required for admission into the Police Force, I cannot recommend any alteration.

Probation.

The term during which recruits are kept on probation in the training depot is at present two months. The following are the subjects dealt with by the instructor, who holds the rank of sergeant, and who is a most capable officer:—

Physical.—Infantry squad drill; extension motions (military style); dumb-bell exercise (Sandow's method).

Instruction in Police Duties and the Law relating thereto.—(1.) A careful study of the Police Force Act and the Police Regulations, with a full explanation of each regulation, and the manner in which the duties under them should be performed. (2.) A study of the criminal law with which the police are directly concerned, including: (a) The Police Offences Act throughout, touching on the more important offences found under by-laws but not found in Part I of this Act; (b) the Crimes Act, principally offences thereunder; (c) the Justices of the Peace Act—Summary procedure, issue, service, and execution of summonses and warrants, indictable offences triable summarily, juvenile offenders and the duties of police when they come into custody; (d) the Licensing Act—offences thereunder, the manner of detecting them and enforcing the law generally; (e) a few sections under which duties devolve on the police, in such Acts as the Second-hand Dealers Act, Lunatics Act, Coroners Act, Industrial School Act, &c. (3.) The law of evidence and the Evidence Act—such points only as a constable should be acquainted with. (4.) The constant writing of reports on different subjects, and the method of filling in some of the commoner police forms, including how to make out a subpoena for a witness and fill in affidavit of service. (5.) Attendance at Court occasionally, and, if time permits, sending probationers out a few times with a constable on beat. (6.) The St. John's Ambulance Association's course of first aid to the injured. Probationers also have to undergo a police examination when first taken on, and also before leaving the training depot, and those who are considered unsuitable or unqualified for police work are discharged.

Experience has proved that the period of probation is somewhat limited, and, in consequence, in April last I made a recommendation suggesting that the term of probation should be extended to three months, and to include in the course of instruction rifle drill and shooting-practice. Some little difficulty may be experienced in accommodating the men if the time of probation is extended, but I think arrangements could be made which will enable an increased period of probation being satisfactorily carried out. It has been suggested that the men, after leaving the training depot and being appointed constables, should still remain on probation for six or twelve months. I do not favour such a suggestion, because the regulations provide that constables can be dismissed at any time from the service if found remiss or negligent in the execution of their duties. Further, the men on appointment must be sworn in, and if they misconduct themselves it is immaterial whether they are called probationers or constables—the same discredit is brought on the service. No difficulty exists in discharging constables with short service if they are reported on as being useless to the service. I cannot therefore recommend the suggested additional probation.

Appointment of Constables.

Having satisfactorily passed the probation class, all the probationers are posted to city districts, in order that they may be trained in practical police work, and continue their technical instruction by attending the city weekly police classes for at least twelve months after appointment. Married men are sent to country districts by seniority when vacancies occur, as also are single men. At most stations there is accommodation for one or two single men, and it is important to have them living on the premises, as their services are frequently required in cases of emergency. This system has worked well, and has given general satisfaction. If the junior men were sent out prior to the senior, dissatisfaction and trouble would result. I cannot, therefore, recommend a change in the present system. It has been suggested that recruits should be posted direct to out-stations, but this suggestion is impracticable, and cannot, in my opinion, be adopted with advantage to the Force.

Charge of Stations.

Great care has to be exercised in selecting men for charge of stations; and district Inspectors are therefore annually asked to recommend men whom they consider competent to fill such positions, showing whether they are fit to act as Clerks of Court, or fit for mounted duty. Selections are made from those recommended, due regard being given to seniority and qualifications. The question of emoluments in addition to the ordinary police pay is also a factor which is not lost sight of in allotting stations. If qualifications are equal, seniority obtains. Occasionally the Inspectors recommend certain changes in their own districts, which are given due consideration; but, in fairness to members of the service as a whole, all the recommendations from the various districts must be taken into consideration. If we were to confine the appointments in each district to the

men serving in that district only, great injustice would inevitably often result. The men in charge of stations are, on the whole, well satisfied, and very little trouble indeed results from the careful manner in which stations are allotted.

It has been suggested that men should be ordered to any station where it is thought fit to send them, and that they should have no option. The compulsory system obtains in all cases in which the interests of the service are at stake, or when a transfer is ordered for misconduct. But there are instances in which it is entirely immaterial which one of a number of sergeants or constables is selected for a particular station. In such instances consideration is given to the representations of the men who may from health or family reasons decline a transfer to certain districts; but in no case is an unsuitable man placed in charge of any station.

I do not consider it advisable to interfere with the present method of allowing police officers to receive additional pay for extra work done for other departments. The amounts they receive do not average very much per annum; and when the saving of expenditure to other departments and to the Dominion as a whole is considered, it will, I am sure, be admitted generally that the present arrangement is a convenient one and should not be disturbed.

Station or Senior Sergeants.

The appointment of a station sergeant, and the increasing of the number of ordinary sergeants in each of the four cities in March, 1906, resulted in improved supervision and increased efficiency. I now propose to designate the station sergeants "senior sergeants," and to increase the number by placing a senior sergeant in charge of each of the most important out-stations, which position is now held by an ordinary sergeant. Vacancies in the commissioned rank will in future be filled from amongst the senior sergeants or Chief Detectives. Thus the field of selection will be widened.

Detectives.

All detectives are recruited from the uniform branch of the service. The district Inspectors recommend annually those men they consider best fitted for plain-clothes duty, and selections are made to fill the vacancies in the branch from those recommended. The men are first appointed on three months' probation, and if they give satisfaction in the performance of their duties they are permanently appointed acting-detectives. As vacancies occur in the detective rank, the positions are filled by selection from the acting-detectives. The appointment of Chief Detective is made from the detective staff. The officer who by seniority and merit is considered best qualified for the position is appointed. The relations between the detective and the uniform branch are most satisfactory—the two branches working harmoniously together. I consider the detective staff a very efficient body of men. In making promotions to commissioned rank the claims of the detectives are considered with other members of the service.

It has been suggested that the Chief Detectives should rank as Sub-Inspectors. I cannot approve of the suggestion, as it is necessary that before a Chief Detective attains the rank of Inspector he should first hold the rank of Sub-Inspector in the uniform branch, and thus qualify for further promotion in that branch. The detective branch is too small at present to introduce grades.

District and Assistant Clerks.

District and assistant clerks are appointed from the uniform branch on the recommendations of the Inspectors. They are selected because of their special qualifications and fitness for clerical work. A plain-clothes allowance of 1s. per day is granted to them in lieu of uniform. District Inspectors recommend annually all men with over ten years' service whom they consider qualified for promotion to the rank of sergeant, including district clerks. The position of a district clerk is one which most undoubtedly must be held by an officer holding the rank of sergeant, because in the absence of the sergeant in charge of the men in the smaller districts the district clerk acts for him, and in city districts he has a number of assistants to instruct and control. As regards further promotion to the higher ranks, which is carried out by merit and seniority combined, district clerks' claims are considered with those of the other branches of the service. A clerical training is a very important one, and is a necessary qualification for those holding the higher ranks in the service. Financially speaking, district clerks are not so well off as the ordinary constable who gets charge of a station after five years' service; and were it not for the chance of early promotion a difficulty might arise in securing suitable clerks. Assistant clerks in district offices have an equal opportunity with constables doing ordinary beat duty in obtaining appointments to charge of stations, and frequent applications are made by them for such appointments (see Exhibit No. 4).

Headquarters Staff.

It has been suggested that the clerical staff at Headquarters should be civilians. Such a suggestion as this cannot have emanated from any one of experience or knowledge of the position. From my experience of both civilian and police clerks, I can speak with some authority on the subject, and I unhesitatingly aver that if efficiency and the interests of the service are to be considered, no change whatsoever should be made in the present well-qualified, police-trained, and most efficient staff. Police experience is of great value to the Headquarters staff, and assists them in carrying out what may be termed the purely professional duties of the Department. A certain amount of legal knowledge of police matters generally is also requisite. As regards promotion in the staff, no grounds whatever exist for complaint. On the contrary, such promotions in the clerical staff remove specially qualified men from competition with the uniform men, and create additional posts, thus making the Force more attractive. No strict rule can obtain in dealing

with the clerical staff, or, in fact, with any of the police branches of the service if efficiency is desired. To place the right man in the right place is the secret of successful administration. If any hard-and-fast rule were introduced in respect to clerical appointments, detective appointments, or promotions, the efficiency of the Force would be impaired, and more dissatisfaction amongst the members of the service would result.

The question of the Chief Clerk signing routine documents on my behalf in my absence has been raised. Chief Clerks in all departments have to act in a similar capacity in the absence of the head of their department. No objection has ever been taken in respect to documents so signed by my Chief Clerk, and I have always found that the files have received careful and proper attention. He has carefully observed the line to be drawn in respect to documents and cases which should be personally dealt with by me. When the Chief Clerk in my office was a civilian complaints were received in respect to minutes he placed on the files, and the district Inspectors did not consider a Civil servant capable of minuting correspondence to them on police matters.

I am afraid that the Inspector at Auckland, in disparagingly referring to the Headquarters staff, allowed his personal animus to overcome his better judgment. His relations with the Chief Magistrate and Police Surgeon of his district tend to confirm this.

Special Positions.

There are three special appointments in the police service which are held by sergeants—namely, the instructor in charge of the probation class, the editor of the *Police Gazette*, and the police storekeeper. These sergeants are specially selected and qualified for the responsible and particular kind of work which has to be performed. Their rank as sergeant is warranted because of the responsible nature of their duties, which bring them into constant contact with the men. Their promotion does not in any way interfere with the ordinary promotions in the uniform branch.

Finger-prints.

Some suggestions have been made in respect to the extension of the finger-print system of identification by opening a bureau in each of the four cities. To any one having a knowledge of the system, this suggestion is absurd, and cannot be entertained. It has been found necessary, however, to specially instruct those officers in centres who photograph prisoners in the art of securing photographs of finger-prints, and arrangements have been made accordingly. This branch of the service has proved invaluable to the Police Force, both in the detection of crime and the identification of criminals; and the two finger-print experts have carried out their duties in a most careful and creditable manner.

General Supervision.

Considering the difficulties existing in properly supervising a body of eight hundred men scattered over an extensive country like New Zealand, I am satisfied that no fault can be found with the present system of supervision, which is strict and in every way satisfactory. The Inspector at Auckland has suggested the division of the Dominion into four districts, and the appointment of Superintendents in charge of each district; and the abolition of four districts (Thames, Napier, Greymouth, and Invercargill) by transferring the Inspectors in charge of those places to city districts, and replacing them by Sub-Inspectors. I had already thought out a scheme of this description, but failed to find how the supervision could be improved or the expenditure lessened. The expenditure would certainly be increased if the suggested change were adopted. The present system works remarkably well, and should not be altered. The district Inspectors are all able, trustworthy, most reliable, and efficient officers, who take great interest in the service and the supervision of their districts. The pay of the city district Inspectors was increased in 1905, and a recommendation was made by me that they should be designated Superintendents because of the importance of their positions and additional responsibilities to those of the other district Inspectors. The Sub-Inspectors and station sergeants in the centres, who are about the hardest worked officers of the Force, could then be advanced to the rank of Inspector and Sub-Inspector respectively. I am still in favour of this arrangement.

The suggestion that small districts cannot be properly supervised is unworthy of consideration, as the very reverse is the fact. As the Auckland District is an exceptionally extensive one, and the district Inspector has testified to the long hours he is engaged daily in carrying out his onerous duties, I suggest that my original recommendation to annex a portion of that district to the Thames Police District (which is a small one) should be carried out—namely, that part of Auckland District from Hamilton southwards should be attached to the Thames. A portion of the Christchurch District from Waitaki River southwards might with advantage be added to the Dunedin District. These are the only alterations in districts that I can at present recommend.

Promotions.

The system governing promotions in the police service is based on efficiency. District Inspectors recommend annually those men they consider most suitable for promotion, care being taken, in the interests of the service, to select only those who are best qualified, or, in other words, have evinced superior intelligence, promptitude, zeal, and efficiency in the discharge of their duties. Selections for promotion are made by me from the district Inspectors' recommendations. The present rule, although not absolute, is to select from those with over ten years' service, and who are under fifty years of age; and thus far there has been no difficulty whatever in securing suitable men for promotion. Special appointments, such as those of probation instructor, editor of *Police Gazette*, and police storekeeper, are specially dealt with, as it is important to secure men who are in every way qualified to fill those positions, and to have the work systematically and competently performed.

All promotions to non-commissioned rank are practically made by me, although it has been the invariable rule to obtain Ministerial sanction to my selections. As regards promotions to commissioned rank, I recommend those I consider most capable, and the Minister makes the appointment. I cannot too strongly emphasize this: that no hard-and-fast rule can be adopted in the matter of promotions. Merit and efficiency must be the sole consideration, due regard being had to seniority when the conditions are otherwise equal.

As regards suggested compulsory promotions, I may say that during the last six years no constable that I considered specially qualified for promotion has refused it when offered. One or two constables applied for promotion to the rank of sergeant in charge of an out-station, but their applications were refused, and they were told that if promoted they would have to be transferred to a city district, and would be placed in charge of an out-station by seniority. In consequence they withdrew their applications. Since the Pension Fund was inaugurated constables have been more anxious to get promotion than previously, in view of securing increased pensions. I do not believe that any constable who possesses the necessary qualifications for promotion will refuse it if offered under present conditions.

It has been found that some constables on receiving promotion were not medically fit to efficiently perform the duties required of them as section sergeants in city districts. In view of this it might be well to have all constables who are recommended for promotion medically examined by the police surgeon to ascertain their physical fitness for the post. Sergeants are practically the backbone of the service, and it is therefore of the utmost importance, in order to insure efficiency, to have only young, active, and intelligent men appointed to that rank. No complaint whatsoever has been made by officers detrimental to the qualifications of the present staff of sergeants, who have been carefully selected from the best qualified constables with over ten years' service.

Complaints of having been overlooked in the matter of promotion are very few indeed, and, as far as the evidence goes, there is only one instance in which the slightest suggestion can be made of delay in promoting a constable. In this case the district Inspector placed the constable's name on the list of those recommended for promotion, with the following remarks: "Well conducted, of average ability, not active." And my predecessor's remarks in respect to the same constable's qualifications were: "An average constable, fit for quiet station only." In the face of these remarks, I could scarcely be expected to promote the constable in question, as my own knowledge of him was limited. The other complaints are cases in which the constables are either unsuitable or too old to be promoted.

Examinations.

I am strongly of opinion that it is of the utmost importance that there should be a police regulation providing for a compulsory police examination prior to promotion to the rank of sergeant; the subjects of such examination to consist of reports in respect to police duties and the law pertaining to police work; that the examinations should be set and reported on by some one outside the Police Department, such as a Magistrate or solicitor of the Supreme Court. The selection of some one outside the Force to conduct the examinations would remove any suspicion of favouritism. The present annual examinations are not compulsory, but were instituted with the view of inducing the men to become thoroughly conversant with their duties, to improve their knowledge of the various police Acts, and the system of reporting on police matters generally. Thus far I am satisfied that the institution of these examinations has had the undoubted effect of improving the efficiency of the Force. I know of no other Police Force in which the men have such facilities for improvement and for increasing their knowledge.

Although there are some strong arguments which could be put forward in favour of examinations for commissioned rank, I am of opinion, after giving the matter careful consideration, that it is hardly necessary to disturb the present system of advancement by merit, giving seniority preference if the candidates are otherwise equal. In the performance of practical police work the special fitness of officers for promotion to commissioned rank becomes apparent to their superiors, and this affords a better guide as to the particular qualifications required for commissioned rank than would be shown by a mere competitive examination.

Pay and Allowances.

A considerable amount of evidence has been given in support of a general increase of pay and lodging-allowance to members of the Force. In March last recommendations were made in respect to both these subjects. I attach to my statement for your information an estimate of the cost (Exhibit No. 5). The period when married constables are most in need of extra pay or allowances is during the first five years of their service, and prior to their appointment to charge of a station.

As regards minor matters brought up during the Commission, such as free uniform, railway concessions, rubber gloves, lamps, saloon passages, boots, &c., the representations made will receive due consideration.

Misconduct.

All members of the Police Force who have been reported for misconduct or breach of Police Regulations have been strictly dealt with, perhaps in a more severe manner than obtains in other Police Forces; and no complaints have been made in respect to my decisions. Very few men escape being reported for misconduct, because of the strict supervision now maintained.

Annual Leave.

Twelve days' annual leave of absence is granted to members of the New Zealand Police Force, and the leave is allowed to accumulate for three years—to thirty-six days. A Sunday or week-day's leave is allowed as duties permit, and an occasional day's leave on application under special

circumstances. I recommend that the annual leave to members with over five years' service be extended to fourteen days, and be allowed to accumulate as heretofore. A return of the leave granted to members of other Police Forces in Australasia is attached for your information (Exhibit No. 6).

General.

It has been suggested that my Chief Clerk uses undue influence with me in dealing with police matters generally. I simply reply that there is not an atom of truth in the suggestion; but I am not at all surprised at this or any other such unfounded suggestion emanating from the source this did. I desire to point out that although the member for Newtown (Mr. Wright) attended the Commission, and displayed a marked hostility to myself personally and to the Police Force generally, the result of the inquiries which emanated from him has only demonstrated that he has throughout acted upon baseless and unreliable information.

Improvements in Force effected by me.

On my arrival in New Zealand to take up my new duties I first made myself acquainted with the general organization of the Force and the work of the Department. This naturally took some time. Having done this, I turned my attention to the task of effecting improvements to the service, and my previous varied experience of the administration of Police Forces in other countries enabled me to make certain alterations and changes which I can say with confidence have considerably increased the efficiency of the Force. I first developed—and, indeed, practically established—the finger-print branch of the service, which has proved invaluable to the Police Department in the detection and identification of criminals. By the system in force of exchanging finger-prints with other Police Departments, criminals can be traced and identified no matter what name they assume and false information they may give as to their identity. Many striking instances of this have recently occurred in New Zealand, and must be fresh in the minds of all. Numerous criminals would have escaped punishment if it had not been for the existence of this important method of detecting and identifying offenders. The success of this branch has been most gratifying, and ample testimony of its value has been given by Magistrates and Judges of the Supreme Court. A great number of serious crimes have been detected entirely as the result of the system, the perpetrators of which crimes would otherwise have escaped punishment. I next turned my attention to revising and improving the *Police Gazette*. This publication was deficient in many respects, and was only published fortnightly, whereas it is now issued weekly, and will compare most favourably with similar publications issued by other Forces. Photographs of noted criminals in other countries, as well as those in New Zealand, are now reproduced in the *Gazette*, and distributed to every police station in the Dominion. My next step was to introduce a system of compulsory attendance of young constables at weekly police instruction classes in the four cities. The instruction imparted at these classes has been most beneficial, and, taken in conjunction with their practical experience under vigilant supervision, prepares them for the more important work which devolves upon constables taking charge of stations. I next established a system of monthly drill in the four centres, which has had the effect of improving the appearance and bearing of the men. Prior to my appointment, the senior detective in each city was designated Chief Detective, and held that position by seniority alone. On my recommendation, the rank of Chief Detective was created, carrying with it additional pay and responsibility; and merit became a factor in the selection of the men for this important post. It was evident to me that seniority alone, apart from the question of fitness, had not in the past resulted satisfactorily. On my recommendation, the Minister in charge of the Department granted increases in the lodging-allowances of the men, and a general increase of pay was authorised by the Government; and thus some anomalies that formerly existed in the remuneration of the members of the service were rectified. The scale of pay was entirely revised, with a more just treatment of the various ranks. There are still a few anomalies with regard to remuneration which will require attention. It is my intention to have the Police Regulations thoroughly revised, and this important work is now being carried out.

In addition to the above, numerous minor improvements have been made.

I cannot conclude my evidence without directing attention to the methods resorted to by some people in seeking departmental and other information with the object of casting reflections on the Department. It is evident that no stone has been left unturned to direct the attention of the Commission to every little suspicious occurrence in the Force for years back. Numerous files have thus been brought out and scrutinised; but I am satisfied they require no comment from me, as they speak for themselves. Deplorable action of this nature, and exaggerated and groundless allegations, are not calculated to improve the efficiency of the Force.

1. *The Commissioner.*] In regard to your reference to Inspector Cullen's evidence relative to the Headquarters staff, I do not see the connection between his opinions of the Headquarters staff and his relations with the Police Surgeon and the Magistrate. What do you wish me to infer?—If he once takes a dislike to any one, he carries the feeling to a degree.

2. He is vindictive?—To an extent, yes.

3. Would that not rather render his capacity less for controlling a large district, such as Auckland? Have you ever considered that aspect of the matter?—I certainly have.

4. With what result?—It is not satisfactory, to say the least of it.

5. Do you not think it was your duty to take some steps to prevent a man whom you describe as being vindictive from having the control and oversight over a large body of men?—No; in nearly all respects he is a most thorough and efficient officer, but he has this one little failing.

6. But the practical effect of your statement with regard to Inspector Cullen's evidence in reference to the Headquarters staff is that his evidence on that point is unreliable and untrue, and actuated by malice?—To a degree, it is.

7. If that is your opinion I should question very much his suitability for continuance in the position he now holds?—It does not affect the efficiency of the Force; he is a most strict and capable officer.

8. Do you think an unreliable man is suitable for the position of Inspector?—He is not unreliable in other directions, but he does bear malice very often.

9. Do you not see that must affect the efficiency of the Force, inasmuch as you rely on his recommendations in the matter of promotion; and if he allows himself to be actuated by animosity in the matter of the Headquarters staff he might do so in the matter of the constables he recommends for promotion?—I have always found the men he has recommended most capable men; it is only the best men he recommends. All those he places in charge of stations are well selected.

10. He must be a many-sided man?—I do not know how many sides he has; he has this one failing; we all have our failings.

11. I should call that a very big one?—It does not affect the efficiency of the Force.

12. You raised the question of Constable Leahy. His case is one that has attracted more attention than that of any other constable, because a number of witnesses have voluntarily come forward in all parts of the Dominion and testified to his capability, in view of the fact that they had seen his name mentioned. Why was he passed over?—In the first instance, his recommendation was not particularly strong.

13. His recommendation by whom?—The district Inspector at Christchurch.

14. Is that the only recommendation he ever received from the present Inspectors of Police?—I think there may have been a similar one the year before or after.

15. He has thirty years' service?—Yes.

16. Is there anything else besides what you would term a not quite satisfactory recommendation from an Inspector that influenced you in overlooking him?—My predecessor, who was here for six years, should have had some knowledge of the man, and he apparently held the opinion that he was only fit to hold a quiet station.

17. Have you allowed yourself, in dealing out promotion, to be influenced by your predecessor?—I take his opinion with those of the Inspectors and my own.

18. I am going to read a letter I received this morning from Constable Leahy, because it has a bearing on this aspect of the matter, and in justice to him I think I ought to read it. It is as follows: "Police-station, Oxford, 1st October, 1909.—H. W. Bishop, Esq., Police Commission, Wellington. —SIR,—Referring to the statement made in Christchurch that Commissioner Tunbridge had left a memo. that I was an average constable, fit for a quiet station, I would respectfully state that Mr. Tunbridge never inspected my station during his term of office, and, as far as I am aware, never spoke to me in his life except to ask me on a crowded platform in Christchurch where the Traffic Manager's office was. The statement took me so much by surprise that I was unable to reply at the time. I hope I am in order in writing to you on the matter, and if an opportunity should occur, I am prepared to substantiate what I say on oath.—I have, &c., W. LEAHY, Constable."?—I presume the Commissioner got his information from the Inspector and the sergeant supervising him.

19. Have you allowed yourself to be influenced in other respects by the late Commissioner's memos. to you?—I always take a general view of matters—my Inspectors' recommendation, my own knowledge, and any information the late Commissioner left behind him.

20. How often have you seen him?—I think on one occasion—perhaps twice.

21. You are aware, I suppose, that the recommendation of Inspector Gillies of this constable did not vary much in terms from his recommendation of others you have promoted?—That might be so.

22. You would simply say you had not sufficient personal knowledge of the man to enable you to form a judgment as to his capabilities?—Yes; and the recommendation was not such as to justify me in putting him forward. I might have thought I had better men to put forward. I should think he would make a fair sergeant; but I think if I were in charge of a station, and thought I had been overlooked, I would not sit idle; I would want to know something.

23. Who recommended this man whose name I hand to you?—It was one of my own appointments. I have made two, I think, during my term; in fact, three, because Sergeant Mathieson was one.

24. After you promoted him, what happened?—He got into trouble in Dunedin, and was promptly reduced.

25. He is now reduced?—Yes.

26. May I take it, then, that you have in certain instances exercised your own individual judgment in regard to men?—On these three occasions. I think those are the only ones.

27. Had you any special reasons in these cases?—I judged from what I saw of the men and the work they submitted.

28. What had you seen of this man before you promoted him?—I had not seen very much of him.

29. Who gave you information as to his qualifications?—I obtained it partly from my predecessor's report. The list he left behind was of the most important advantage to me, and all the men he spoke well of turned out the very best men. This one has not; but he is a good enough sergeant.

30. What did he say of this man?—"A good intelligent constable, and will make a good sergeant."

31. That influenced you mainly, I take it, as you had no personal knowledge of him?—To a great extent. I inquired of Inspector Cullen, and he did not say anything against him; he did not recommend him.

32. You know Inspector Cullen stated on oath he refused to recommend him?—He did not say anything against him.

33. I understand the Minister approves the appointment of sergeants?—Yes.
34. Has it always been so?—Yes.
35. It has obtained previously?—Yes.
36. Do you think it is desirable?—I think it would be better without.
37. The Commissioner ought to have absolute power?—Yes; the Minister does not know anything about the qualifications of the men.
38. Have your recommendations ever been set at nought in connection with sergeants?—No.
39. Do you always recommend the promotion of Sub-Inspectors as well?—Yes.
40. I may assume you recommended that latest—that of Mr. McGrath?—Yes.
41. You always recommend Inspectors?—Yes.
42. Did you recommend the promotion of the last one—Inspector Dwyer—and his transfer to Napier?—Yes.
43. You will not lose sight of the fact that the seniority as between Sub-Inspector McGrath and Sub-Inspector Hendrey has to be put right, because that should be done?—Yes.
44. Do your recommendations and your papers and matters in connection with the Minister go direct to him, or pass through any one else?—Since our Department has been amalgamated with the Justice Department I have to send all files through that Department.
45. You have no direct access to the Minister as the head of your Department?—I can see him at any time on police matters.
46. What is the advantage of passing these matters through the Under-Secretary for Justice?—It is not for me to say.
47. Can you suggest any?—None whatever. There is a great and serious delay in getting letters answered and matters attended to generally. It is simply a matter of form.
48. Do you know whether there was anything that actuated the new departure?—I have not the least idea.
49. Did you take exception to it?—Well, I did; but it was a Cabinet order, and had to be complied with.
50. In regard to the finger-print department, was it in existence when you came here?—There was something like a finger-print system.
51. There was a special officer in charge?—With a little knowledge of the old system only.
52. Your labours have been making it more valuable and reliable?—Undoubtedly.
53. You say practically it was useless as an adjunct to the Department when you came?—It was. I might tell you the party that was here ordered cabinets that could not be got into any building.
54. He was an officer of the Prisons Department?—Yes.
55. Did you recommend its removal from the Prisons to the Police Department?—The Minister spoke to me about it, knowing I knew something about it, and wanted me to take it over. He had been troubled continually with this man, and did not know what to do.
56. Had you studied the system before coming here?—Yes.
57. Did the present expert obtain his knowledge at Home?—Yes.
58. And has developed it since?—Yes.
59. He has a thorough knowledge of photography, and so on?—There is no question about it.
60. The finger-print system as it exists is as reasonably efficient as it is possible to make it?—I do not think you would find a system as complete anywhere.
61. Is every facility afforded you for making it in any way more complete if necessary?—I should like more room.
62. Have you pointed out the necessity for that?—I have applied for years for another room, but I cannot get it.
63. Do you think the weekly issue of the *Gazette* is necessary and valuable?—Yes; it saves sending information from one district to another.
64. Does it justify the cost?—Undoubtedly.
65. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Were all the questions I asked baseless?—Pretty well.
66. Was there truth in any of them?—Not that I am aware of.
67. Are you aware that five hotels were selling in Newtown without licenses? Was that baseless?
- The Commissioner:* I thought we understood that was dealt with politically.
68. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] The Inspector said he was prevented from taking action. My question now is, who prevented him?—I cannot tell you.
69. *The Commissioner.*] It must have been some one superior to the Commissioner of Police?—The question was in superior hands than mine.
70. From reports received by you as Commissioner of Police, had you reason to believe they were selling without licenses?—From what I heard, I had reason to believe they were selling.
- The Commissioner:* He was evidently prohibited by his political head—as a matter of policy.
- Mr. Wright, M.P.:* I am not blaming the Commissioner for that.
- The Commissioner:* It is a question if he would have felt justified in overriding that.
71. *Mr. Wright, M.P. (to witness).*] Referring to Sergeant Mathieson's removal to Newtown, was it because letters appeared in the Invercargill papers?—He was removed in the interests of the service.
72. *The Commissioner.*] You yourself stated that there were certain allegations in respect to certain letters in the local papers?—Yes.
73. Had they anything to do with the transfer of Sergeant Mathieson?—From what was asked in the House, the deputations down South, and some reliable representations, I considered it my duty to transfer him, to put a stop to a certain conspiracy.
74. Then, you believed him to have had something to do with that conspiracy?—Undoubtedly.

75. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Did letters appear in Invercargill papers?—In Dunedin papers.

76. Then, you think he wrote from Invercargill to Dunedin?—I am not insinuating anything.

The Commissioner: The sergeant has stated on oath that he has no knowledge of the letters.

77. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] The only thing is he said certain letters appeared in the Invercargill papers. Is there any rule in the Force or regulation to the effect that no officer should be transferred where his friends are engaged in the liquor traffic?—I am not quite sure about that.

The Commissioner: It not only applies to the liquor traffic, but to any relationship if he has a number of relatives where he is to be transferred.

Witness: If he has relatives in a particular place we do not send a constable there, as a rule.

78. *Mr. Wright, M.P.* (to witness).] Is there any particular regulation in regard to the liquor traffic?—I do not think so.

79. I have here a statement by the Hon. Mr. McGowan that, as a rule, no policeman is stationed where he has got a relation in the liquor traffic: do you say his statement is wrong?—I am not quite sure; I would want to see the regulation first.

The Commissioner: It will be sufficient that no man is ever transferred where his relations are concerned in business. Even if not an absolute rule, it is *lex non scripta*.

80. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] Is it not a fact that there is a prominent police officer whose relations are concerned in the liquor traffic?

The Commissioner: Give me his name, please.

The Witness: I am not aware of it.

81. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] I presume you were acquainted with the administration in the Head Office? You were aware that the usual parliamentary documents show that during the time it was a civilian staff the total salaries for the years 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1897 averaged £1,395, but that in 1908 it went up to £2,919, or an increase of £1,664 over the previous expenditure?—I think that is easily explained; they were put under the ordinary staff one time, and it was all included in the one vote; they are separate now.

82. Then there is no actual increase?—No.

The Commissioner: I am having all the figures embodied in my report.

83. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] You say you prefer the present system?—I think it adds to the efficiency of the Force.

84. Is it not a fact that the system of civilian clerks worked better?—I do not believe so; secrecy is absolutely necessary.

The Commissioner: I am going to deal with that in my report, and on quite different lines to those Mr. Dinnie has taken.

85. *Mr. Wright, M.P.*] In regard to the appointment of Chief Detective McIlveney, he travels all over the Dominion?—He is employed by me, and sent wherever I wish him to make special inquiries.

86. Mostly in regard to the Post and Telegraph Departments. Does he get extra allowances?—No, he does not get much.

87. Do you consider that fair treatment was meted out to Detective Cassells?—The files can be seen by the Commissioner.

The Commissioner: It was in connection with the transfer—with an alleged political interference—between Detective Cassells and the detective at Palmerston North. It was alleged that political influence had been used. In the files I found a full and complete reference to a dispute between Detective Cassells and the Department with regard to certain rewards he thought he ought to obtain in connection with certain housebreaking affairs.

Mr. Wright, M.P.: You have gone into that.

The Commissioner: I cannot deal with it.

88. *Mr. Skerrett, K.C.*] With regard to the Newtown Licensing District, the circumstances at the time were somewhat exceptional, were they not?—They were.

89. The licensing poll had been set aside on a petition, and the Licensing Committee, by a majority, held that it had no power to grant licenses. That was afterwards reversed by the Privy Council and the licenses were issued?—They were.

90. You do not desire to impugn Inspector Cullen's competency or his efficiency as an Inspector?—On the contrary, he is one of the best officers I have. There is feeling between himself and my Chief Clerk, and that is the whole cause of the trouble.

This concluded the evidence, and the Commissioner intimated that his report would be forwarded to His Excellency in due course.

EXHIBITS.

EXHIBIT No. 1.

Name in full :

No. .

[New Zealand.]

APPLICATION FOR A SITUATION IN THE POLICE SERVICE.

QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED.

CANDIDATES must submit a certificate, or other satisfactory evidence, that they have passed the Fifth Standard examination prescribed under "The Education Act, 1908," or some other examination of at least equal grade.

They must be of unexceptional moral character, of which satisfactory testimonials will be required.

They must possess activity, intelligence, and good temper.

They must not be less than twenty-one and not more than thirty years of age.

They must be not less than 5 ft. 9 in. in height, of good physique, and of a normal chest-measurement of not less than 38 in.

All applicants must be in good health, free from any bodily complaint, of sound constitution, and have been successfully vaccinated.

Candidates, before appointment to the probationary class, will have to undergo a medical examination by a duly qualified medical practitioner named by the Department in order to ascertain whether they have health and strength to undertake the duties of a police constable. If selected, they will be drafted to a training depot in Wellington, and, before being appointed police constables, will have to undergo a further departmental examination as to their probable fitness to properly fulfil the duties required of them. Should it be found that they lack the necessary qualifications, they will be discharged from the depot without being appointed. Men who have previously served in the New Zealand or any other Police Force may, at the discretion of the Commissioner, be enrolled in the service and exempted from the depot training if not more than forty years of age.

While in the probationary class the rate of pay will be 6s. per diem, and when appointed to constable 7s. 6d. per diem, advancing 6d. per diem every four years up to 9s. 6d. per diem, less contributions to Police Provident Fund.

Married men, if not provided with free quarters, will receive 1s. per diem as lodging-allowance.

Applications will not be entertained unless they are accompanied by—

- (1.) Certificate of birth or other satisfactory proof of age.
- (2.) Education certificate as above defined. (If applicant has not passed the Fifth Standard he must be examined by the headmaster of some Government school, and submit certificate from him that he is qualified to pass that standard.)
- (3.) Original testimonials, and copies thereof. (The originals will be returned to the candidate.)

[This Form is to be filled up by the Candidate himself.]

[NOTE.—Should any of the particulars furnished in answer to the undermentioned queries be found to be false, within the knowledge of the candidate, his nomination will be cancelled; or, should he have been admitted to office, he will be dismissed. The wilful suppression of any material fact will be similarly punished.]

1. Christian name and surname (in full):
2. Date of application:
3. Residence or address:
4. Situation applied for:
5. Day and year of birth:
6. Place of birth:
7. Age (last birthday):
8. Schools. (Mention school or schools at which you were educated, stating whether public, private, collegiate, national, British, &c.):
9. Height (without shoes):
10. Weight: stones pounds.
11. Chest-measurement (full expansion): inches.
12. Religion:
13. If vaccinated:
14. Trade or occupation:
15. Present or last employment:
16. If ever in the public service. (Give particulars, as number of regiment, names of ships, &c.).
17. Particulars of service:
18. Number of good-conduct stripes, &c.:
19. If receiving any pension, amount:
20. Single or married:
21. Number of children:
22. Ages and sexes of children:
23. How soon ready for proposed duties:
24. Are you free from pecuniary embarrassment?
25. Signature of candidate;

FULL STATEMENT OF PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONS.

[The following particulars are to be filled in by candidates in respect to every situation they have held. If there has been any interval between one situation and another, applicant must state what he was doing in the interval. Such information can be written across the form between the situations where the interval occurred.]

Name, Address, and Business of Employer.	Positions held by you since leaving School.	Length of Stay, giving Dates.		Cause of Leaving.
		From	To	

EXHIBIT No. 2.

Joined.	Age.	Previous Occupations.			Inquiry made by.	Character.
		Where and how employed.	From	To		

No. 1387.—Dismissed for disorderly conduct, 2nd June, 1909.

Nov. 27, 1907	26	London; basketmaking ..	1893 ..	1900 ..	Discharges (produced)	Good.
		West Surrey Regiment; soldier ..	Jan., 1900	Sept., 1901		
		London; Metropolitan Police ..	Oct., 1901	Mar., 1903		
		Cape Colony; police ..	June, 1903	May, 1905		
		De Beers Mines, South Africa; guard	May, 1905	Sept., 1907		

No. 1287.—Dismissed for assault, 2nd June, 1909.

Nov. 1, 1906	24	Stratford; blacksmith's improver	Jan., 1895	June, 1897	Constable Ryan, No. 100	Good.
		Stratford; improver ..	June, 1897	July, 1899	Ditto ..	"
		" ..	July, 1899	Aug., 1900	" ..	"
		New Plymouth; builder's improver	Oct., 1900	Mar., 1901	Constable Wood, No. 903	"
		New Plymouth; improver ..	Mar., 1901	Mar., 1902	Ditto ..	"
		Stratford; improver ..	Mar., 1902	Dec., 1902	Constable Ryan, No. 100	"
		Wellington; carpenter ..	Dec., 1902	Mar., 1903	Constable Carmody, No. 979	"
		Christchurch; carpenter ..	Mar., 1903	July, 1904	Constable Gibson, No. 1030	"
		Railway Department, Christchurch; carpenter	July, 1904	Sept., 1906	Ditto ..	"

No. 1358.—Dismissed for assault, 2nd June, 1909.

Sept. 1, 1907	23	Auckland; assistant boy ..	Nov., 1897	Jan., 1898	Sergeant McPhee, No. 655	Good.
		" shop-boy ..	Feb., 1898	Mar., 1898	" ..	"
		" junior and Customs clerk	Mar., 1898	Dec., 1901	Sergeant McPhee, No. 655	Good.
		" junior clerk ..	Jan., 1902	July, 1902	Ditto ..	"
		" clerk ..	Oct., 1902	Nov., 1902	" ..	"
		" general hand ..	Dec., 1902	Feb., 1903	" ..	"
		" shipping clerk ..	Mar., 1903	Dec., 1904	" ..	"
		New Zealand Permanent Artillery	Aug., 1905	July, 1907	Sergeant Beattie, No. 538	"

No. 1436.—Called upon to resign for immorality, 24th May, 1909.

June 11, 1908	31	Bristol, England; butcher ..	Dec., 1894	May, 1900	First-class testimonials and discharge for service in South Africa and England	..
		Cape Town; grocer ..	June, 1900	May, 1901		
		Cape Railways; guard ..	May, 1901	Aug., 1902		
		Cape Police ..	Aug., 1902	Nov., 1902		
		London; agent ..	Mar., 1903	Dec., 1903	Constable McAnerin, No. 364	Good.
		Wellington and Manawatu Railway Company; porter	Mar., 1904	Oct., 1904		
		New Zealand Government Railways; porter	Oct., 1904	June, 1908	Ditto ..	"

No. 1338.—Voluntarily resigned, 28th February, 1909.

June 18, 1907	32	Leicester Regiment; soldier ..	1892 ..	1902 ..	Good discharges
		Birmingham, England; constable	1904 ..	1907 ..		

Joined.	Age.	Previous Occupations.			Inquiry made by.	Character.
		Where and how employed.	From	To		

No. 1418.

April 1, 1908	29	Hokitika; gold-mining ..	1890 ..	1897 ..	Sergeant Folley, No. 327	Good.
		Public Works, Otira; platelaying	1897 ..	1899 ..	Sergeant Hanson, No. 354	"
		Royal New Zealand Artillery; gunner	1899 ..	1907 ..	Constable Davidson, No. 1136	"
		Wellington Trams; conductor, and laying cables	Feb., 1907	Dec., 1907	Sergeant Rutledge, No. 489	"
		Wellington; labourer ..	Dec., 1907	Mar., 1908	Very good discharge.. Sergeant Murphy, No. 566	Good.
					Ditto ..	"

No. 1197.—Dismissed for having made false statement in his application for enrolment in the New Zealand Police Force, 25th January, 1906.

Oct. 30, 1905	25	Lanarkshire Police ..	Sept., 1898	Nov., 1900	Good discharge
		Hunterville, N.Z.; ploughman ..	1904 ..	1905 ..	Constable Gray, No. 510	Good.
					Constable McBride, No. 1196	
					Constable O'Connor, No. 1168	

No. 1168.—Called upon to resign for failing to report that Constable No. 1197 had been dismissed from the Glasgow Police, that fact being known to him, 26th January, 1906.

June 12, 1905	26	Glasgow Police ..	Sept., 1900	Jan., 1905	Good discharge
---------------	----	-------------------	-------------	------------	-------------------	----

No. 1169.—Called upon to resign for failing to report that Constable No. 1197 had been dismissed from the Glasgow Police, that fact being known to him, 26th January, 1906.

June 12, 1905	27	Glasgow Police ..	July, 1900	Jan., 1905	Good discharge
---------------	----	-------------------	------------	------------	-------------------	----

No. 1430.—Dismissed for having made false statements in his application for enrolment in the New Zealand Police Force, 20th June, 1908.

May 14, 1908	28	New South Wales; hospital wardman	Jan., 1899	Mar., 1900	Testimonials (good)
		Darlinghurst, N.S.W.; overseer	Mar., 1900	Feb., 1905		
		Port Stephens, N.S.W.; dredge hand	Mar., 1905	Dec., 1906		
		Darlinghurst, N.S.W.; overseer	Jan., 1907	Dec., 1907		

No. 1415.—Called upon to resign for refusing to render assistance to his comrades during the arrest of an offender, 13th April, 1909.

Mar. 30, 1908	25	Eden Valley, S.A.; gardening ..	Oct., 1895	Nov., 1900
		Mount Pleasant, S.A.; dairy-farming	Dec., 1900	Jan., 1902
		South Australian Eighth Continent	Feb., 1902	Aug., 1902
		Mount Pleasant, S.A.; dairy-farming	Sept., 1902	Dec., 1903
		Adelaide, S.A.; groom and gardener	Jan., 1904	Nov., 1904
		Angaston, S.A.; mill hand ..	Dec., 1904	Mar., 1905
		South Australian Police ..	Mar., 1905	Jan., 1908	Very good discharges	..

No. 1483.—Dismissed for drunkenness, 7th June, 1909.

Nov. 1, 1908	23	Christchurch; sheet-iron worker	Feb., 1899	Feb., 1908	Constable McCormack, No. 440	Good.
					Constable Copland, No. 507	"
		Wellington; ironworker ..	Feb., 1908	June, 1908	Constable Scott, No. 1241	"
					Sergeant Baskiville, No. 499	"

No. 1350.

July 19, 1907	29	Perthshire, Scotland; shepherd ..	May, 1893	May, 1897
		Blairgowrie, Scotland; shepherd	May, 1897	May, 1899
		Perthshire; shearing ..	May, 1899	July, 1899
		Ayrshire Constabulary ..	July, 1899	Oct., 1906	Very good discharge..	..
		Stevenston, Scotland; Compulsory Officer, drillmaster, and physical-exercise instructor	Oct., 1906	May, 1907	Good references

Joined.	Age.	Previous Occupations.			Inquiry made by.	Character.
		Where and how employed.	From	To		
No. 1351.						
July 19, 1907	23	Scotland ; farm labourer	April, 1898	Oct., 1902	Very good discharge..	..
		Inverness Police	Oct., 1902	Oct., 1904		
		Dundee Police	May, 1905	May, 1907		
No. 1471.						
Oct. 9, 1908	23	Scotland ; farm servant	May, 1900	July, 1905	Good discharge	..
		Leith Police	July, 1905	Aug., 1908		
No. 1514.						
April 1, 1909	26	Lochalsh ; woodcutting	1896	1900	Good discharge Constable Collett, No. 886	Good.
		Ross-shire ; farm labourer	1900	1901		
		Auchmore ; farm labourer	1901	1902		
		" " "	1902	1905		
		Glasgow Police	April, 1905	July, 1908		
		Dunsandel, N.Z. ; farm labourer	Oct., 1908	Nov., 1908		
		Otira ; labourer	Nov., 1908	Dec., 1908		
		Greymouth ; fencing	Jan., 1909			
		Public Works, Dunollie, Grey- mouth ; labourer	Feb., 1909	Mar., 1909		
No. 1468.						
Oct. 1, 1908	34	Glasgow Police	May, 1897	Dec., 1900	Good discharge	..
		Cape Police ; constable and de- tective	Dec., 1900	July, 1908	Very good discharge..	
No. 1437.—Voluntarily resigned, 30th November, 1908.						
June 15, 1908	27	Nottingham ; clerk	Jan., 1899	Aug., 1900	Excellent testimonials and very good dis- charges	..
		Surrey ; farm steward..	Aug., 1900	Dec., 1900		
		Wolverhampton ; agent	July, 1901	Sept., 1901		
		Cape Police	Nov., 1901	Nov., 1903		
		Transvaal Police	Dec., 1903	Dec., 1904		
		Cape Town ; photographer	Jan., 1905	Mar., 1905		
		Cape Police	April, 1905	Sept., 1906		
		Johannesburg ; Assistant Chinese Controller	Oct., 1906	Feb., 1908		

EXHIBIT No. 3.

New Zealand Police, 08/2624.

Finger-print Branch, Police Department, Wellington, 2nd December, 1908.

APPLICATION OF E. W. DINNIE, FINGER-PRINT EXPERT, FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO VISIT ENGLAND.

I RESPECTFULLY beg to apply for six months' leave of absence from 12th February next to 11th August, 1909, for the purpose of proceeding to England on private business.

I have now completed five and a half years' service, during which time I have not had any leave of absence.

It is my intention when in London to visit the Finger-print Department of the Metropolitan Police, New Scotland Yard, with the view of obtaining all information in respect to all recent improvements in the system of identifying criminals, and also to purchase some up-to-date paraphernalia required in the F.P. Branch.

E. W. DINNIE,
Finger-print Expert.

The Commissioner of Police, Wellington.

The Hon. the Minister of Justice.

Recommended, one month with pay, remainder without pay. Arrangements can be made in respect to the duties of applicant during his absence.

W. DINNIE, Com.
2/12/08.

Appd.—J.McG. 2/12/08.

EXHIBIT No. 4.

RETURN OF CLERKS AND ASSISTANTS, SHOWING SERVICE, ETC., SEPTEMBER, 1909.

No.	Rank.	Name.	Where stationed.	Joined Service.	Appointed to Office.	Promoted.
..	Sub-Insp.	Wright, A. H. ..	Head Office ..	2/8/82	11/11/82	Sergeant, 1/1/98.
413	Sergeant	McGill, W. ..	" ..	18/5/82	21/11/92	Sub-Insp., 1/1/06.
800	"	McNeely, W. ..	" ..	24/5/97	June, 1897	Sergeant, 1/1/03.
939	"	Dart, J. W. M. ..	" ..	1/2/00	4/1/04	" 1/4/06.
902	"	Muggeridge, A. ..	" ..	1/7/99	23/2/00	" 1/6/06.
822	"	Gaffney, M. ..	" ..	11/12/97	10/3/98	" 1/10/06.
914	Constable	Nelson, J. ..	" ..	1/9/99	11/6/03	" 1/12/07.
1216	"	Thomson, J. R. ..	" ..	1/1/06	24/12/08	..
			Districts,—			
720	Sergeant	Wohlmann, W. G. ..	Auckland ..	14/11/95	Aug., 1898	Sergeant, 1/4/06.
1063	Constable	Nash, John ..	" ..	1/12/02	22/11/06	..
1258	"	Halke, C. J. ..	" ..	21/5/06	17/2/07	..
1299	"	Garvey, S. ..	" ..	21/12/06	1/5/07	..
990	"	Hughes, J. ..	Thames ..	1/3/01	4/7/01	..
906	Sergeant	Cummings, D. J. ..	Napier ..	1/7/99	4/11/01	Sergeant, 1/7/09.
865	"	Till, S. ..	Wanganui ..	19/9/98	Feb., 1899	" 1/9/08.
1113	Constable	Powell, J. ..	" ..	1/5/04	27/5/07	..
674	Sergeant	McGuire, J. P. H. ..	Wellington ..	15/5/94	26/1/99	Sergeant, 1/4/06.
1105	Constable	Fleming, M. ..	" ..	1/2/04	21/2/08	..
1309	"	Blake, W. ..	" ..	1/2/07	12/7/09	..
541	Sergeant	Oliver, T. ..	Greymouth..	6/4/89	1895	Sergeant, 1/2/06.
308	"	McClelland, R. ..	Christchurch	18/6/79	8/12/87	" 1/12/01.
1069	Constable	Grace, T. ..	" ..	1/4/03	2/1/06	..
1151	"	Snow, C. A. E. ..	" ..	1/2/05	1/8/08	..
769	Sergeant	Murray, E. ..	Dunedin ..	8/2/97	1/2/99	Sergeant, 1/1/07.
1181	Constable	Chalmers, G. ..	" ..	1/7/05	23/1/06	..
1201	"	Lennon, C. H. ..	" ..	1/11/05	1/8/08	..
944	"	Booth, E. ..	Invercargill..	1/2/00	5/3/00	..

EXHIBIT No. 5.

PRESENT AND PROPOSED PAY OF POLICE.

Rank.	Present Pay.				Proposed Pay.				House allowance.		
	Rate.	Amount per Year.		Rate.	Amount per Year.		Present.	Proposed.			
								In Cities.	Outside Cities.		

PRESENT AND PROPOSED PAY OF POLICE—*continued.*

Rank.	Present Pay.		Proposed Pay.		House allowance.		
	Rate.	Amount per Year.	Rate.	Amount per Year.	Present.	Proposed.	
						In Cities.	Outside Cities.
					Per year. £	Per year. £	Per year. £
Station Sergeant	12 6	228 2 6	13 0	237 5 0	40	40	
After 1 year	13 0	237 5 0	13 6	246 7 6	to	to	
„ 2 years	13 6	246 7 6	14 0	255 10 0	45	45	
Sub-Inspector	260 0 0	..	270 0 0	50 to 60	50 to 60	50
After 1 year	270 0 0	..	280 0 0			
„ 2 years	280 0 0	..	290 0 0			
„ 3 „	290 0 0	..	300 0 0			
„ 4 „	300 0 0	..	310 0 0			
„ 5 „	310 0 0	..	320 0 0			
Inspector	330 0 0	..	340 0 0	50	..	50
After 1 year	340 0 0	..	350 0 0			
„ 2 years	350 0 0	..	360 0 0			
„ 3 „	360 0 0	..	370 0 0			
„ 4 „	370 0 0	..	380 0 0			
„ 5 „	380 0 0	..	390 0 0			
„ 6 „	390 0 0	..	400 0 0			
„ 7 „	400 0 0	..	410 0 0			
„ 8 „	410 0 0	..	420 0 0			
City Inspector	420 0 0	..	430 0 0	65 to 80	65 to 80	
After 1 year	430 0 0	..	440 0 0			
„ 2 years	440 0 0	..	450 0 0			
„ 3 „	450 0 0	..	460 0 0			
„ 4 „	460 0 0	..	470 0 0			
Detective	s. d. 10 0	£ s. d. 182 10 0	s. d. 10 6	£ s. d. 191 12 6	Per day. s. d. 1 6	Per day. s. d. 2 0	Per day. s. d. 1 6
After 3 years	11 0	200 15 0	11 6	209 17 6
„ 6 „	12 0	219 0 0	12 6	228 2 6
„ 9 „	13 0	237 5 0	13 6	246 7 6
„ 12 „	14 0	255 10 0	14 6	264 2 6
„ 15 „	15 0	273 15 0	15 6	282 17 6
Chief Detective	15 6	282 17 6	16 0	292 0 0	2 0	2 6	2 0
After 2 years	16 0	292 0 0	16 6	301 2 6
„ 4 „	16 6	301 2 6	17 0	310 5 0
Probationer	6 0	109 10 0	7 0	127 15 0

The total cost of the proposed increase in pay to all ranks would be,—

753 sergeants, constables, and detectives, at £9 2s. 6d.	£	6,871
10 probationers, at £18 5s.		182
15 officers, at £10		150
Per annum		7,203

The cost of the increased house-allowance would be,—

245 sergeants, detectives, and constables, at £9 2s. 6d.	£	2,235
Total increase per annum		£9,438

W. DINNIE,
Commissioner of Police.

EXHIBIT No. 6.

ANNUAL AND OTHER LEAVE GRANTED CONSTABLES IN AUSTRALASIAN POLICE FORCES.

SYDNEY.

Twenty-eight days, taken as follows: viz., 1 day a month, and 16 days continuously; four periods of 7 days each; the whole 28 days continuously.

MELBOURNE.

Seventeen days. No provision for occasional leave, for which men apply when requiring same.

ADELAIDE.

Fourteen days; also an occasional Sunday.

BRISBANE.

Three weeks; 4 or 5 weeks in remote country districts; also an occasional Sunday.

HOBART.

Fourteen days. No provision for occasional leave, for which men apply when requiring same.

PERTH.

Three weeks; 1 month in remote country districts; also 1 Sunday a month.

EXHIBIT No. 7.

NUMBER OF BOYS PASSING STANDARDS IV, V, AND VI RESPECTIVELY.

(See Mr. Hogben's evidence, page 422.)

I. IN THE YEARS 1896-99, WHEN S4 WAS STANDARD OF EXEMPTION.

II. IN THE YEARS 1905-8, WHEN S5 WAS STANDARD OF EXEMPTION.

	I.		II.	
	1896-99.	Per Cent.	1905-8.	Per Cent.
Out of those entering S4 classes there—				
(a.) Left without passing S4...	...	22	12	
(b.) Passed S4	78	88	
(c.) Left without passing S5 (including (a))	47	37	
(d.) Passed S5	53	63	
(e.) Left without passing S6 (including (a) and (c))	65	54	
(f.) Passed S6	35	46	

NOTES.—(i.) The number entering S4 classes annually may be taken as about 9,000.

(ii.) Since 1904 there have been no individual passes in standards, although any individual who applies can obtain a certificate of competency for any standard if he satisfies the requirements. The word "passed" in II, above, means "qualified for promotion to a higher class."

(iii.) If we take the following education districts—Taranaki, Wanganui, Hawke's Bay, Marlborough, Nelson, and South Canterbury—which have probably a larger proportion of rural population than the rest, we get boys who—

	Per Cent.
Leave without passing S4 ...	12
Pass S4 ...	88
Pass S5 ...	55

For the whole Dominion the corresponding figures are 12, 88, and 63 per cent.

G. HOGBEN.
14/9/09.

EXHIBIT No. 8.

RETURN OF MEN NOW SERVING WHO HAVE BEEN DEALT WITH FOR BEING UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF LIQUOR.

Reg. No.	Rank.	Date of Offence.	How dealt with.	By whom.
138	Constable	Mar. 27, 1880	Fined 5s.	Inspector James.
142	"	Aug. 5, 1875	Fined 10s.	Inspector Broham.
144	"	May 4, 1905..	Pay reduced to 8s. per day for twelve months	Commissioner Dinnie.
160	"	Oct. 4, 1883 ..	Fined 5s.	Inspector Thomson.
160	"	Sept. 24, 1885	Fined 10s.	"
160	"	May 20, 1886	"	"
160	"	Aug. 17, 1888	"	Inspector Broham.
178	"	Mar. 1, 1890..	Reduced to third-class constable ..	Commissioner Hume.
205	"	April, 1892 ..	" " " " " "	"
213	"	Mar. 25, 1879	Fined 2s. 6d.	Inspector James.
239	"	Mar. 23, 1908	Fined 10s., and transferred to Dunedin City	Commissioner Dinnie.
239	"	Oct. 15, 1908	Fined £1, dismounted to perform street duty, and conduct to be reported on in three months	"
240	Sergeant	Aug. 16, 1907	Transferred to Auckland	"
252	Constable	Aug. 18, 1878	Fined 10s.	W. G. Stack, commanding depot.
265	Sergeant	Jan. 21, 1881	Fined £1	Inspector Hickson.
275	"	May 4, 1881 ..	Fined 5s.	Inspector Broham.
276	"	Dec. 25, 1883	Severely reprimanded	"
282	Constable	April 4, 1908	Fined 10s.	Commissioner Dinnie.
304	"	May 24, 1882	Fined £1	Captain Baker.
309A	"	April 17, 1906	Loss of three days' pay, and transferred to do street duty in Palmerston North	Commissioner Dinnie.
432	"	April 3, 1884	Fined £1	Inspector Broham.
432	"	Feb. 19, 1883	"	Sub-Inspector Coleman.
413	Sergeant	Oct. 9, 1883	"	Commissioner Reader.
440	Constable	Feb. 10, 1887	"	Inspector Pender.
469	"	Jan. 1, 1886 ..	"	Inspector Weldon.
460	"	Oct. 4, 1887 ..	Fined £2	Commissioner of Police.
488	Sergeant	April 9, 1894	Fined 10s.	"
516	Constable	July 23, 1907	Fined 10s., and transferred to Wellington	Commissioner Dinnie.
516	"	May 24, 1908	Fined, and cautioned, if again found in similar condition, will be dismissed	"
548	"	Feb. 1, 1904 ..	Fined £1 and caution	"
548	"	Oct. 26, 1906	Fined £1	"
556	"	April 6, 1904	Fined 10s. and caution	"
560	Detective	July 15, 1890	Fined 10s.	Inspector Moore.
579	Constable	April 11, 1900	"	Commissioner of Police.
588	"	Oct. 12, 1905	Reduced 6d. per day for six months, and transferred	Commissioner Dinnie.
588	"	July 1, 1908 ..	Reduced 6d. per day for twelve months, and cautioned	"
739	Detective	Feb. 26, 1909	Fined 10s.	"
766	Constable	Oct. 16, 1903	Fined 7s. 6d. and caution	Inspector O'Brien.
766	"	May 8, 1906 ..	Fined £1, and transferred	Commissioner Dinnie.
875	"	May 5, 1907 ..	Transferred to Bluff	"
894	"	Oct. 16, 1903	Fined £1 1s. and caution	"
927	"	Jan. 22, 1907	Fined 10s., and removed from watch-house	"
935	"	May 9, 1903 ..	Fined £1	"
946	"	Mar. 29, 1909	Fined 5s.	"
962	"	Jan. 16, 1909	Fined 10s., and strictly cautioned ..	"
1091	"	Oct. 27, 1907	Fined £1	"
1091	"	June 13, 1908	Fined £1, and strictly cautioned ..	"
1142	"	Jan. 30, 1907	Fined 10s.	"
1145	"	May 12, 1909	Fined £1, and cautioned a repetition will mean dismissal	"
1178	"	Nov. 27, 1907	Fined £1	"

RETURN OF MEN NOW SERVING WHO HAVE BEEN DEALT WITH FOR BEING UNDER THE INFLUENCE
OF LIQUOR—*continued.*

Reg. No.	Rank.	Date of Offence.	How dealt with.	By whom.
1191	Constable	Jan. 20, 1907	Fined 10s.	Commissioner Dinnie.
1214	"	April 18, 1907	Fined £1	"
1230	"	Oct. 10, 1907	To forfeit pay until such time as he re- sumes duty	"
1253	"	Oct. 11, 1906	Fined £1	"
1263	"	Aug. 7, 1909	"	"
1283	"	Feb. 29, 1908	Fined 10s.	"
1295	"	Feb. 16, 1907	"	"
1313	"	Dec. 31, 1908	Fined £1	"
1344	"	Dec. 24, 1908	Fined 10s.	"
1373	"	Nov. 21, 1908	Fined £1	"
1373	"	Dec. 31, 1908	Fined £1 and strictly cautioned ..	"
1414	"	April 1, 1909	Fined £1	"
1422	"	July 18, 1908	Fined 10s. and caution	"
1450	"	Aug. 14, 1908	Fined £1 and caution	"
1513	"	April 30, 1909	"	"

EXHIBIT No. 9.

ST. JOHN AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION.

(See Sergeant Dart's evidence, page 442.)

EXAMINATION IN FIRST AID.

Date, 25th August, 1909.

Instructor : Dr. Henry.

Examiner : Dr. Bowerbank.

Candidate.	Examination No.	Marks, 100.			Result.
		Oral and Practical, 50.	Written, 50.	Total.	
Charles T. Baylis	1	50	45	95	Pass.
James H. Brooks	2	47	50	97	"
Patrick Butler	3	45	47	92	"
E. H. Dalton	4	Absent
M. F. de la Cour	5	46	45	91	Pass.
Fred. J. Hanlon	6	47	45	92	"
D. J. M. Hewitt	7	48	50	98	"
Charles A. Lambert	8	46	50	96	"
Arch. Leckie	9	47	50	97	"
William McPherson	10	46	48	94	"
G. Naughton	11	50	50	100	"
J. R. Proctor	12	45	47	92	"
George Sivyver	13	50	50	100	"
H. R. Huntly	14*	50	43	93	"
William A. Calwell	15*	50	50	100	"

* Second year.

The knowledge displayed by the candidates in both practical and written was most thorough.

FRED. T. BOWERBANK.

ST. JOHN AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION.
EXAMINATION IN FIRST AID.

27th May, 1909.

Instructor : Dr. Henry.

Examiner : Dr. F. T. Bowerbank.

Candidate.	Year.	Exami- nation No.	Marks, 100.			Result.	Remarks.
			Oral and Practical, 50.	Written, 50.	Total.		
<i>Police.</i>							
Anderson, H. ..	1	1	40	41	81	Passed
Berthelson, P. C. ..	1	2	50	45	95	"
Cooper, Samuel ..	1	3	50	37	87	"
Courtney, James ..	1	4	45	39	84	"
Fox, Lawrence ..	1	5	47	50	97	"
Jackson, A. J. ..	1	6	50	48	98	"
Johnson, R. A. ..	1	7	45	25	70	"
Kenealy, William G. ..	1	8	50	50	100	"
Magee, P. James ..	1	9	50	50	100	"
McQuitty, James E. ..	1	10	45	44	89	"
Nolan, J. John ..	1	11	45	50	95	"
Reeves, Horace T. ..	1	12	50	50	100	"
Smith, Daniel Robert ..	1	13	45	48	93	"

EXHIBIT No. 10.

NEW ZEALAND POLICE.

RETURN SHOWING THE AGE AND LENGTH OF SERVICE OF EACH SERGEANT IN THE POLICE FORCE AT THE
DATE OF HIS PROMOTION TO THE NON-COMMISSIONED RANK.

Reg. No.	Date.	Name.	Age at Date of Promo- tion.	Length of Service at Date of Promo- tion.
Station Sergeants,—				
244	Mar. 1, 1906..	King, Thomas, 8	54	28
199	May 1, 1907..	Johnston, James, 8	50	31
195	July 1, 1908..	Darby, Robert, 10	59	32
128	Feb. 1, 1909..	Treanor, James, 8	57	35
Sergeant-Major,—				
57	Dec. 15, 1884..	Mason, William Thomas, 10 ..	39	16
Sergeants,—				
130	May 30, 1879..	Gilbert, William, 10	32	5
193	Aug. 26, 1879..	McGrath, Patrick, 8	29	3
269	June 1, 1885..	Lyons, William, 8	30	7
101	July 1, 1887..	Stagpoole, Martin Dudley, 8 ..	32	15
306	Jan. 1, 1894..	Bernard, John Stanhope, 10 ..	49	15
210	Jan. 1, 1894..	Mackay, Edward, 8	37	17
187	Jan. 1, 1898..	Mackenzie, John Campbell, 8 ..	47	22
235	Jan. 1, 1898..	Bourke, Thomas, 8	41	20
270	Jan. 1, 1898..	Bowman, Patrick, 8	44	19
265	Aug. 1, 1898..	Higgins, William Henry, 8 ..	46	20
109	Oct. 1, 1898..	Haddrell, Walter Henry, 8 ..	49	26
275	Oct. 7, 1898..	Dougan, John, 8	41	20
240	Jan. 1, 1899..	Rogers, Martin, 8	41	21
169	April 1, 1899..	Smart, William Wilson, 8 ..	49	24

RETURN SHOWING AGE AND LENGTH OF SERVICE OF EACH SERGEANT AT DATE OF PROMOTION
—continued.

Reg. No.	Date.	Name.	Age at Date of Promotion.	Length of Service at Date of Promotion.	
		Sergeants—continued.	Years.	Years.	
433	Feb. 8, 1900..	Griffith, Thomas, 8 (Constable from 6/1/03 to 29/2/04)	47	17	
281	Mar. 1, 1900..	Cruickshank, Alexander, 8 ..	44	21	
220	Oct. 20, 1900..	Cullen, Francis, 10 ..	54	23	
327	Jan. 1, 1901..	Folley, William, 8 ..	42	21	
214	Sept. 15, 1901..	Bowden, Charles, 8 ..	49	24	
276	Sept. 15, 1901..	Sheehan, Bartholomew, 8 ..	42	23	
308	Dec. 1, 1901..	McClelland, Robert, 8 ..	44	22	District Clerk, Christchurch.
280	Feb. 7, 1902..	Egan, Eugene, 8 ..	47	23	
335	Mar. 14, 1902..	Millar, Nathaniel, 8 ..	46	22	
354	Mar. 14, 1902..	Hanson, John, 8 ..	49	21	
380	May 1, 1902..	Fouhy, William, 6½ ..	42	21	
372	July 21, 1902..	Remer, Alfred Edward, 8 ..	47	21	
397	Jan. 1, 1903..	Carroll, Lawrence, 8 ..	51	21	
413	Jan. 1, 1903..	McGill, William, 8 ..	46	21	Editor, Police Gazette.
428	Jan. 1, 1903..	Crawford, Robert, 8 ..	43	20	
437	Jan. 27, 1903..	Dew, Samuel Joseph, 6½ ..	43	20	
388	Mar. 1, 1903..	McKinnon, William Hector, 6½ ..	42	21	
184	Jan. 1, 1904..	Donovan, Michael, 10 ..	58	28	
391	Oct. 1, 1904..	Bird, Edward Punjab, 8 ..	48	23	
232	Dec. 1, 1904..	Ryan, Patrick, 8 ..	48	27	
473	Dec. 1, 1904..	Mullany, Luke, 6½ ..	43	19	
489	Dec. 1, 1904..	Rutledge, Barrett, 6½ ..	39	18	
530	Dec. 1, 1904..	Watt, John, 8 ..	52	16	
311	Jan. 1, 1905..	Hastie, George, 8 ..	48	26	
488	Mar. 1, 1905..	Ramsay, William, 6½ ..	40	19	
374	July 1, 1905..	Morgan, Andrew, 8 ..	51	24	
477	Feb. 1, 1906..	Mathieson, William, 6½ ..	40	21	
531	Feb. 1, 1906..	Moore, Frederick Augustus, 6½ ..	46	17	
538	Feb. 1, 1906..	Beattie, Henry, 6½ ..	44	17	
541	Feb. 1, 1906..	Oliver, Thomas, 6½ ..	42	17	District Clerk, Grey-mouth.
542	Feb. 1, 1906..	Brookes, Wallace Abercrombie, 8..	46	17	
566	Mar. 1, 1906..	Murphy, Michael, 8 ..	48	16	
568	Mar. 1, 1906..	Barrett, Thomas, 6½ ..	39	16	
570	Mar. 1, 1906..	Hutton, David Dearlove, 6½ ..	45	16	
577	Mar. 1, 1906..	Black, James, 8 ..	47	16	
674	April 1, 1906..	McGuire, John Pat. Hackett, 6½ ..	38	12	District Clerk, Wellington.
720	April 1, 1906..	Wohlmann, Ward George, 5 ..	34	10	District Clerk, Auckland.
800	April 1, 1906..	McNeely, William, 5 ..	36	9	Clerk, Commissioner's Office.
619	June 1, 1906..	Forster, John, 8 ..	47	14	
623	June 1, 1906..	Emerson, Albert Tivy, 5 ..	35	14	
939	June 1, 1906..	Dart, John William Martin, 5 ..	34	6	Instructor, Training Depot.
494	June 15, 1906..	Baskiville, Walter Joseph, 8 ..	49	20	
472A	July 15, 1906..	Burrows, John, 6½ ..	46	21	
625	Aug. 1, 1906..	McPhee, Archibald, 6½ ..	40	14	
644	Aug. 17, 1906..	Eales, Edwin, 5 ..	36	13	
902	Oct. 1, 1906..	Muggeridge, Amos, 5 ..	32	7	Police Storekeeper.
373	Dec. 1, 1906..	Dale, James, 6½ ..	45	25	
769	Jan. 1, 1907..	Murray, Edwin, 6½ ..	39	10	District Clerk, Dunedin.
650	Mar. 8, 1907..	Hogan, John James, 6½ ..	40	14	
659	May 1, 1907..	Willis, Joseph Charles Stevens, 6½ ..	38	13	
673	June 1, 1907..	Griffiths, James Coghlan, 6½ ..	40	13	
628	Sept. 1, 1907..	Kelly, Charles William, 6½ ..	40	15	
822	Dec. 1, 1907..	Gaffney, Michael, 5 ..	35	10	Clerk, Commissioner's Office.
649	Dec. 15, 1907..	O'Grady, Thomas, 6½ ..	38	14	

RETURN SHOWING AGE AND LENGTH OF SERVICE OF EACH SERGEANT AT DATE OF PROMOTION
—continued.

Reg. No.	Date.	Name.	Age at Date of Promo- tion.	Length of Service at Date of Promo- tion.	—
		Sergeants—continued.	Years.	Years.	
699	Dec. 15, 1907..	Crean, Patrick, 6½	40	13	
512	Feb. 1, 1908..	McKeefry, Michael, 8	49	20	
708	Feb. 1, 1908..	Simpson, James Kerr, 6½	41	13	
547	Mar. 1, 1908..	Stewart, David, 6½	48	19	
740	June 10, 1908..	Harvey, Peter, 5	38	12	
611	July 1, 1908..	Keep, George, 6½	39	17	
691	Sept. 1, 1908..	Ferguson, James, 5	38	14	
865	Sept. 1, 1908..	Till, Stephen, 5	35	10	District Clerk, Wa- nganui.
684	Nov. 1, 1908..	Rowell, Alfred Ernest, 6½	41	14	
584	Feb. 15, 1909..	O'Connell, Patrick Denis, 8	50	18	
719	Feb. 15, 1909..	Miller, William, 6½	41	13	
727	Mar. 16, 1909..	Eccles, William, 5	38	13	
728	April 1, 1909..	McCrorie, Hugh, 6½	41	13	
621	July 1, 1909..	Hodgson, Richard Thomas, 5	39	17	
906	July 1, 1909..	Cummings, Denis Joseph, 5	31	10	District Clerk, Napier.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation (not given); printing (1,100 copies, including maps), £346 5s. 6d.

By Authority : JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1909.

Price 5s.]

Map showing boundaries of the present
THAMES POLICE DISTRICT,
and the addition proposed by
INSPECTOR KIELY.

Proposed addition shown thus,



Bay of Plenty

PRESENT THAMES POLICE DISTRICT

North Taranaki Bight

South Latitude

Mahia Peninsula

